

THE BROOKINGS INSTITUTION

IMMIGRATION, POLITICS AND LOCAL RESPONSES

Washington, D.C.

Thursday, February 26, 2009

ANDERSON COURT REPORTING  
706 Duke Street, Suite 100  
Alexandria, VA 22314  
Phone (703) 519-7180 Fax (703) 519-7190

**PARTICIPANTS:****Introduction:**

ALICE RIVLIN  
Senior Fellow and Director  
Greater Washington Research Project  
The Brookings Institution

**Presentation:**

AUDREY SINGER  
Senior Fellow  
The Brookings Institution

**Panel Discussion:**

MARCELA SANCHEZ, Moderator  
Washington Columnist  
The New York Times Syndicate

RANDOLPH CAPPS  
Demographer and Senior Policy Analyst  
Migration Policy Institute

ROBIN KORALEK  
Research Associate  
Center on Labor, Human Services and Population  
The Urban Institute

ANGELES ORTEGA-MOORE  
Chief Executive Officer  
Latin American Coalition

\* \* \* \* \*

## P R O C E E D I N G S

DR. RIVLIN: (In progress) -- among the audience on the issue of local responses to immigration. We all know that immigration is a major national issue and I guess if one lives in Washington, one thinks of it as a national issue. Our nation has been struggling for some time with how to balance conflicting values, values that most of us hold.

Over the decades the United States has been enriched by a remarkable flow of immigration. New immigrants have provided workers for America's industries. They've provided skills and energy and entrepreneurial talent and a belief in making life better for their children. But there have been strains over the years of assimilation. In recent years since we've had a large number of illegal immigrants either coming across the borders or overstaying visas, we've been faced with the problem of we do believe that laws should be observed and what do we do in the face of large undocumented immigrants who are vulnerable to exploitation and cause us to have conflict between the values of wanting more immigration and wanting to enforce the law. So we've been working on resolving that conflict at the national level and that work is

still very much unfinished.

Meanwhile, immigration is also a local issue.

People live somewhere, they work somewhere, and they run into the values of the community into which they have moved. So local communities have found themselves in the middle of immigration policy taking steps in one direction or the other, some to welcome immigrants and some to keep them out. These have become local law-enforcement issues, local housing issues, local labor-market issues.

Right here in our area we've had many examples of this, but most particularly in Prince William County. Today we're going to start by focusing on Prince William County, a paper that Audrey Singer, Jill Wilson, and Brooke DeRenzis have written about what's happened there and what is happening there. I will start by introducing Audrey, and then we will have a panel talking about other local immigration issues chaired by Marcela Sanchez.

Audrey besides being one of my favorite people, always cheerful, very hard working, is by profession a sociologist and a demographer, but she has focused very heavily on immigration issues both nationally and locally. She has a very long list of

publications and books which I will not read to you, but she has focused in addition to the national work on Washington as an immigrant gateway which it has very much become in the last few years. So without further ado, I present to you Audrey Singer to talk about the paper that she and her colleagues wrote on Prince William County.

DR. SINGER: Thanks, Alice, and I also want to thank everybody for coming out today, this afternoon. It's finally spring and it's amazing we could get people to come inside on such a nice afternoon. I also want to mention my two co-authors Jill Wilson and Brooke DeRenzis who worked very hard on this paper, following the news and events in Prince William County as they unfolded, and gathering and analyzing data. So this is as much their report as it is mine.

We got interested in what was happening in Prince William County because in the Metropolitan Policy Program we've been researching the changing settlement patterns of immigrants across the United States. The strong economy of the 1990s and the growth of new economy jobs in particular spread population growth in many urban and suburban communities across

the country. Immigrants were attracted by the demand for workers in construction, manufacturing and service sectors, and many immigrants settled in some of the fastest-growing metropolitan areas in the country. Some of these places were unaccustomed to receiving immigrants. The paper that we're presenting today zeroes in on one of those places, Prince William County, to take a closer look at how a county undergoing swift demographic change responded to immigration.

To give you a sense of the large context, I probably don't have to mind this audience that the U.S. Congress recently took up immigration reform as an issue in need of an overhaul. After several years of very difficult debate, the issue was tabled while the presidential campaign got underway and now with the new administration there is renewed pressure for reform. In the meantime, local leaders in many areas around the country were pressured to change local policies around immigrants in response to the lack of federal immigration reform. Localities have responded to immigrants in their midst in a variety of different ways, some with restrictive actions and others with more inclusive policies. And at the state level, the

National Conference of State Legislatures reports that in 2008 over 1,300 state laws and resolutions were introduced and just over 200 of them were enacted. These pieces of legislation focus on issues regarding employment, health care, law enforcement, English-language training and other integrative programs.

But that's just the states. Municipalities in many areas also proposed or passed new laws and resolutions related to immigrants and immigration. So it's not surprising that debates around immigration have become common in many more places around the country. Immigration used to be something that people debated in California, New York, in Texas, and now because of this new geography of immigration, many more local areas are having discussions about the changes brought on by immigration.

Prince William County, Virginia, is one of the major places, and we were lucky that it happens to be right here where we live. It has experienced a lot of changes over a very short period of time. You can see how it fits in to counties across the country. This is a table that shows the top counties for Hispanic growth since the year 2000, and these numbers reflect all Hispanics, not just the foreign born.

Prince William County ranks eleventh in the country and numerically has the largest number by far of any of the other counties on this list. Five additional counties in metropolitan Washington are also on the list as is Luzerne County, Pennsylvania, which is where the city of Hazelton is located, and some of you might recognize that as another place with landmark laws; suburban Atlanta is also well represented in this list.

What happened in Prince William County? It took is about a year to figure it out ourselves after talking to a lot of people and doing a lot of research, but I'm going to tell you in just a few minutes and encapsulate the story for you. First I want to look at local policy with regard to immigrants residing in the county and specifically those who are unauthorized to be in the United States.

Starting with the December 2006 directive that mandated county staff to calculate the total cost of providing services to unauthorized immigrants, the Board of County Supervisors in Prince William County has repeatedly introduced and revised policies aimed at the unauthorized population. In addition, the November 2007 election campaign of county board members produced an outpouring of anti-illegal immigrant rhetoric and



intense pressuring of candidates to take a stand against illegal immigration. In that regard, county leaders portrayed the presence of unauthorized immigrants as an affront to the rule of law and as a public safety issue. Both officials and residents used legal status to frame their words and actions against immigrants, and in July 2007 the board unanimously passed a resolution that ordered local police to check the residency status of those in violation of county or state law if there was probable cause to believe that they were present illegally.

Another provision required county staff to deny certain public benefits to those unable to prove legal residency. Then over the course of a little bit less than a year, the policy underwent revisions that resulted in a more defensible enforcement strategy. However, the message of the initial crackdown was strong and it had both immediate and lasting effects.

So while the wave of restrictive immigration policymaking in Prince William County seemed to have emerged with little forewarning, its origins came over a long period of time marked by intense demographic change. It coincided with broader economic and demographic changes within the metropolitan area which

was suburbanizing at a very rapid pace, and many long-term residents and newcomers faced with high home prices begin settling farther out from the core where they found more affordable homes along with other quality-of-life attributes such as good schools and safe neighborhoods.

As researchers of immigration to this region, we were intrigued by Prince William's growth in immigrants and Latinos and also the response to the large and quick influx of immigrants, and in the paper that you all now have, we focus on the metamorphosis of this county from a place with a small town feel and a relatively homogenous population to one with a very diverse population within this larger context of a rapidly transforming metropolitan area.

Prince William County responded to the very fast growth of the immigrant population by enacting one of the most strict enforcement strategies in the country, and it has attracted a lot of attention from local and national media. At the root of these great changes is the confluence of population growth, demographic change and economic development combined with policies, grassroots activism and media attention. Washington as you all probably know has only recently

emerged as a major immigrant gateway during the last few decades, and you can see on this slide the growth from 1970 to 2007 when more than 1 million immigrants resided in the region. It's now 20 percent foreign born and ranks seventh nationally on the number of immigrants among all metropolitan areas in the country.

Metropolitan Washington's immigrants are from a very diverse set of countries and no one country truly dominates. You can see on this chart that El Salvador is the top country but it only makes up 13 percent of the total foreign born in the region. The next several countries, India, Korea, and Mexico, make up about 5 or 6 percent. And immigrants have been settling farther away from the core of the region which includes the District, Arlington, and Alexandria, and past the inner suburban counties of Montgomery, Prince George's and Fairfax, and rapidly finding homes in the next ring of suburbs, especially Loudoun and Prince William Counties. So in 1970 you can see that 39 percent of all immigrants lived in the core while only 2 percent were in the outer suburbs; by 2007, there were nearly equal proportions living in these places, about 14 to 15 percent.

So we spent over a year tracking events as

they developed and analyzed growth and changed through economic and census data, and you can see our sources on this slide. I won't go through them, but I will talk a little bit about demographic change in Prince William County because it's an important part of the context for what happened.

Here is a map of the Washington metropolitan area. Prince William County is part of the fast-growing outer suburbs which are in that medium blue color on the map. The total population nearly doubled between 1980 and 2006 to over 350,000. Between 2000 and 2006, population growth was nearly twice what it was in the 1990s on an annual basis. As a result, Prince William County has experienced dramatic demographic change. Hispanics accounted for a greater proportion of the county's overall growth, about 31 percent of the total county growth between 1980 and 2006, and you can see the respective figures for blacks and whites. The majority of this growth in the Latino population between 1980 and 2006 has occurred since 2000, and as you saw in that other table, that puts it at the top of the list of county growth in the country. The non-Hispanic white share of the population fell from 87 percent in 1980 to 52 percent in 2006, and

we'll see in a moment on another slide that this change has been concentrated in certain parts of the county.

