Phil Nadeau had several careers with the military, a family catering/deli business, and the wholesale wine and beer business before settling into the profession of public administration as Richmond, Maine's Town Manager following his graduation from the University of Maine at Augusta in 1994.

His five years in Richmond was followed by his selection in 1999 as Lewiston's Assistant City Administrator. During the last six years in Lewiston, Nadeau has worked for three different city administrators and has served as Acting City Administrator twice. His normal duties typically involve overseeing general city operations and special projects. In 2004, he was appointed as the Interim General Manager of the newly acquired community civic center (The Colisee) from February 2004 through May 2004 and stayed on to serve as the construction manager of a recently completed $2 million addition.

When he is not overseeing special projects, other responsibilities involve his participation as a member of the Maine Municipal Association's Legislative Policy Committee; the Lewiston-Auburn Water Pollution Control Authority Board of Directors; Chairperson of the Lewiston-Auburn Transportation Committee; Secretary/Treasurer of the Maine Service Center Coalition; Secretary/Treasurer of the Colisee Board of Directors; and Secretary of the Androscoggin Valley Council of Governments Executive Committee. Nadeau recently served on the Governor's State Review Panel for Efficient Delivery of Local/Regional Services and completed his MA in Public Policy and Management at the University of Southern Maine's Edmund S. Muskie School of Public Service.

Most notably, Nadeau has served as the municipality's primary contact for immigrant policy, programming, and services for its growing population of immigrant residents. Since February 2001, approximately 1,700 immigrants, primarily Somali, have elected to relocate to Lewiston from other parts of the country. Over the last four years, Nadeau has been interviewed on this still-evolving immigrant story by most major national (and several international) print, radio, and television news organizations. The media attention continues to this day, as evidenced by a 13 March 2005 article about Lewiston's Somali community in the St. Petersburg Times (Florida).

Nadeau has worked on a myriad of local, state, and federal refugee policy and programming issues with such organizations as the U.S. Department of Justice; Maine Department of Human Services; Lewiston School Department; Maine Welfare Directors Association; Maine Department of Labor; Portland Department of Health and Human Services; Catholic Charities Maine; Clark University; and the Governor's Immigrant/Refugee Task Force. Additionally, Nadeau has been invited to speak about Lewiston's newest residents at the Camden Conference, Bates College, Brown University,
the University of Massachusetts at Lowell, the University of Maine at Farmington, the American Repertory Theater at Harvard University, the Maine Community Policing Institute's Leadership series, the Maine Advisory Board to the U.S. Commission on Civil Rights, the Greater Portland Neighborhoods Coalition Annual Conference, and through an op-ed piece in the *Boston Globe*.

Nadeau and his wife Marcia served in the military at the Pentagon, where they met in 1974. They have been married for 27 years and have a son, Anthony, who is currently a student at the University of Maine at Farmington.
It came as no surprise to municipal officials in June 2001 that some citizens began to notice more than just a few Somali people living in the downtown area, particularly given that many of the women wore their traditional, brightly colored garments and head coverings (Hijab). What did surprise Lewiston officials was that the initial relocation of Somali secondary migrants1 into this largely homogeneous community (95.7% Caucasian) would ultimately produce a Somali population of over 1,000 and become an international news story.2

By September 2002, the rapid and unanticipated relocation of approximately 1,100 Somalis set the stage for what became not only a local matter but a statewide and even national discussion regarding the future of immigrant and refugee policy and programming in Maine. In response to increasing citizen inquiries about municipal costs to support the city’s new residents, Lewiston Mayor Laurier Raymond, Jr. wrote an open letter to the general Somali community on 1 October 2002.3 Mayor Raymond’s letter asked local Somali residents to communicate with out-of-state Somalis and discourage them from considering Lewiston as a destination, reflecting his concern that city services would not be able to accommodate the demands of a growing refugee population.4 The City of Lewiston strained to fund its local budget, with much of this struggle driven by its statewide property tax mil rate, which is the fourth highest in Maine.5 The mayor’s letter generated a firestorm of national and international media attention that, combined with a white supremacist group’s decision to hold a public meeting in the city, culminated in a major community event. On 11 January 2003, as many as 4,500 people descended upon Lewiston.6

This study presents an overview of the numerous events and changes that transpired in Lewiston before and after Somali families began arriving in February 2001.7 The city’s immigrant history serves as a backdrop to the story of the Somalis’ journey, which brought them from refugee camps in Africa to the promise of a new and better life in the United States.8 The speed and number of Somali arrivals and the resulting community, state, and national response have generated debate and action on many issues, including race, culture and religion, federal/state refugee funding policy, and homeland security in a post-9/11 environment.