Immigrant was a large component of the rapid and recent change and Prince William's immigration boom has come since 2000, and there are now almost 80,000 foreign born as of 2006. The county itself is 22 percent foreign born which is slightly higher than the region as a whole, compared to just 12 percent 6 years earlier in 2000. And the geographic origins of immigrants in the county have also shifted. Latin Americans made up 28 percent of the total, and by 2006 they were a majority.

Really quickly this table talks about some of the characteristics of the foreign born. Just over half in the county were from Latin American and Caribbean countries. About one quarter arrived in the United States since 2000. That's a lower proportion than the region as a whole. Just over half have limited English skills which is also higher than the regional average. A majority are Spanish speakers, 70 percent. Nearly one third do not have a high school degree. And the one thing that we don't have that nobody has that everybody wants to know is what is the legal status of the immigrants living in Prince William

County. The best estimates that can sort of put some boundaries around this are estimates that come from a couple of sources and these are done by some of the best demographers in the country including Randy Capps and Jeffrey Passel, point to about one-third of the immigrants in the Washington metropolitan area are here in an unauthorized status and the same rate also goes for the State of Virginia, but we don't have data at smaller geographic levels and so there are no estimates for Prince William County.

The big question is what was driving all the recent growth in the county. We identified three broad reasons, jobs, housing and quality-of-life issues. The metropolitan area was going through a process of regional decentralization of population and jobs and the number of jobs as a consequence doubled in Prince William County between 1990 and 2006, so that there was strong job growth in that area. Amid souring prices, Prince William County remained affordable relative to a lot of other places in the region, so for example, during the height of the housing bubble, the outer suburbs contained a third of all affordable housing for purchase so that people were definitely looking for places that they could afford to buy homes. In terms

of quality of life, some of the things I've already mentioned, people are attracted to the county for its schools, low crime rates and other attributes that they found desirable. And the fact is that many people were attracted including immigrants by all of these qualities.

So we looked at recent home buyers who are Hispanic to look at some of the concentrations that we had heard about and we found that they were concentrated in two areas of the county, what we call the up county neighborhoods around Manassas and Manassas Park, and down county areas around Woodbridge.

The striking thing that we found was that the majority of new home purchase loans were made to Hispanic home buyers in 2006 in those areas, in the down county neighborhoods such as Dale City and Woodbridge and parts of Dumfries and a few other areas. Fifty-six percent of all loans in 2006 went to Latino homebuyers and that's up from 8 percent in 1997. It was even higher in the up county neighborhoods, and this is Sudley, Bull Run, Westgate, those neighborhoods and a few others. Seventy-five percent of all loans went to Hispanics in 2006 versus 11 percent in 1990.

What were some of the challenges associated

with this growth? Some of the challenges were what you would find in any fast-growing place including traffic congestion, demand on schools, heavy demand on public services. This is what fast-growing communities have to deal with no matter who is moving there. And as you just saw, Hispanic home ownership was clustered in certain areas which became more apparent as time went on. What we heard from long-term county residents and county officials is that neighborhoods were changing and it was not just who was living in the houses but the outward appearance of property, and the complaints were around trash, debris, tall grass, parking on lawns, inoperable vehicles, high-occupancy households and so forth.

With these changes residents began registering complaints to the county's Property Code Enforcement Group which was in the Neighborhood Services Division. The number of complaints increased by about 75 percent in the short time between 2004 and 2007, and the enforcement group had a hard time keeping up even after hiring more staff and adding Spanish speakers to the staff. In addition, due to the overwhelming growth in the county, residents also perceived that neighborhood schools were overcrowded



and worried that resources that were going to the growing number of students who had limited English proficiency were rising. ESOLE, which is English Speakers of Language Student Enrollment did rise quickly. They made up about 18 percent of the county's student population in 2007 compared to just 1 percent in 1990.

In essence, some long-residents perceived a decline in their quality of life and lobbied their elected officials to do something about it. In March 2007 some Prince William residents banded together to form Help Save Manassas whose stated goal was, "To reduce the number of illegal aliens living in our community." The organization grew quickly and successfully lobbied their county supervisor to introduce legislation aimed at cracking down on unauthorized immigrants. Shortly thereafter in spite of the police chief's warning of unintended consequences, the board unanimously passed a resolution mandating police to check a person's legal status when they had probable cause to believe that the person was illegally present. It also ordered police to enter into a 287(g) agreement with Immigration and Customs Enforcement also known as ICE which gave them access to

ICE databases and the ability to initiate deportation proceedings. The resolution also directed county staff to investigate what public services could be denied to unauthorized immigrants.

Shortly thereafter the board followed-up by voting unanimously to restrict unauthorized immigrants from receiving business licenses and from participating in eight social service programs. In addition, the updated resolution incorporated recommendations from the police chief and others to engage in public outreach and education on the new policy as well as hire an outside firm to evaluate its effects. The board also voted to install video cameras and the county's 250 police cars in order to defend against accusations of racial profiling.

Two weeks later was election day for all but one of the county board members and at least two of those board members campaigned on an anti-illegal immigration platform using their vote for the resolution as evidence of their ability to get tough. After the election the board turned its attention to implementing and paying for the resolution and balked at the high price tag, estimated at \$6.4 million, including half of that for police car cameras. So by

the end of April they had worked out a way to reduce the cost which included eliminating the probable cause standard by checking the legal status of everyone arrested and thus eliminating the risk of racial profiling accusations and thereby the need for police car cameras.

What were the impacts of these new policies very quickly? We can't say with much certainty whether the policies in Prince William have made people think twice about living there or moving there. We have heard anecdotally that families have moved and that other school districts in the region are reporting an increase of children of immigrants that corresponds to the timing of what happened in Prince William County. We do think there have been civic costs such as widespread fear within the immigrant community that they have become targets and the perception by some residents that immigrants, particularly those from Latin America, lack legal status which over the long term can be very divisive. We also can say that not everyone is completely satisfied with how things have played out in the county both among those who support the policies and those who do not.

What other factors contributed to the policy

changes? To summarize our analysis going beyond the demographic and economic changes that pushed Prince William County officials to enact this tough legislation, we have identified a number of other issues. The first is the larger congressional debate that I mentioned at the beginning of this talk and the failure of federal government to pass immigration reform in a timely manner seemed to have spurred on local immigrant policy activism. Second, we found that media, including talk radio, blogs, video and certain television personalities contributed to the discussion and helped to create links between the national and the local.

We also noticed that Prince William County looked around to other places for models of what to do, and this was at a time when the Hazelton case and other localities were working through their own policies. Public officials made it clear that they wanted their policy response to be air tight to avoid lawsuits. A fourth feature was the local election politics that were ongoing at this time, and these politics had a hand in candidates using immigration as a wedge issue. Finally, there was only limited service and advocacy infrastructure that existed in the county to guide

locals, both immigrants and others through this process.

We do have a few observations, and we're coming into the home stretch here, about what other local leaders can think about with places where fast changes in the population are happening through immigration. The first is that facts are important for effective policymaking. It's difficult to stay on top of change when it's happening very quickly. We who use demographic data know this very well, that it's very hard to get up-to-the minute information when you need it and particularly hard when you're looking at an elusive population. But local leaders should rely on official and valid data when it's available and consult with others who have grounded knowledge.

Second, we think that officials should communicate policy changes clearly. Many residents in the county were confused by the new policies and then all of the changes that followed. Many in the immigrant community were fearful about how the new policies would impact them. Building in public outreach before policies go into effect and afterwards are very important.

Third, local policies should address local

problems. Here we wanted to point out that local areas have very little control over who moves into their jurisdictions, but they make all the difference in the world on how social interactions play out and how immigrants are integrated into communities, and different areas have take different approaches to managing immigration ranging from the restrictive, the very restrictive to the very inclusive. I think we're going to hear more about this on the panel, so I will save those thoughts for later. Finally, elected officials set the tone about how a place thinks about its changing population. Residents look to leaders for information and guidance and they are really key to this process.

Finally, as Prince William County and the rest of the country turn their focus to economic issues and how to weather the current recession, the county is concerned with attracting new immigrants and businesses and retaining existing ones. How they handle the challenges and the tensions around immigration going forward is important for the economic wellbeing of everyone in the county. I will end there and I thank you for listening. I'll turn the mike over to Alice Rivlin.

DR. RIVLIN: Thank you, Audrey. I'm sure everybody has questions for Audrey but we're not going to let you ask them yet because we have a very interesting panel to follow and talk about some other aspects of the local responses and some other parts of the country. We are lucky today to have Marcela Sanchez to moderate this panel. Marcela is one of Washington's most prominent journalists following Latin American and Latino affairs. She writes a weekly column which is available in English, Spanish and Arabic via the *New York Times*. She doesn't do the translation personally, but people from all parts of the spectrum are interested in immigration and they read Marcela. It's available via the *New York Times* Syndicate. For more than 10 years Marcela worked at the *Washington Post* where she started her syndicated column and also did daily reports from the "Post" newsroom for the local Univision newscasts. Before joining the Post in 1997, she was Washington correspondent for two major daily newspapers in Colombia as well as Colombia's En Vivo and QAP television newscasts. Marcela? She will introduce the panel.

MS. SANCHEZ: It's always a pleasure to learn

so much about me when I come to these kinds of events not so much because of what Alice says because anything she says I kind of know about, but more what Audrey said and when you're an immigrant it's always interesting to hear experts explore the experience of immigration in the United States. Believe me, as an immigrant you learn a lot from experts looking at what you're doing and where you've been.