This work focuses on some of the specific fiscal, political, and social challenges associated with the rapid and unanticipated arrival of an immigrant population to a small, rural Maine city. It presents city hall’s response
to a quickly changing and highly regulated social and political climate, along with resulting media and public actions and reactions, within the context of local and statewide readiness. Social service program delivery, housing, employment training, language education, and health service requirements all serve as indicators that reveal how the community and state were largely unprepared for this influx of secondary migrants. The resulting attention from white-supremacist, anti-immigration, and civil-rights groups; the intervention of local citizens and federal agencies such as the United States Department of Justice; and a discussion about racial attitudes provide a basis for this paper’s conclusions, which reflect on the challenges and benefits Lewiston has experienced while adjusting to the notion of becoming more closely linked to a global community.

Lewiston: A Historical Perspective

Locals often describe Lewiston’s character as built upon its historical position as a “city of immigrants.” It is important to note that understanding Lewiston’s immigrant history requires more than a basic knowledge of the groups that shaped the community and how well they interacted with each other. The history of those early residents is one in which the dominant industries of textile and shoe manufacturing significantly affected family incomes, educational opportunities, and community attitudes and beliefs.

Lewiston was founded in 1795 and incorporated as a city in 1863, when the population was approximately 5,000. The introduction of textile manufacturing attracted thousands of immigrants to the community, which experienced unprecedented levels of population and economic growth throughout the last half of the nineteenth century.

The first immigrants to arrive in Lewiston during the 1840s were the Irish. As their numbers increased, so did tensions between the new residents and native, largely Protestant, Lewistonians, sometimes escalating to violence. In one instance, anti-Catholic Know-Nothing sympathizers participated in the burning of Lewiston’s first Catholic Church, built by Irish immigrants in 1855. The Irish did not pose any real economic threat; locals held most of the better jobs in the new mills. In fact, Irish workers often performed labor in which many residents preferred not to engage, such as digging canals for new mill construction. The lower wages paid to the new residents contributed to levels of poverty, however, and exposed natives to new social challenges such as mass sickness, slum housing (then called “patches,” as immigrants often built shacks in open fields), and public welfare.

Lewiston experienced another wave of immigration between 1840 and 1930 when some 750,000 French Canadians (also known as “Francos”) moved into New England and sought work in the woolen and cotton mills sprouting up throughout the region. This extraordinary mill growth also
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took hold in Lewiston, which housed the construction of eight cotton mills between 1852 and 1866 that employed over 3,500 women and 1,500 men.\textsuperscript{14}

By 1900, 23,761 people lived in Lewiston, and 70\% of its labor force worked in its mills.\textsuperscript{15} This 375\% increase in population over less than forty years was the fastest period of growth in the city's history. Fifty-six percent of the city's population was French Canadian, with 64\% identifying their origins as “French” (French Canadian or French).\textsuperscript{16} A comparison with 2000 Census data reveals that these numbers have been declining; the total number of residents now identifying themselves as French Canadian makes up only 29\% of the population, while those identifying themselves as French stands at approximately 48\% (see appendix 1E).

By the mid 1950s, Lewiston was the pre-eminent textile manufacturing center in Maine. One cotton mill operation, Bates Manufacturing of Maine, employed 6,000 people, making it the state’s largest employer.\textsuperscript{17} Additionally, its neighboring “sister city” of Auburn became the shoe manufacturing leader in Maine, producing four million pairs of shoes annually.\textsuperscript{18}