But anyway my job is actually to moderate the panel and keep the people given the constraints of the time and I'll start with Randy Capps. You've already heard about him being one of the best known demographers in the country on Latino issues also. He is a Senior Policy Analyst with the Migration Policy Institute, the Nation Center on Immigration Integration Policy. His areas of expertise include immigration trends, the unauthorized population, immigrants in the U.S. labor force and children of immigrants. He has also done work on the issue of the 287(g) agreements, the agreements that use the police to enforce federal immigration law, so he can also talk about that I believe. And he has expertise and has written about the immigration experience in Arkansas, Kentucky, California, Connecticut and Maryland. So I think he



covers a lot of the territory.

Then we have Robin Koralek who is a Research Associate in the Urban Institute's Center on Labor, Human Services and Population. She has focused her research on poverty and social welfare issues including welfare reform, employment and training, assistive benefits programs and services integration. She has done work in Oklahoma, Arkansas and Iowa.

Finally we have Angeles Ortega-Moore who is from Mexico and is the Chief Executive Officer of the Latin American Coalition, a nonprofit United Way agency answering the needs of the Latino community in Charlotte, North Carolina. Ortega-Moore is a strong advocate of the Latino community and has expanded the organization from a one-room office with two programs to a full-grown organization with a dozen staff members and over 20 different programs.

The way we're going to start is that each one of them has between 5 to 7 minutes to respond to Audrey's presentation talking from their own experience and their own research. Then we will have a little dialogue with questions and answers just with me. And at the end I certainly offer to you to ask questions of the panelists and to Audrey of course. Shall we start

with Randy?

DR. CAPPS: Thanks, Marcela. I would like to thank Audrey very much for the invitation today and to the Brookings Institution for hosting this. My comments today are going to focus on the demographics and the politics and public policy of specifically these local agreements between state and local police and the federal government to enforce immigration laws that are known sort of technically a 287 agreements. Most of the stuff written on this is by lawyers so they often refer to the exact statute which is 287(g) specifically of the immigration law. So I'll call them 287 agreements just for brevity.

My colleague at the Urban Institute Juan Pedrosa who is in the audience here today and I were in Springdale and Rogers, Arkansas, the northwestern corner of the state where Wal-Mart is headquartered, about a year ago and we heard a lot of similar stories to what Audrey talked about and investigated some of the local law-enforcement things there. So what I'm going to talk about today is some national context and some more specifically from that site in northwest Arkansas.

The main point I want to start out by

emphasizing is that Prince William County is far from unique. It's received a lot of attention, but there are 67 different jurisdictions across the country with these agreements in place. The vast majority of them are in either the Southeast or the Southwest. There are very few in the Midwest or the Northeast. In fact, nine of the agreements are in Virginia and eight are in North Carolina, so Prince William is located in a region of the country where this approach is very common.

The Southeast and the Southwest are home to most of the states with the fastest growing immigrant populations. They are also the regions of the country with the highest shares of immigrants from Mexico and Central America. The other reasons that don't have as many of these programs tend to have more immigrants from other parts of the world. So that's one demographic factor to keep in mind.

A second one is that a lot of these other jurisdictions are also suburban so you have a lot of the counties around the city of Atlanta, you have Farmers Branch which is a suburb of Dallas. You also have Frederick County, Maryland. In some cases in this area in particular they tend to be more outlying faster

growing jurisdictions. Those areas like the major cities and almost urban counties like Fairfax County, Virginia, and Montgomery County, Maryland, where I live are so big and so diverse now, they have a lot more immigrants who can vote because they're naturalized citizens and they have a lower share of immigrants who are more recent than are naturalized citizens and are unauthorized. So I think that's part of the reason why we are more likely to see these kinds of initiatives in areas that have newer faster growing populations.

Additionally, these areas with newer populations, the immigrant communities aren't always as well organized.

They don't have the same depth of experience, the same knowledge of U.S. laws and customs, policing, housing ordinances, et cetera, the same kind of strength of local leadership.

But what we see in a lot of the communities like Northwest Arkansas and like Prince William County, Virginia, and these other areas is a growing backlash because as Audrey mentioned the perception is there hasn't been a lot of action at the federal level. The reality is that the federal government has done a lot to seal the border, there are an increasing number of raids on work sites and other locations, but that

hasn't really made a dent in the unauthorized population so that the perception at the local level is that Washington is not doing anything about this problem. One of the ways that this comes out I think is not just in the legal status of the newcomers but in what's perceived to be their differences, language, culture, et cetera. The thing that people kept saying to us in Arkansas bearing in mind that it's the headquarters of Wal-Mart was what bothered people was seeing and hearing a lot of Spanish speakers in Wal-Marts. That's just an example of the kind of interactions that people uncomfortable.

Then of course there's the cost side to it, and Audrey alluded to this as well. There is a burden on public schools and other infrastructure when you have fast growing populations. In Springdale, Arkansas, until 2 years ago they were building a new elementary school every 2 years and most of that growth was to accommodate new Latino students.

Where really do these 287(g) programs come from? What's the genesis at the local level? There usually seem to be two or three themes that come out in the study that I've seen about it that we saw in Arkansas and here in Prince William. The first is that

people say they want to reduce the number of illegal immigrants in the community and quite often you have mayors or city council members explicitly saying this.

The second thing you hear which sounds somewhat contradictory at first glance is that we want to only go after serious criminals, that these programs are designed to go over the most serious criminals in the community. The lines between going after serious criminals and reducing the illegal immigrant altogether tend to get blurred after these programs are implemented. In fact, they're often blurred in the rhetoric ahead of time because you hear people talking about the fact that illegal immigrants are more likely to commit crimes than anybody else or immigrants generally are more likely to commit crimes than anybody else. Civic leaders said this in Arkansas and I imagine they said it in Prince William County, Virginia, they said it in Hazelton, Pennsylvania. The sociological evidence on that is not so good, but that's what a lot of people believe. In fact, the agreements and riders in Springdale were originally sold as a means to catch serious criminals and they had an Hispanic Advisory Steering Committee with a lot of the Latino leadership from the community on board at

the beginning because they were told that they would primarily go after violent offenders, gang members and drug dealers who happened to be immigrants. But what happened in Arkansas and from what I've read is happening in some other places around the country, potentially in Prince William as well, is that the definition of what a serious crime is expanded after the program went into operation, and not long before they implemented the program there Arkansas made it illegal for an unauthorized immigrant to have a driver's license. So one of the things that's considered a serious enough crime to warrant arrest, investigation and then deportation is not having a valid driver's license. Then the second thing is working with somebody else's Social Security number which is considered at the extreme case to be identity theft. ICE has also used this as a criminal charge against unauthorized immigrants. In most of the arrests in Northwest Arkansas that we of have been from these two categories, either traffic violations of people who don't have a valid driver's license or work site investigations of people who don't have a valid Social Security number. In other words, most of the immigrants there have been arrested for driving or

working.

Arizona has gone the farthest out on this, and this is more extreme I'm sure than is the case in Prince William or in Arkansas. Just before they launched their program there the state passed a law defining smuggling yourself into the country as a crime as basically a smuggling felony. So anyone in the State of Arizona who drives themselves or harbors themselves in their own home could be accused of smuggling and they've used this as an even broader sort of catch-all serious crime. The problem in my mind with these broad definitions of serious crimes, and it appears that that's a way a lot of these 287 programs are going, is they criminalize the entire unauthorized population. In the eyes of the police in the eyes of the law because they have the authority arrest people and in the eyes of the public, unauthorized immigrants are no longer workers or people who happen be in the country illegally, they become serious criminals. They become threats or dangers to the community. What police officers will say is that it's very troubling to them if they arrest someone and they don't have a valid I.D., they don't really know who they are and they could be somebody who's committed a whole series of



crimes who's masquerading under somebody else's name so that there is a real law-enforcement angle to this. The problem is the perception is everyone in the unauthorized community becomes by default a criminal.

Then there's this probable cause standard, which it's interesting that they've sort of downplayed that in Prince William, but to some degree or another, probable cause factors into all of this because who is likely to be unauthorized? From the point of view of the officer who's enforcing the law, when do they have probable cause to think that this person could be unauthorized? What types of arrest, what kinds of police operations are they going to conduct to find people who might be in the country illegally? You can't tell just by looking at somebody or listening to somebody whether or not they're in the country illegally and the fact of the matter is you can tell if they don't speak English or they don't speak English very well or with an accent, and not surprisingly that's meant that there's a perception and in some cases I think a reality of targeting of the Latino community generally. So in the case of riders in Springdale, those members of the Latino community who originally supported the program, after it was

implemented and there were much wider arrests than they had anticipated withdrew their support because they felt the entire Latino community was being targeted. And it's not surprising that nationally, and this is according to a recent Pew Hispanic Center survey, over half of Latinos in the country are afraid that they themselves or a family member or friend will be arrested and detained and asked about their immigration status and this includes citizens as well as noncitizens.

What can happen in places like Prince William, and this is the concern from the law-enforcement point of view, I think of 287 as almost an anti community policing strategy. As opposed to pulling the community in, it's pushing the community away. And this can have a couple of impacts, one which is the intended result is to force Latinos to leave the community and we didn't get into what the cost might be to the community if that does happen, but if Latinos stay put, if they still have jobs, they choose to stay, they have roots in the community, they bought houses which many have in Prince William, they choose to stay put, they're more likely to go underground further for employment, they're less likely to report crimes,

they're less likely to interact with schools and other public institutions. This can be harmful not only for their families, not to mention those cases where parents are arrested and separated from children, but also to entire communities because it's going to make immigrants less integrated, and in the long run if they're poor and less integrated it will be most costly to the community.

What are the policy solutions real briefly? I can think of three that Audrey mostly alluded to. One is developing positive integration strategies before there's the sense that things are out of control. That means welcoming people into the community, providing interpretation and translation, providing English instruction. I think communication is one of the major problems in these communities so it means going forward with something to help immigrants communicate and to help other community members understand immigrants.

The second thing is to develop open and inclusive policies, not to conduct these policies in secret. A lot of these places in Arkansas refused to release numbers even on the total number of people arrested. We're used to not getting good information

from the Department of Homeland Security. That may change now. But good information to the public about what's actually going on and then the opportunity for the public to provide input into the program I think could overcome a lot of problems.

Then the third thing finally, and I'll finish with this, I believe the 287(g) programs may be warranted to go after serious criminals, but who a serious criminal needs to be carefully and narrowly defined. And with proper targeting I would bet in most communities not only everyone generally but Latino immigrants would strongly support these programs if they went after violent offenders, gang members, drug dealers and the like, but they're not going to support it if they feel it's targeted at the community more broadly. So I'll end there.

MS. SANCHEZ: Thank you very much. Robin?

MS. KORALEK: Audrey, I want to thank you for including me on your panel today. It's always interesting to hear about what's happening in your own back yard. I'm here to talk about another jurisdiction, the State of Oklahoma and how they have addressed their rapidly growing immigrant population in the wake of comprehensive federal immigration reform.

The Urban Institute is currently conducting a study to look at the early effects of the Oklahoma Taxpayer and Citizen Protection Act of 2007, also known as House Bill 1804. This legislation which was passed in May 2007 was implemented in November of that year and is among the most far-reaching of the anti-immigrant laws enacted at the state level. The bill was sponsored by a State Representative in response to the failure of the federal government to take control of the immigration crisis and to protect the state of a perceived invasion of illegal aliens. Some of the major provisions of House Bill 1804 include making it a felony to transport, conceal, harbor or shelter unauthorized immigrants, prohibiting the issuance and use of driver's licenses and other official identification cards for and by unauthorized immigrants, requiring that all applicants for federal, state and local public benefits over the age of 14 have their immigration status verified through the federal government's -- system. It requires jails to verify the legal status of persons detained on felony and DUI charges. And also encourages state and local law-enforcement agencies to enter into the 287(g) agreements that Randy just described. Other aspects of

the legislation prevent unauthorized immigrant students from receiving scholarships and financial assistance, and allows the state regent for higher education to preserve the policy giving unauthorized immigrant students access to in-state tuition. The legislation also had the requirement for public employers and state and local government contractors to use the Department of Homeland Security's E-Verify database to confirm the work authorization of all employees. This and some of the other employment provisions have not been implemented while they're being challenged in court.

The Urban Institute was asked by the National Council of La Raza to take an early look at this legislation and how it's affected families with children, specifically those living in Oklahoma City and in Tulsa. Through this exploratory study my colleague Juan Pedroza as well as Randy and I are looking at how the law has been implemented, how it's being interpreted, and how its provisions are being enforced, as well as what benefits and services have been restricted. We're also looking to see if there have been changes in parenting behavior. For example, are there certain activities that parents are no longer participating in or locations that they're avoiding

with their children. We're also looking to see if there have been changes in children's access to health and social services and if immigrant families' use of services has declined. Another aspect we're examining is access to education.

As I talk, I ask you to keep in mind that this is primarily a qualitative study. We have spoken with many, many agency administrators, service providers, advocates as well as law-enforcement agencies in local cities. And we are still in the process of collecting some additional on our data analysis. It's important for you to understand that as we're looking at changes in program or school enrollment, we will be able to determine if total enrollment has changed over time, but we will not be able to tell if there has been turnover among individual participants or students.

I'd like to take a minute to provide you with a little bit of background on the immigrant population in Oklahoma. Oklahoma has a long history of immigration and the Hispanic population continues to grow. There was nearly a 45 percent increase between 2000 and 2007. In 2006, Hispanics made up 7 percent of the state population. Sixty percent of those were

native born. Oklahoma is among the top five states in terms of the largest percent growth of first-generation children between 2000 and 2007. In 2007, Hispanics made up 12 percent of the population in Oklahoma County and 9 percent of the population in Tulsa County.

Some preliminary observations that I'd like to share today. First, it's important to understand that much of House Bill 1804 restates or reinforces federal law including the provisions about verifying the legal status of those applying for public benefits, the harboring, sheltering and transporting provision, as well as the restrictions against employing unauthorized workers. Under federal law, unauthorized immigrants are not eligible to receive many public benefits including cash assistance, food stamps, SSI and Medicare.

One thing that we found in our study is that Oklahoma City and Tulsa have very different local climates with regard to immigration and their response to 1804. Tulsa has a notably different feel to it. Advocates have indicated that Tulsa was much more receptive to 1804. The local sheriff had already pursued establishing a 287(g) agreement as far back as 2001, and by September 2007 before this legislation was



implemented, the first ICE trained officers were already on the street. In addition, the City Council in Tulsa passed a resolution requiring police officers to check individuals' immigration status after making an arrest on a felony or misdemeanor charge, and if immigration is not confirmed to notify ICE within 24 hours. The Mayor of Tulsa refused to sign that, but her policy clarification does state that immigration status checks will not take place until after a person is in the custody of the jail. Oklahoma City in contrast has not passed any additional anti-immigrant resolutions and local law-enforcement agencies at this time have no plan to pursue any 287(g) agreements.

House Bill 1804 created a very real environment of fear in the immigrant community both among unauthorized and legal immigrants. There was an initial wave of fear even before the law was implemented. Much of this was based on the high level of uncertainty regarding how the law would be implemented and who it would affect. As of the fall of 2008 when we were in Oklahoma, it seemed that much of this fear had subsided, but it's still very real.

In terms of arrest under 1804, there have only been three 1804-related arrests statewide. All

were made by the State Highway Patrol and they related to aiding and abetting unauthorized immigrants rather than to the unauthorized individuals themselves. We do know that there have been a significant number of 287(g) related arrests in Tulsa. Close to 2,300 people have been sent for immigration hearings.

From the perspective of service providers who we spoke with be they public or private, the legislation came with no policy guidance for agencies and service providers in terms of how to implement the provisions of 1804. They had to determine whether or not they were providing a public benefit which is not defined under the legislation or whether they were exempt from the provisions. We have read many about people leaving Oklahoma, but early indications are that program enrollment remains relatively steady, school enrollment also remains steady, but we're still in the process of analyzing some of that data.

Just to give you a sense of what's happening in Oklahoma now, there have been several new actions in Oklahoma since we were there in the fall. A Tulsa County judge recently upheld the constitutionality of House Bill 1804 with the exception of denial of instant tuition for higher education to those who have

successfully graduated from high school or completed their GED. New legislation was introduced, House Bill 2252, that would require that driver's licenses tests be given only in English and would eliminate the current requirement for the state to provide driver's licenses tests in Spanish. There is also a resolution that would add a ballot measure for a proposed constitutional amendment to make English the official language of state government in Oklahoma. Another resolution would give the state the authority to deport noncitizens who are held in Oklahoma jails regardless of their reason for detention.

MS. ORTEGA-MOORE: As advocates in this community and all around the country, we hear about what's happening in this county, but we never really heard all the details. So going through the paper and really understanding what happened, we don't feel bad in the South in North Carolina.

As an affiliate of the National Council of La Raza, we actually obviously like many of you and many people around the country. We are so connected either via email, via all kinds of blogs, all kinds of things, we know what's going on, but definitely knowing exactly how it happened, it was very, very interesting. The

Latin American Coalition, the organization that I work for, we began as a cultural organization. We were around for established Latinos who were in North Carolina to come together and celebrate and have parties and -- and all those things. And as the population began to grow just like in many other parts of the Southeast, we had to change our programming. No longer we were doing -- and horse shows and things like that. We started doing English as a second language, how do we help people applying for their driver's licenses and so forth. So we had totally to change completely our programming and we became really fully a social services organization and that's how we got engaged with the National Council of La Raza. As of today for example this year, 50,000 driver's licenses have expired in North Carolina, 50,000. But do you think that 50,000 people have stopped driving? Most likely not. Because we have moved into that mobility of civic engagement, our programming now is more about how do we get people to become involved in citizenship? How do they learn English? How do we provide them the civic engagement that they need to be working into and getting engaged in their communities and organizing their communities and organizing their

neighborhoods and organizing themselves and engaging our students into going to talk to the legislators and to come into D.C. during Advocacy Days so that they start beginning to hear from the people and from the people who get affected the most because most of the families are mixed and most of us know that. We have children who are U.S. citizens and we have parents or a cousin or a neighbor or somebody who is not a U.S. citizen or who is not legally in the country. So people don't think about those things when we're talking about the debate of immigration. They think it's just all one mass group of individuals and they all just need to get out. And obviously, you know, thinking about our little organization, we are very small comparing to many large organizations, but we're one of two in the state of North Carolina -- one of the two largest organizations, and, I mean, considering if we weren't there, I can't imagine what would happen, and I don't think we have that much power after all, but we have been able to somehow alleviate some of those -- maybe those steps that could have been taking place if we had not been there, because we're providing the assistance for clients of what to do in the case of deportation, how to prevent that, what do you need to

prevent yourself, how do you plan for all those things?

So, we come into that.

We also tend to be the sounding board for many elected officials. You know, maybe an ordinance is coming down the path line and some of the officials will come to us and say hey, what does this mean? What does this really mean in our community if we pass this? So, luckily, some of them have been able to hear us. Not everybody. But, you know, we're doing our job a little bit better I guess.