The arrival of French Canadians to Lewiston was not met with the violence first experienced by the Irish; however, the combination of low wages and language and cultural barriers stunted the economic, educational, and social growth of many first-generation Francophone mill workers. An 1875 study of Lowell, Massachusetts revealed that 52\% of those working in textile mills were “in very difficult economic circumstances.”\textsuperscript{19} United States Census data suggest that the Lowell findings are consistent with median wages over the last half of the twentieth century within the Lewiston-Auburn metropolitan statistical area (MSA). The area’s median wage ranking was the lowest of all Maine MSAs from 1959 through 1989.\textsuperscript{20} Recent data suggest that the “mature industry”\textsuperscript{21} effect in Lewiston is still at work: 1999 family median income levels of $40,061; 1999 household median income levels of $29,191; and 1999 per capita income levels of $17,905 ranked Lewiston the lowest of Maine’s eight largest cities (see table 1).\textsuperscript{22} Still, Lewiston’s opportunities surpassed those left behind in Quebec around the turn of the century.\textsuperscript{23}

The immigrants were hard working but lacked the skills needed to fill management positions or other more lucrative “white-collar” or office jobs—understandable given the educational levels of most Francophones at that time. Although Francophone families clearly saw the mills as providers of a better life for the present and future, they may also have benefited greatly by the presence of affordable post-secondary education within the community.
Lewiston did not have a state university presence in the community until September 1989 (the nearest campus was at least thirty miles away).\textsuperscript{24} According to the U.S. Bureau of the Census, Lewiston ranks in the bottom 25/111 of college-educated white adults twenty-five years or older. Additionally, when considering all adults eighteen or older who have at least some college education, Lewiston ranks last among the state's eight largest population centers (see table 2).\textsuperscript{25}

### Table 2
College Educated Adults — 18 Years+, 1999

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th></th>
<th>Auburn</th>
<th>Augusta</th>
<th>Bangor</th>
<th>Biddeford</th>
<th>Lewiston</th>
<th>Portland</th>
<th>Saco</th>
<th>S. Portland</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Pop. w/college education*</td>
<td>7648</td>
<td>6362</td>
<td>13661</td>
<td>6954</td>
<td>10690</td>
<td>32068</td>
<td>6707</td>
<td>10610</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Total population</td>
<td>23203</td>
<td>18560</td>
<td>31473</td>
<td>20942</td>
<td>35690</td>
<td>64249</td>
<td>16822</td>
<td>23324</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>% of total college ed pop</td>
<td>33.00%</td>
<td>34.30%</td>
<td>43.40%</td>
<td>33.20%</td>
<td>30.00%</td>
<td>49.90%</td>
<td>39.90%</td>
<td>45.50%</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

\*This data set includes all adults with some college undergraduate/graduate/post-graduate credits or completing undergraduate/graduate/post-graduate studies

Over the course of the last century, the reluctance of legislative officials to approve a state university in Lewiston may have contributed to its low adult college-educated population and impacted variables such as median family income and household wages. Ironically, recent information shows that the Lewiston-Auburn College campus of the University of Southern Maine has one of the fastest growing student bodies in the state.\textsuperscript{26}

Lewiston, like many other New England communities in the early-1960s, faced what Robert Ross describes as “deindustrialization; population stagnation; and fiscal stress.”\textsuperscript{27} Although Maine's second largest city (35,690), Lewiston’s population has been declining since the 1960s.\textsuperscript{28} Its largest population decline (some 4,000 residents) appeared in the 2000 Census and represented a 10% decline from the 1990 Census count of 39,757 and a 14.5% decline from the 1970 Census count of 41,779 (see appendix 1D).\textsuperscript{29} Reasons for this downturn included urban sprawl, high property taxes, an aging municipal infrastructure, and the loss of much of Lewiston's mature manufacturing base. From the 1980s to the mid-1990s, the decline in textile and shoe manufacturing jobs and the secondary businesses that supported them led to extremely high levels of unemployment, which peaked in Lewiston-Auburn at 16.4% in 1983\textsuperscript{30} and continued to remain elevated into 1991, 1992, and 1993 (Lewiston only: 9.3%, 8.7%, and 9.1% respectively).\textsuperscript{31}

Over the last twenty years, Lewiston's economic base has shifted from manufacturing to a more diversified service and light industrial economy. Its present economy and demographics indicate positive movement, with unemployment rates at historically low levels. Between 1999 and 2001, Lewiston's MSA unemployment rate did not rise above 4%—a first in forty-three years—and 2001 labor force figures (approximately 21,730) were higher than 1978 numbers.\textsuperscript{32} Although Lewiston has one census tract with the
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highest poverty rate in the state (46.3%), the overall 2000 Census poverty rate of 15.5% is below Bangor (16.6%), Maine's third largest city, and only slightly higher than Portland (14.1%), Maine's largest city. The Lewiston Development Office reported that economic investment in the Lewiston-Auburn area over the last three years exceeded $200 million, not including projects such as the $50 million Wal-Mart distribution center scheduled to generate 350 jobs for the city in 2005.