We're doing a lot of voter registration. This past year we registered over a thousand people and voted, and we had about 13,000 in North Carolina new voters in Latinos -- new voters -- and we know which, and in North Carolina Obama won just by a little bit over 4,000 votes. So, we think the Latino vote made a big difference of course.

One of the things I think many times happens with organizations like ourselves is that we provide that education for the rest of the community -- not just to the elected officials but to the rest of the community that may have a question. As you all know, you know, the recent election around the country -- really, people who ran on that one issue of anti-

immigration or the immigration issue were voted at the office, and so we able to, you know, with some education we able to really pinpoint and say, you know, this is what people need to hear and this is what people need to understand fully.

One time I heard -- somebody said, you know, trying to understand immigration debate is like trying to explain the tax code. You just can't do that. And so what we try to do it is try to pull it apart a little bit and so people understand it, because when really the genuine feeling of the American public is that we want something that works. We want the protection of the borders. We want something that works. And we want something that is humane. So, I think that people have spoken and, really, when it comes to these ordinances, really, people have -- they're beginning to be blogged, because, really, they're not effective and they're not really doing anything for a community.

The other thing is for us is we deal with the aftermath of deportation, and that's what people don't see. You know, when I get a woman in my office and she says my husband didn't come home last night from work, and we go to the computer and we log online and we go

to the Sheriff's Department and we look at his picture, you know, and say is this your husband, and, you know, with tears in her eyes she says yes, this is my husband, what do I do now? And after much struggling, you know, she -- maybe two weeks later, she decides well I'm going to go back to my country, and unfortunately it's very hard to leave the country. People don't think -- don't realize that if you have a child who's born in United States and you have one that's born in Guatemala or Mexico and they don't have documents, for the child who was born in United States, you still have to get him a passport to get him out of the country. And then -- and not only then, once you try to get him a passport, you have to have approval of both parents. But one of them is in jail. It's in the deportation procedures. We can't a passport for that child, and the one who's in Guatemala, we have to go to the embassy or the consulate who's been closest to North Carolina, maybe Miami or Washington, D.C., so we can't get them. They need money. They need to be fed. They need to, you know, go to school. So, what happens to all of that, and I don't think people have that concept of what happens.

And even our communities are not ready.



Communities around the country, you know, especially in the southeast, they have not been ready for this incredible growth. They were very happy to see us all come here in great -- such a great workers coming in -- oh, such a great work ethic and they work hard and they really don't take breaks and they're so wonderful. But the moment we had started -- we began to have needs. And when we have to have children in school, it's like, oh, wait a second, what do you mean? You need your children in school? We don't want your children in school.

So, you know, now that when all of it's happening with our detentions and deportations, people -- the communities not ready. We're meeting with judges and he says well, if you leave a child with the neighbors, that doesn't do anything for me. No paper that you sign allowing the neighbors to have a child is valid for anything that I want, and what happens is a school. So, we're trying just now in North Carolina trying to meet around a circle of school system, the churches, the legal segment to see what can we do? How can we prepare our communities? But it's an aspect, a human aspect, of our communities that it just never heard about.

MS. SANCHEZ: Thank you. I thank all the panelists, and now we'll open it to actually for a little discussion among us and then I'll turn it to question-and-answers, and I'd like to start perhaps by asking -- sorry -- Audrey a question about the precipitative factors, and I think one that you I think referred to in the study but you didn't talk a lot about it -- is the fact that the government was unprepared for what was happening and that led perhaps to the actions taken. Could you expand a little bit on that and let -- in the meantime, I'd like to ask the panelists whether they can talk about that, about governments being unprepared to the change and how that affects and makes things happen or not happen.

DR. SINGER: I think there are a couple elements that made them unprepared. One is just the scale and the pace of change that was happening overall, and so I think that's an issue that was more widespread not just in terms of dealing with the new immigrants coming in. But you can imagine a place that really had no history of immigration. All of a sudden having people who don't speak their language and children who have -- who are going to public schools who may need to be -- to have extra reinforcement in

their language skills -- that's really where the first impact is usually felt. And so the school districts often get caught off guard. But school -- public -- the public schools in this country are charged with educating children, and they know how to do it, and they tend to ramp up very quickly.

But in terms of other aspects of an unprepared local government, where it really hit strongly in Prince William County was in these code violations and neighborhood-level complaints, and I think it was very hard for both the county to take care of those issues by going out to places and, you know, talking to people or making changes but also just communicating with enough people. So, there are a lot of dimensions of it, but those are some of the main ones.

MS. SANCHEZ: Okay. Can anybody else -- I mean, Angeles, you talked a little bit about how you used as a sounding board, and in some ways it sounds like having it already in infrastructure community established (inaudible) perhaps, that that makes them better prepared to deal. I don't know if you guys would agree with that (inaudible) what you've seen or if you could expand on that or how new communities or

organizations like yours help in some ways.

MS. ORTEGA-MOORE: Absolutely. I think we provide a service to the client, to the individuals who are maybe targeted, or they may be in that situation, but also to the greater community. You know, our job is also to educate (inaudible) community about what it all entails, that it's not as simple as saying what -- you know, what is illegal, you don't understand, that it's a very simplistic thing, you know, view of that whole situation. So, I definitely think it's a plus, and, you know, organizations like ourselves our challenged, because we're, you know, told you're serving illegals, and at the same time but all the organizations are being asked how are you serving the Latino population? So, it's -- you know, a thing we sort of get targeted for, serving undocumented when in fact we're really like churches. I mean, nobody asks the churches when you enter the church whether you have an ID card to get in.

MS. SANCHEZ: Um-hmm. Do you think you have dissuaded so much from governments?

MS. ORTEGA-MOORE: Absolutely, yes, yes. I mean, you know, at least at the local level. Not at state level but definitely at the local level for some

ordinances that they have been considered and, you know, I mean, there's a lot of, I think, in my, I mean, ignorance, perhaps, you know, when an elected official wants to go and challenge the way that you're registering people to vote --

MS. SANCHEZ: Which happened.

MS. ORTEGA-MOORE: Which is happening, yes, in our agency, yes. There was a challenging, like how are you doing? Are you registering people who are undocumented, and we're doing just like everybody else does it.

MS. SANCHEZ: Robin or Randy, can you address some of that -- governments being unprepared and that's causes some of this action?

MS. KORALEK: What I think in Oklahoma what was interesting is that people were blindsided by this legislation, and in terms of the agencies you had to deal with the implementation, I don't think they were prepared to even process what was happening. So, there were some catch-up trying to understand what this meant for them and what it would mean for surveying the community, and this is a long-term part of the Oklahoma demographics, and even people who have their documentation who are U.S. citizens were fearful of

going out and what was going to happen to them.

MS. SANCHEZ: Um-hmm.

DR. CAPPS: What's odd about the case in northwest Arkansas is that I was there before the 2807(g) agreement was enacted, and there was a lot of back-and-forth on it, but the community was actually doing a pretty good job. I mean, they had a pretty good program in the public schools, they had hired a lot of bilingual teachers and bilingual activities coordinators. They -- you know, Wal-Mart and some of the other companies were very internationally oriented big companies. People were -- the attitude was much more sort of global than you would expect in a lot of these communities, and it still happened anyway, because there was a core group of people in the community, particularly in one of the cities in Rogers that was concerned about all these cultural, linguistic challenges. So, I would say at the same time that the community was thoroughly well prepared, certain people in the community were not going along with that. And that has resulted in a lot of division, because the corporate people on the Wal-Mart side and the immigrant community leaders, who are very strong there, are on one side of that and then there are other people in the

public who are on the other side.

MS. SANCHEZ: Audrey also talks about the sensationalization -- what is the word -- sensationalized coverage of immigration and how that affected some of the action and the feelings in the community (inaudible). We all hear about Lou Dobbs and how much he might actually influence what people think they are experiencing. I remember we were covering these issues at the Post and sometimes you'd talk to people in the community and they'd say oh, yeah, this is horrible, the situation is terrible; but when you ask them okay, so how many immigrants are going to -- oh, I don't know anybody. So, it's like oh, okay, wait a second, so where are your experiences coming from? Is it coming from television? Is it coming from the coverage of another media that makes you believe that this is terrible even though personally you really haven't felt it?

So, how about that factor -- how much the media sensationalized coverage of this issue you think is playing into some of this, you know, the ordinances (inaudible).

DR. SINGER: Well, I would say that the media, the role of the media was really accelerated or

it accelerated the sort of trickle-down -- you know, the federal to the local in a way that was different than ever before because of these new communities of immigrants that were cropping up across the country, so in places where immigration never really was an issue before, they may not have paid attention so much to the news around immigration or what was happening at the border or, you know, a number of different issues. But, you know, we saw since the mid-1990s these new growth areas in so many places, in so many states that really haven't had a 20th century settlement of immigrant pattern, and that really -- that kind of change really affected people, because in a lot of places, their first encounters with immigrants were likely to be things like day labor sites, informal day labor sites, where they saw men on the streets, or these houses where they're over-occupied or high-occupancy houses with a lot of vehicles and things like that, and those are the kinds of things that really bother people about their neighborhoods.

MS. SANCHEZ: Um-hmm. Anybody else?

MR. CAPPS: I think some of it's the sensationalization of crime. I mean, what happened in Rogers was that a police officer was shot by an



unauthorized immigrant in an altercation, and this one incident was broadcast. And then it feeds on itself, because then the mayor starts repeating this, and then the media starts covering what the mayor says over and over again, and it's the same talking point, and that's basically what happened in Hazelton, and I think there's been a lot of sensationalism around the crime issue and a lot of misinformation around that.

MS. SANCHEZ: Um-hmm. (Inaudible)

MS. KORALEK: I think in Oklahoma, you know, we didn't spend as much time looking at the buildup to the legislation, but some of the things that we've read indicate that, you know, things like, you know, my husband was driving and was hit by a drunk driver, he's illegal, he doesn't have his driver's license, look what's happening -- as well as playing on people's fears about rising crime rates -- really gave us some momentum.

MS. SANCHEZ: Um-hmm. Well, let's start looking a little bit more about the effects of all this, because we've heard some, but I don't know if we've really looked in-depth (inaudible), Audrey, on what's happened in Prince William. How many immigrants have left? What's happening to the businesses? Are

they leaving? Are they actually hiding? Somebody talked about even how they putter in the families -- I mean, how much behavior of the immigrant families changes.

I remember visiting a family in Prince William who have never taken their kids to the museums in Washington. Never. I mean, they're so afraid to leave. I mean, they're not that far, but they are really afraid to go far. They just limit themselves to a very small, you know, area where they live and hope that nothing happens when they are out.

DR. SINGER: Well, you know, that was a very hard thing for us to explore, because we've very -- you know, we're research-y, in the sense that we're always looking for good data and evidence to support what we're finding, and so it's been hard for us to capture that through population estimates or even through school enrollment figures. But I think the next round of data we'll be able to see that a little bit more. I mean, we have heard and, you know, there's of course been a lot of news around people leaving not just the county but the region and moving to North Carolina and other places, but I think it's been really hard for us to capture it in a very formal way.

MS. SANCHEZ: Um-hmm.

MR. CAPPS: Yeah, I think that's true for, you know, an author speaking as a demographer and looking at an Arkansas case that you hear stories of people leaving, and, you know, I mentioned in the presentation they were building a school every two years and in 2007 they stopped building schools and their student population stopped going up. Now, that was also the beginning of the housing bust, and they were really -- I mean, a lot of their economy was built on housing growth. So, it's hard to know which factor influenced it, but there is that slowdown.

Now, there are other effects that you can look at that are harder to measure quantitatively, but I think they're very real, and we're really concerned with the impacts on children and families. So, for instance, one of the people who was arrested in Springdale was arrested while he was waiting outside the school to pick up his son from school, so the arrest happened right in front of the school, not in view of the kids but still at the school, and so what you hear from the teachers is that kids are worried when they see certain cars pass that they're coming to capture their parents. So, where and how people get

arrested can have a big impact.

There was another case in Arkansas where some grandparents and their grandkids were all sort of taken into custody for a brief time before they released the kids in their house. So, people don't feel safe necessarily where they are. And then when this happens in one or two isolated incidents so it's not the rule, it's the exception, rumors start to fly and you start hearing about other stories that turn out not to be true that are even worse. So, this kind of general fear that Robin said was going on across the state of Oklahoma -- there was still a lot of that in northwest Arkansas. How do you quantify that? I think there's room for people to study the psychological impact on children and on communities more generally that live under this kind of fear, and there's been very little research on that so far.

MS. SANCHEZ: Yes, Angeles.

MS. ORTEGA-MOORE: I mean, don't get me wrong. In North Carolina, it's no piece of cake. It's not nice for our community, and just because we are there it doesn't mean that we have not -- you know, we have our (inaudible) on legislature or some ordinances. We actually were the first county to have 2807(g), so

that's where it was born, so -- and definitely the whole issue of people not feeling safe is very real. I mean, I don't have any medical experience on the mental health issues, but there is going to be an epidemic of children with mental health issues in our communities all around the country just because these conversations are happening at the kitchen table. What do we do if you get deported? What do we do if this, you know? And for children who are little and, you know, they're just sponges and they're absorbing all of this, and these are children who are American citizens, most of them, so it is just going to be very, you know, damning to our communities. We hear -- you know we may have an event of something, you know, and our -- from our organizations, like, people are saying oh, this is so nice, finally we're able to get out, you know, we have been so afraid. Somehow, because, you know, maybe it's organized by a Latino organization they feel safer, that they can go and participate, but there's a lot of concern about going out. Am I going to classes? English classes? The numbers went down in our community after 2807G. People are not participating. They drive the minimum of their -- just because of fears.

MS. SANCHEZ: Robin, I think you should address the issue of how community organizations also - and the effects of how they're reacting to help some of these issues or the effects on immigrants.

MS. KORALEK: In Oklahoma we saw, you know, it was a struggle for the organizations. They had to meet with their boards, determine, you know, is our funding in jeopardy, what are -- what provisions do we have to comply with, and in the end, it appears that a lot of them sat up and said we're going to continue business as usual. Many of the services, with the exception of some of the federal public benefits, like cash assistance and food stamps -- children are going to continue to get their health care services, education is open, and they guarantee that for all children -- no questions asked -- but it was a real struggle for them, and even before the legislation went into effect, they saw that the fear was keeping people away from coming to get needed services. So, we're -- we can't wait to get our hands on some of the data and see how that's played out over time, but --

MS. SANCHEZ: It's aiding and abetting supposedly, isn't it? And you said the arrests got (inaudible) because of that, and so far a few, but --

MS. KORALEK: Well, the 1804-related arrests really had to do with transporting undocumented people through the state or bringing them over the border, but, you know, we've heard that people are getting pulled over for failure to yield pulling out of the driveway and that if you don't have a driver's license, that's spirals out of control.

MS. SANCHEZ: Well, do -- I also wanted to ask you something you talked about, and I'm curious about how easy it is for you to access some of the information, because I found that people -- when it comes to this issues, there's very little transparency, there's very little communication. People are almost afraid to talk about it. If you ask -- even I went to a public clinic that was surveying illegal immigrants. They wouldn't give me any numbers whatsoever, and they wouldn't want to talk about it -- we don't do anything. I mean, they really -- it seems like that, you know, the community services are afraid to talk, at least to the press, about what they are doing or not doing. So, I even wonder how are you getting your information. Is it getting -- is it very hard for you to access some of this data?

MS. KORALEK: We, surprisingly, haven't had

that much trouble getting the data that we've needed other than the usual. It takes a long time to get what you need, and there's a delay in information. But one thing we will not be able to determine is if you look at enrollment numbers in a program -- have people left the state and new people come in to replace them or, you know, did people stay away and the same people reenroll in a program. So that information -- you hear lots of things about how there's been a mass exodus from Oklahoma. But we can't tell that yet. The numbers aren't out yet to show any demographic shifts, and in terms of program enrollment, we are not -- we don't have access to individual level data and will have the aggregate, so.

MS. SANCHEZ: Okay, Randy. I wonder if you could address the issue of the cost of new local law enforcement policies for localities. Is that something you could talk about?

DR. CAPPS: It's not something I know that much about in terms of really quantifying it, and other researchers have begun to quantify it. I mean, Audrey certainly quantified what they thought it would cost in Prince William County, and I remember seeing some stuff on Arizona where they thought it would cost -- Maricopa



County thought it would cost them a million or something like that and it wound up costing six million over the course of the years, but, I mean, they've been arresting a lot of people in Phoenix. But I don't think anybody's looked at it comprehensively.

So, you've got the cost to the state and local government entities that are actually doing the enforcement. You've got the cost to the federal government for coordinating all of this and doing the training for the local officers. You've got the cost in terms of opportunity costs either hiring additional police officers or not pursuing other types of crimes instead of what you're pursuing.

The costs to the community are hard to measure, especially in the current economic climate. If people leave or if they stay home and don't go out to shop, then that's going to make the economic crisis worse. If they don't leave and they just sort of hunker down and do things a little bit differently -- you know, no, I mean, it might not affect, though it's hard to tell in terms of those hard economic costs. But Chambers of Commerce, particularly in Oklahoma but also, from what I understand, business groups in Arizona and big businesses in Arkansas don't like this.

Part of it is probably because some of their members employ unauthorized immigrants and part of it is because they're afraid that some of the small businesses -- that their member are going to be affected.

And when you have sort of the absolute worst case, which is another project I've been working on with Urban Institute looking at big immigration raids the federal government's done -- you go to Postville, Iowa, for instance, and you raid the only big employer in town. You know, almost a year later, the restaurants are all closed, half the housing is vacant.

I mean, if you carry this to its logical extreme and remove everybody, which is what happened in Postville, you can kill a town or kill a city.

MS. SANCHEZ: What happened in that town, for instance, because I remember reading a story in the New York times in 2007 about Riverside, New Jersey, that kind of (inaudible) the kind of enforcement of laws that made a lot of immigrants leave to the point of these studies say oh, my gosh, this really went too far, we didn't know that it would cost economically so much. And then you said backtracking. Is that what you found also there?

MR. CAPPS: Well, it depends. I haven't seen that much evidence. I don't think any of us have seen that much evidence of backtracking. I mean, it sounds like they're doing more in Oklahoma -- you know, new legislation. I think at the state and local level this has become very popular, and there are 67 agreements in place and as many 70 or 80 more jurisdictions waiting for ICE's approval. So, even though some jurisdictions and some and people complain about the cost, other people will say it's worth it, this is our priority. Now, when the federal government comes in and does something and then the state or local government has to pay for it, that's another story. And of course they're going to complain, and then you're going to get some backlash that way, which is what's happened, I think, in Iowa.

MS. SANCHEZ: I see. Well, Audrey, one of your conclusions, which has -- I was curious -- is that because of the economic crisis now, the current crisis, you feel that there has to be some backtracking in some ways. I mean, there has to be some change, because it's not helping the economy of Prince William. Some would say to the country. I mean, we don't need more illegal immigrants taking our jobs away, you know, the

few jobs that are left. So, I wonder if it's a hard conclusion to reach.