The possibility of a population increase exists for the U.S. Census in 2010 because the Somali immigrants arrived in 2001, after completion of the 2000 Census. The city appears to be in the midst of a true economic renaissance as it leaves behind its manufacturing base and population declines. The arrival of Lewiston's newest residents has contributed to this ongoing economic and social transformation.

The Somalis: From Africa to Lewiston

S
omalis first arrived in the United States during the 1920s, attracted by employment in the steel mills, study in American colleges and universities, and work in the merchant marine industry. As political unrest and civil war escalated in Somalia in the mid-1980s and early-1990s, many more Somalis arrived in the United States as refugees. Estimates claim that some 400,000 people died in Somalia of famine, disease, or war-related activity during this period.

By the end of 2001, 300,000 Somalis lived as refugees in about two dozen African countries. As the number of Somali and other African refugees has increased over the past several years, so has the U.S. commitment to accept more Somali people through its refugee resettlement program. In FY 1989, of the 17 or more African nationalities and ethnic groups selected for resettlement only 1,922 Africans of the 116,500 authorized refugee total entered the U.S., and only 44 of those were Somali. By the year 2000, of the 90,000 authorized refugee total, the actual number of Africans admitted into the United States increased to 18,979, of which 6,026 were Somali, representing 7% of all refugees relocating to the United States.

Over 40,000 Somalis have resettled in this country since 1980. Maine's estimated total Somali population is over 3,000, approximately 1,100 of whom reside in Lewiston. After conversations with officials in Minneapolis, Minnesota; Atlanta, Georgia; and Columbus, Ohio, the City of Lewiston estimated the combined number of U.S. Somalis currently documented or pending asylum at approximately 100,000. Some estimates place the national total at 150,000. Officials estimate that Hennepin County (making up the greater Minneapolis/St. Paul area) has upwards of 40,000 Somalis, with statewide numbers that approach approximately 75,000. These figures make Minnesota home to the single largest Somali population in the United States.
Although the major urban centers of Atlanta, Georgia; Nashville, Tennessee; Louisville, Kentucky; Columbus, Ohio; Minneapolis, Minnesota; and Memphis, Tennessee all serve as primary Somali refugee resettlement areas, smaller cities such as Portland, Maine also fill that role.45 Between 1982 and 2000, Catholic Charities Maine's (CCM) Office of Refugee/Immigration Services resettled 315 Somalis and approximately 3,500 other refugees in the greater Portland area.46 The gradual resettlement of these few hundred Somalis in greater Portland most likely affected the relocation decisions of an additional 1,000 or more secondary migrant Somalis from other parts of the country.

There are a variety of reasons why secondary migrant populations move from their initial communities of resettlement. Perhaps the simple explanation offered by the Office of Refugee Resettlement (ORR) is the most reasonable: “...better employment opportunities, the pull of an established ethnic community, more generous welfare benefits, better training opportunities, reunification with relatives, or a more congenial climate.”47 Moreover, many Somalis have indicated that their decisions to relocate were often driven by individual quality-of-life values that Maine could offer.48 In an open letter to former Maine Governor Angus King in May 2002, Somali community representatives wrote: “Given the possessive nature of Somali parents towards their families and children (cities such as Atlanta, Nashville and Louisville) are seen as places where the potential for running into undesirable situations are high. These include drugs, guns and related violence as well as other social problems such as homelessness.”49 Although media speculation suggests that more generous state welfare benefits significantly influence some Somali relocation decisions, there is little evidence to support that notion in Maine.50

The arrival of large numbers of Somali secondary migrants to Portland from the greater Atlanta area continued to the end of 2000. These numbers, and a 2.3% rental vacancy rate in Portland, forced the Portland Department of Health and Human Services (DHHS) to house the new arrivals in municipally operated shelters and local hotels.51 At Portland's request, municipal social service staff members from both Portland and Lewiston worked to relocate several Somali families to Lewiston in February 2001.52 By April 2001, Lewiston's General Assistance Office (GAO) estimated that fewer than 100 Somalis had relocated from Portland to Lewiston.53 The arrival of families in Lewiston from outside Portland and Maine, however, signaled to assistance officials that Somali arrivals were no longer looking to Portland as the preferred city of relocation. Lewiston General Assistance applicant interviews revealed that Somalis were beginning to board busses from the Dekalb County area of Georgia bound directly for Lewiston.

Lewiston's GAO estimated that 260 Somalis had relocated there by August 2001,54 although various media sources reported that up to 1,000 lived in the city during this period.55 Records also show that the locations from which they arrived expanded over time: Columbus, Memphis, Minneapolis, Kansas City, New Orleans, and several other communities.56
The initial relocation of Somali families from Portland to Lewiston provided some explanation as to why some out-of-state Somalis initially chose to move to the city—relocation was driven by family/friend reunification. The number and speed of Somali arrivals was inconsistent, however, with other typical relocation patterns of secondary migrant groups. Anecdotal evidence of other national relocations suggests that immigrants tend to resettle in areas populated by primary resettlement groups or where employment opportunities attract them to nearby communities. For example, Minneapolis area Somalis moved into the surrounding towns of Rochester, St. Cloud, and Owatonna to seek employment in meat processing industries. Without similar employment opportunities, secondary migrant movement appears to require a certain “critical mass” of primary resettlements before a community becomes attractive as a relocation area. Evidence of this critical mass exists in Lowell, Massachusetts, where Trang Nguyen estimates the Cambodian population at approximately 20,000.

The first Somali movement to Maine suggested that the initial resettlement of 315 Somalis to the greater Portland area was of sufficient critical mass to encourage secondary migration to that city. What confounded most experts about Lewiston’s influx, however, was the absence of any significant resettlement activity or industry that might have influenced the relocation. Most Maine residents would certainly agree with the Somali assessment of the state’s livability, but quality-of-life issues cannot fully explain the phenomenon. Further study is necessary to better understand what may be an entirely new rural relocation dynamic.

The First Somali Arrivals: The Early Response

At the onset of the Somali arrivals, Lewiston needed to quickly develop reasonable, responsive, and compliant services to address the needs of a large non-English-speaking population and support those needs with adequate resources into the foreseeable future. The city understood that the responsibility for addressing programmatic and service needs fell squarely on its shoulders during the first ten months of 2001 because the state was not equipped to provide any practical guidance or funding for Lewiston to prepare itself.

City staff quickly determined that most Somalis came immediately to city hall to request general assistance, the Maine equivalent of local welfare. The GAO estimated that up to 75% of new arrivals applied for this aid, and approximately 5% of the Somali population was in receipt of local general assistance support over the last several months of 2003. The Maine Department of Labor reported to the city that over 50% of all Somali adults in Lewiston were unemployed, and approximately 60% of Somalis were children (see table 3). Thus, it is possible that upwards of 50% of all Somalis received some form of local or federal assistance (federal welfare pro-
grams administered directly by the Maine Department of Human Services [DHS]). Regrettably, the DHS’ data-gathering methodologies do not permit city officials to accurately assess the percentage of Lewiston’s Somali population that actually received federal/state assistance.