DR. SINGER: Well, I think the county officials have come out on this issue saying -- not saying, you know, we're dropping the whole matter. They're saying it's been a successful program and they're continuing with it. But they're going to -- they're refocusing on economic issues, not necessarily making a tie. There is some debate over whether Prince William County's policies have softened over time or whether they've stayed as strong, and one interpretation is that that with the changes to the resolutions, particularly on the law enforcement issue from probable cause where anybody stopped by the police for any reason could have been asked for their legal residency. So the current state, which they only check residency status on those who have been arrested, that has been portrayed as a softening by some people, and to others it's, you know, a strengthening of what the original purpose of the intent of the law was, which was to go after criminals and to improve public safety in the county. So, there's some spin in both directions I think, but in some ways the effect has already taken place over this period of time with the

initial resolution that came out so strong and, you know, had an impact on a lot of people.

MS. SANCHEZ: Okay. Before I open it to questions, the thing is it's important to address the big issue of changes in Washington with the new government and whether there's going to be a comprehensive immigration reform, and I hope that all of you maybe can answer this question. If there is a comprehensive immigration reform, how will things change to the thing? What's been happening at the local level or state level?

MS. ORTEGA-MOORE: Well, organizations like ourselves, we have a lot of work to do, because obviously individuals come to these organizations to get the support and guidance; otherwise, I could just see the amount of abuse that would be going toward our consumers because they -- oh, I can -- now there's immigration reform, I can do it for you, it'll only cost you \$5,000 -- and even when there was just a discussion in 2006 about a possible immigration reform, people were already doing it. So, it's really important for organizations like ourselves to be ready to provide those services, you know, that are certified, that are bona fide, that, you know, that

provide good services to our clients so that they are served properly rather than, you know, being taken --

MS. SANCHEZ: Advantage.

MS. ORTEGA-MOORE: Absolutely.

MS. SANCHEZ: Um-hmm.

MS. KORALEK: Well, my perspective is really on access to benefits and services, and given that federal policy has already restricted access to many public benefits, I think it'll be interesting to see how a state like Oklahoma would respond. Much of what they said about access to services really mirrors federal policy, so I'm not quite sure what (inaudible).

DR. CAPPS: Yeah, and I think one issue I'm concerned about with this is that it used to be most of the people who were arrested were -- I guess it's still true -- that most that were arrested were, and in these raids, are just charged with what they would call an administrative violation -- illegal presence in the country -- and they're either allowed to leave voluntarily or they're deported. But increasingly -- and this is true in a lot of these local programs -- they're being given another crime, this crime of working without the right Social Security Number, not having a valid driver's license, and this carries a

longer ban on legal reentry into the U.S. sometimes, in some cases, almost forever. So, even if there is an amnesty, I think some of the people who have been arrested and charged with these crimes aren't going to be eligible for it. A fair number of them are not going to be eligible, and that's going to be a very thorny issue, because there isn't going to be any sympathy for them versus the much larger group of people who've never been caught. So, it's kind of almost a roulette in which some people have lost already because they've been charged with these crimes, and so that's one issue I'm worried about.

MS. SANCHEZ: Audrey?

DR. SINGER: Well, if we do get the full range of provisions in a comprehensive set of national reforms, that would include reinforcing our borders, having the internal worksite enforcement policy, maybe changing our visa system, a number of other things but also will likely include a legalization program, which would then make a lot of people eligible to apply for legal status. The question is what does that mean in some of these communities where there is a lot of tension? And I guess, you know, what we heard in Prince William County, and what we hear a lot in other

communities and nationally, is the legal status is a real problem, that legal immigrants are welcome but those who are here who are not authorized to be here, not authorized to work here are not welcome. So, this frame is a very important one. If that frame largely goes away, there are still a lot of the issues that places like Prince William -- the residents of Prince William County have raised that may or may not go away with it, and so I think this is one of the most important lessons from this case study that is to think about what this might mean over the long term, and so we'll see what happens in terms of federal reform. But it does help us think through those things.

MS. SANCHEZ: But are you almost saying that you feel if Prince William County residents try to say -- most of them would rather not have a comprehensive immigration reform? Is that --

MS. KORALEK: You know, I don't know the answer specifically. I mean, probably people who are against comprehensive reform are against the legalization part of it, and what I'm saying -- but I guess what I'm saying is that, you know, if everybody -- if the majority of people became legal one day, would those other problems then go away. Would the



addressing of those problems be easier.

MS. SANCHEZ: Anyway, we'll all put it to questions. I believe there is some microphone. Let's see, one, two -- just one -- hold on one second. And to introduce yourselves and keep it short please.

Right here. Someone here.

MS. SANTANO: Hi, my name is Patricia -- Patricia Santano. Thank you for the talk this morning.

I'm going to try to explain my case in a very brief way. I think we have to relate immigration to economy. The economy -- basically the U.S. has -- with the countries like mine -- I'm from Mexico. This is my case. I happen to have an -- I happen to be an educated person. I have a Bachelor degree, and I happen to be bilingual, because I learned English in Mexico, and I happen to be working and always there's trouble at home because I could never make enough money to be able to afford the house or a car or be able to travel overseas, which were my main interests back in time. So, I even worked for an American company that was established in Mexico, and it still wasn't enough for me. It was always a lot of problems trying to make an income that was decent. So, I married my husband, who is American, and I happened to be coming to this

country, so one of my priorities, being a Mexican race in Mexico for 30 years, was to work to help the illegals, because we always had problems between Mexico and the U.S. with the illegals. So, we gave out some information in Mexico and U.S. had all the information in the newspapers here. So I said well, I'm going to come here and I'm going to think of immigration in terms of human rights. I'm going to try to get documents for these people that don't have any benefits. They cannot go to education. I mean, they cannot go to schools because they don't have any papers, blah-blah-blah.

But now -- now that I am here, and I've been living here for six years, I changed my mind a little bit. I still think that is important, but now I think what is important is that we technically don't title the problem of why immigrants are coming. I think what we need to do is to stop immigrants from coming, not to deal how we integrate immigrants into -- well, we have as of today -- because that is not working for anybody.

I think the (inaudible) for immigrants is that they stay in their countries. Like we cannot pretend -- I mean, the U.S. cannot pretend that this is a country to host or to be the house for all the immigrants that

happen to be coming from under-developing countries. So, I think the problem here is the U.S. economy policy that is, in a way, through the big corporations like McDonald's, like all the big companies that U.S. have that are -- they have -- it's okay as long as you have them here. But in my country, what they do is they basically strike the profits. So, a person like me, no matter how smart I can be, no matter how educated, how many languages I speak, in Mexico I will never, ever be able to get to be -- I mean, to be like -- to be the owner of a company is going to really cost me a lot. I really pride me to marry a guy who's wealthy.

So, the thing here now -- the other day I was just doing a research just to have an idea how industry of Teresa, New Mexico. Those companies -- those hotels that are based in Cancun, which is an example, are making millions of dollars -- millions of dollars a year. So I said I cannot definitely disassociate the economy with immigration issue. I am no longer looking for papers for the Mexicans right here. What I'm trying to think of is ideas to get them out of this country to go -- to send them back to Mexico and how to help my country.

So, basically my question is -- I'm sorry for

your patience -- is here: How can all those organizations that you represent or the ones that you might be more aware of that work with immigration issues -- how could you guys help us work with the federal government and try to make them see the reality as of today that the problem is no longer to give them rise to -- the problem isn't for economy reasons. So, how could you handle that?

MS. SANCHEZ: Okay, let's take a couple more questions and then -- there was somebody else here, right here, right in front of you.

MR. DANIELSON: Mike Danielson, American University.

I've done a good amount of research on this topic specifically in Vista, California, and on the day labor ordinance there, and what I found in Vista -- Vista's in north San Diego County, and it's been a site where immigrants have come for a long time; however, the population has grown considerably over the last 20 to 30 years and it's close to half right now. But what I saw -- my conclusion in my study on Vista was sort of that this is all political. The -- and I'm a student in political science, so maybe that's why I view it that way, but -- for full disclosure -- but in my

interviews with the mayor, members of the council in Vista of why -- where did the day labor ordinance come from, why did they do it -- I mean, they didn't come out and say it was because they needed to deflect the challenge from the right wing nativist sort of side of local politics fueled by the Minutemen and other similar groups, but that's really what it was. They had -- they -- there was a recognition in local politics that something had to be done. That was sort of the phrase that was always used. We have to do something. And the reason I say it was only political is because effectively the impacts of the law are -- they're pretty much zero in the case of Vista. Now, I understand some of the cases you're looking at -- it might not -- there are real, actual impacts that people feel, and in Vista -- I don't want to minimize them completely, but, you know, in the end it sort of is all about the politics as I see it, and I don't know if you all view it that way in the cases you've looked at.

And a final kind of related point that was related to what you were talking about regarding what if there were an amnesty and the 12+ million undocumented immigrants were all of a sudden or in short order documented, would this change, would the

dynamics change, and my view is that they would change very little. I don't -- I see the sort of legal/illegal issue as sort of a stand-in for an anti-Latino viewpoint generally -- and this is reflected in research on where these ordinances have popped up -- anti-immigrant ordinances. They're explained more by the Hispanic population and the growth of the Hispanic population, actually, than by the foreign-born population.

MS. SANCHEZ: All right, somebody else? How about somebody on this side? Okay, how about the lady in pink and then the lady in yellow, and we'll take the questions.