Table 3
Somali Population Serviced by General Assistance thru November 30, 2002

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th></th>
<th>Prior No.</th>
<th>New</th>
<th>New Total Pop %</th>
<th>New Total Adults %</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Total Individuals</td>
<td>798</td>
<td>811</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Total Families</td>
<td>302</td>
<td>309</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Total Adults</td>
<td>331</td>
<td>339</td>
<td>41.80%</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Total Children</td>
<td>467</td>
<td>472</td>
<td>58.20%</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Totals</td>
<td>798</td>
<td>811</td>
<td>100.00%</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Adult Population Breakout</th>
<th></th>
<th></th>
<th></th>
<th></th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Total Single Males</td>
<td>97</td>
<td>101</td>
<td>12.45%</td>
<td>29.79%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Total Single Females</td>
<td>64</td>
<td>64</td>
<td>7.89%</td>
<td>18.88%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Total Female HH w/children</td>
<td>106</td>
<td>108</td>
<td>13.32%</td>
<td>31.86%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Total Male HH w/children</td>
<td>4</td>
<td>4</td>
<td>0.49%</td>
<td>1.18%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Total 2 parent Couples HH w/children (listed as indiv. not couples)</td>
<td>56</td>
<td>56</td>
<td>6.91%</td>
<td>16.52%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Total Husband/Wife Couples n/children (listed as indiv. not couples)</td>
<td>4</td>
<td>6</td>
<td>0.74%</td>
<td>1.77%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>TOTALS</td>
<td>331</td>
<td>339</td>
<td>41.80%</td>
<td>100.00%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>TOTAL ESTIMATED POPULATION AS OF 8/31/02 (total GA no. / 75% = Total Somali City Population)</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>1081</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

**These numbers are not 100% verified but represent our best data to date—adjustments have been made from prior reports. Source: U.S. Bureau of the Census Data

As the volume of Somali relocations increased (as many as 30 per month on average according to the General Assistance Office), General Assistance Director Sue Charron and the assistant city manager realized that the city needed to provide language interpretation services for such basic functions as completing forms. Additional interactions with Somali arrivals revealed that individuals and families also needed other, much more intensive, case management assistance. Finding housing; assisting with employment services; and providing information and assistance on everything from bus services, grocery shopping, and enrollment in public schools to seeking political asylum exceeded the city’s staffing and interpretive abilities. Lewiston officials also realized that obtaining additional staff or programs would be difficult in light of tight municipal budgets and the prospect of future downsizing.

Sue Charron and the assistant city manager made three important decisions early in the second quarter of 2001. The first was to hire a Somali caseworker in May. Although Lewiston’s budget was certainly challenged, the hiring provided immediate case management and interpretive support for both the general assistance and city administrator’s offices. The second decision, to increasingly utilize Portland’s Department of Health and Human Services and
Catholic Charities Maine’s immigrant/refugee expertise, helped to address basic service needs for the quickly growing population of largely non-English-speaking people. The third decision was to produce a comprehensive Limited English Proficiency (LEP) manual to instruct city employees on how to work with speakers of languages other than English and how to use the AT&T Language Service when local interpreters were not available.

The city also decided that another way to elevate its level of service delivery was to enhance its relationships with non-municipal social service and health providers by offering cultural and LEP education. These sessions covered a variety of topics including basic translation needs, the importance of complying with Title VI requirements, cultural-skills education, ESOL training, greater translation ability within departments, more translated materials, and comprehensive non-discrimination training.

Over the course of summer 2001, increasing numbers of Somali secondary migrants arrived in Lewiston. In addition, Somali, Sudanese, Liberian, Ethiopian, and Iraqi secondary migrants continued to arrive in Portland. For several months, general assistance officials in both cities worked with the state’s Immigrant and Refugee Coordinator Pierrot Rugaba to develop an outline for a jointly funded and administered program that would not utilize city or state funds. This operation would provide intensive case management services for immigrants coming through the general assistance offices of both cities. The program focused on the development of new job, cultural-skills, childcare, ESOL, and transportation programming to support the cities’ immigrant populations who were not being serviced as primary resettlement or family reunification cases through Catholic Charities Maine. The offices wrote an Unanticipated Arrivals Grant for funds available through the U.S. Department of Health and Human Services Office of Refugee Resettlement (DHHS/ORR).

These efforts resulted in the creation of the Portland-Lewiston Refugee Collaborative (called the Portland-Lewiston Collaborative Refugee Services Program at its inception), which formally began operation in January 2002 with a budget of $250,000 from DHHS/ORR, supplemented by another program extension award of $216,000 in July 2002. The Collaborative initially projected that the first DHHS/ORR grant would fund programming to support 900 immigrant cases over an eighteen-month period. By December 2002, it reported that 897 individuals had been served between the months of January and November—438 in Portland and 439 in Lewiston. The grant report suggested that, in spite of having to overcome such administrative barriers as working with different hiring and personnel policies and dealing with computer software incompatibility, the program exceeded its service delivery expectations.