MS. HARPER: Hi, this is -- My name is Olga Garcia Harper, and I was born and raised in Texas, so I am very -- I very much want to help the immigrants.

I'm not sure that we can solve all the economic problems that Mexico has or any of these other countries have in order to get immigrants who are going to be citizens here and want to help other immigrants, because I think that's part of the problem. For example, Prince William County. Probably there weren't -- there are not very many native-born Latino-Americans here. I think that's a big difference from

San Antonio, where I come from, where I would probably be very surprised if there were raids in my community, whatever that community is, because the native-born people and the immigrants look alike, and they learn English really fast, and -- but they have their problems. So, I'm kind of interested in gathering data myself, because I'm trying to start a project in Mexico. So, if anybody can help me, I would appreciate anyone out there that can answer.

MS. SANCHEZ: Data on what specifically?

MS. HARPER: For one thing, I found a site -- and I don't know -- this stuff wasn't documented on this site, but Mexico is supposed to be the largest sender of immigrants and there are particular states in Mexico that are, you know, the ones that come. I'm looking at it from the point of view of why do they come? That's so important to know to do a -- get a sense of how to help people here, I think.

MS. SANCHEZ: Okay.

MS. HARPER: The other thing -- I want -- well, if I'm taking too much time, I'll give it up now, but I --

MS. SANCHEZ: If it's very short, what is the other thing?

MS. HARPER: No, the other side of it is I don't know if anybody there knows where I can get information on, you know, what is the birth of any Latino-Americans in Prince William or in any other place and has anybody ever looked at that, because I think that would make a big difference in how you deal with the situation in any of these places.

MS. SANCHEZ: What is the birth? You mean birth rate?

MS. HARPER: Yeah, the birth rate of Americans that are Latino but they're citizens.

And the other thing I would like to find --

MS. SANCHEZ: I'll just say one more. I'd like to let somebody else --

MS. HARPER: Oh, okay, I'll give it up, but I want to know -- you know, about the populations that come to this country -- do you know their states of origin and where do you find that?

MS. SCOTT: Hi, my name is Molly Scott, and I work at the Urban Institute.

I was here last week, and they were talking about immigration law, and short of federal immigration reform they were talking about differences in administration and implementation of budget priorities



in terms of immigration enforcement. And I was wondering if you guys had any incite into how that might affect local implementation of some of these detention policies.

MS. SANCHEZ: Okay. Well, let's see how we can do this. Angeles, I don't know if coming from a Mexican, another Mexican would address the issue of what we need is to get immigrants to go back and address --

MS. ORTEGA-MOORE: I'd love to do that. I'm Mexican, and I don't think I have yet to know a family that has had to come to the United States because they had to. People don't choose to get up one day and say I am going to go to the United States. I am going to break the law and I'm going to go in there because I just want to do harm to the American public. Most people have to come to the United States. You have an incredible privilege to come to the United States the way that you've come with a marriage to somebody. People who have -- a lot of people know, but people who want to come here to work -- let's say as a janitor or even as a painter or something -- will have to wait probably 25 years to get in here legally. People have a really hard time coming in here. We make it easier

in this country to come here illegally? Illegally.

And then the one thing about what we can do with Mexico, and, for example, at the coalition, we are working with a family of women -- in Juana Juato , which is a big sending state in the state of North Carolina, and we -- they manufacture dolls, and recent -- they got this money through a micro-loan program, and the reason that they make these dolls is so that they can provide for their families so their families don't have to leave. So, what we do anytime anybody -- my friends or family go to Mexico, they bring me dolls, and then we sell them here in North Carolina, all around the country, so that we can support these families back home, because we want them to stay. People don't want to leave their families, don't want to leave the land or their food or what's familiar to them. They have to.

MS. SANCHEZ: They just have to see what comes -- the airports -- they say very interesting experience if you ever -- I mean, if you're immigrants you don't really notice, but if you go to the airport and you look at the luggage of immigrants coming back when they go back home. It's only food. That's how -- we all miss the food. I mean, which is -- no matter

how many years are gone, you still -- you go back -- you just want to -- you just -- you know, you miss (inaudible) so much. So, it is true. I mean, leaving is not an easy decision for sure.

How about the political aspects -- it's all political, particularly, you know, trying to respond to the extreme policies. I don't know, Audrey, would you like to address that?

DR. SINGER: Sure. Well, I think the case of Prince William County is pretty clear, that politics played a big role, and that's coming from a demographer. So, you know, there was an election, a local election, in terms of the Board of County Supervisors, and most of them were campaigning at the same time there were these national and state elections going on. And, you know, immigration was one of the big topics of the day. At least -- and we saw that playing out locally. We didn't see that so much in the national contest for President. They tended to avoid that issue, because they know it's a very hard thing to sell. So, I mean, politics did play -- it wasn't the only thing, but it tended to heighten what was happening locally.

MS. SANCHEZ: Sure. Let's see, the anti-

Latino sentiment also that was (inaudible). I don't know, Randy, do you think that's a lot of what moves a lot of this. It's not so -- not really the illegal aspect but it's more of a racial anti-ethnic sentiment.

DR. CAPPS: One aspect to that that I think is true to some degree is that there is a lack of comfort with the different culture and language, and, you know, as far as would -- if we waved a magic wand and gave everybody amnesty, would that help. Well, not if people still couldn't learn English. And there would still be problems for them getting ahead in their careers. There would be problems for them educating their children. There would be problems for people who don't speak Spanish in the community interacting with them. There's probably just as much good that can be done to help people integrate and overcome some of these differences by helping both with the interpretation and translation where it's needed for people who don't know English with English language instruction. I just think that that's a huge and important part of any integration strategy.

Now, on the policing side of it, there are accusations flying around all over the country of racial profiling and we'll just have to see, you know,

how those things play themselves out. Some of the jurisdictions that have done these programs, including Rogers, Arkansas, have been sued before for racial profiling. So, I think there's an element to that, and one of my recommendations, you know, to the federal government would be to do some oversight of these programs and investigate racial profiling accusations, because if they're not true, that's important to know just as much as if they are.

DR. SINGER: May I jump in?

MS. SANCHEZ: Yes.

I think there's a difference also -- and I think this is what Randy means between racial profiling and racism -- I think, you know, when people talk about their discomfort, it does tend to be social or cultural or civic in some way. But there's something that we haven't talked about so much here, and that's also the issue of economic status, and that's something else that makes people uncomfortable. And so that's a hard thing to capture when you're talking about this issue.

But when you look at some of the areas where there's been the most strife, these are places that are more moderate income, and the threats that people might feel with newcomers coming in, whether it's for their

housing or their jobs or whatever, it may be heightened because of that.

MS. SANCHEZ: There was a question about data -- good data, good sources of information, particularly about from the origin of immigrants and all that. I assume you all know very well what's a good source or more than one.

MS. KORALEK: Census.gov -- I use it all the time.

MS. SINGER: Hispanic (inaudible) some tables that are pretty easy to read.

MS. KORALEK: (Inaudible) is a very good source.

DR. CAPPS: (Inaudible) Migration Policy Institute we have some of that. We have some origins by state on now. But it's the American fact-finder website at the Census Bureau -- factfinder.gov -- you can go down to the county level in many cities, many counties and cities, not all -- and get a table that will tell you what countries all the immigrants are from. And that's improving over time. Each year they collect more data, they can get it down to smaller and smaller levels of geography.

MS. SANCHEZ: Okay, well, I'm down to two

minutes, and we already had -- we had another question that I don't any lawyers here that could address it -- the immigration law. Audrey?

DR. SINGER: No, I didn't have a really great answer, so I won't take time.

MR. CAPPS: What was the question.

MS. SANCHEZ: Well, that --

MS. SCOTT: (Inaudible).

MR. CAPPS: Yeah, well, I've talked to the people at MPI about this, so -- Doris Meissner is the former INS Commissioner -- just released the report a couple weeks ago talking about how ICE and other agencies within the Department of Homeland Security should reprioritize, but I think their take on it is that there's only so much the federal government can do without renegotiating these. It almost sometimes sounds like renegotiating free-trade agreements. I mean, you know, can -- I mean, you -- the power's been given, then granted already to some local jurisdictions. Maybe some more oversight would be, you know, what I would recommend and maybe some narrowing of scope and some different approaches to new agreements. But I don't know -- my understanding is a lot of these agreements are open-ended, they don't

(inaudible), etc., etc., so they're not necessarily that hard for the federal government to just suddenly revoke.

MS. SANCHEZ: Angeles, you have one more?

MS. ORTEGA-MOORE: Just something you said. You know, there's a lot of concern in our community, around the country, about just the recent raid a couple days ago in Washington state, so that is really sending a signal to the administration -- is, like, well, what's going on -- is the big concern.

DR. SINGER: Exactly.

Well, I'm sorry. I know there are many more questions (inaudible). I am supposed to close now at 4. If you want to just come up to the panelists you can ask them, and thank you so much for coming. Thanks to the panelists. Thanks a lot, guys.

\* \* \* \* \*



## CERTIFICATE OF NOTARY PUBLIC

I, Carleton J. Anderson, III do hereby certify that the forgoing electronic file when originally transmitted was reduced to text at my direction; that said transcript is a true record of the proceedings therein referenced; that I am neither counsel for, related to, nor employed by any of the parties to the action in which these proceedings were taken; and, furthermore, that I am neither a relative or employee of any attorney or counsel employed by the parties hereto, nor financially or otherwise interested in the outcome of this action.

/s/Carleton J. Anderson, III

Notary Public in and for the Commonwealth of Virginia  
Commission No. 351998  
Expires: November 30, 2012