Portland and Lewiston officials believed that the Collaborative demonstrated its value by adding critical case management and financial support to their respective social service operations. Since the initial award of $466,666, the Collaborative has received an additional $600,000 in Unanticipated...
Arrivals funding from DHHS/ORR. This secondary migrant program between Maine’s two largest cities appears to be the first collaboration of its kind in the United States.

Assessing Fiscal Impacts:
The Longer View

Given that the responsibility for initial program and service development fell to the city and its local nonprofits, Lewiston officials believed that the state needed to take a more active role in general immigrant/refugee programming. The overall strategy was to engage the state in the process of enabling Somali first-generation immigrants to educate themselves, find work and succeed in the workplace, access reasonable healthcare, and adjust to a very different cultural and social environment.

City officials recognized that recruiting more state involvement in these areas would not only benefit Somalis in Lewiston but all immigrant populations in Maine. They also knew that before the development of a statewide strategy could occur Lewiston needed to better understand local programming needs and how they translated into potential costs for municipal property taxpayers.

Estimating these costs was problematic when the first Somali families arrived in Lewiston. Some local residents and media assumed that Lewiston’s General Assistance Office could estimate the number of Somali arrivals based on Portland’s role as a refugee resettlement community. Predicting the movement of secondary migrants of the same nationality or ethnic origin is, however, difficult and rarely accurate. Lewiston’s experience with families from Togo demonstrated that refugee resettlement does not always lead to secondary migrant relocation: The resettlement of 31 individuals to Lewiston in 1999 did not lead to additional relocations of Togolese from other areas of the country.

Relocation estimates for Somali arrivals have never been accurate in Lewiston. In May 2002, local social service agency estimates of summer relocations to Lewiston were as high as 1,000. The actual number of arrivals between Memorial Day and Labor Day was 223. Lewiston officials now believe that Somali relocations from Portland influenced the decisions of others to relocate to Lewiston over the last twenty-eight months. Although a better understanding of the reasons associated with Somali relocation were important to city officials, the need to more accurately assess their needs far outweighed any discussion about how or why they were arriving.

Much to the credit of the Lewiston GAO, staff adapted quickly to learn more about the cultural, social, and religious practices of this predominantly Suni Muslim population and the types of services other cities most often provided. Lewiston officials learned early on that many national Somali population centers already existed. Telephone contacts with officials in Portland,
Maine; Clarkston, Georgia; Minneapolis, Minnesota; and Columbus, Ohio helped to shape the city's preliminary assessments, which indicated that levels of social service need would be much higher for the new arrivals than for any other population residing in Lewiston at that time.75

Armed with this information, Lewiston gained a better understanding of its Somali residents. Many issues confronted this population, including documentation relative to their educational, medical, and employment needs; family reunification processing difficulties; limited English-speaking ability; potential physical and mental health problems (such as post-traumatic stress disorder); and very limited acculturation instruction.

Trying to assess the impact of refugee relocations on local funding was a complex matter, but preliminary reviews suggested real and significant program expenditures at the local level. Some evidence supports Lewiston's initial fiscal concerns. Studies such as those conducted by Deborah Garvey and Thomas Espenshade suggest that higher levels of local social service expenditures were associated with the presence of certain unskilled immigrant populations in New Jersey, which resulted in programming and funding requirements at the local budgetary level.76 With illiteracy rates estimated as high as 75% within the general Somali population, many adults would require intensive levels of ESOL instruction, resulting in higher initial costs for annual public school and adult education budgets.77 The Lewiston School Department also recognized many of the same issues and began to assemble an ESOL program and student-intervention strategy for new Somali students. Programming and budget planning for ESOL instruction grew more complicated with the knowledge that Somalis spoke a relatively new language only formally adopted in 1972.78 At the end of the 2002-2003 school year, data appeared to support the initial concerns of city and school officials regarding ESOL needs. Approximately 96% of all Lewiston Somali K-12 students were registered in the public school ESOL training program.79

The literature suggests that the cost of services for immigrants with high levels of need will be largely borne by the local community in the absence of dedicated supplemental state or federal funding. Such was the experience of Wausau, Wisconsin, a community with approximately the same population as Lewiston, where 70% of the Hmong immigrant population still received public assistance fifteen years after their initial relocation.80 Although comparisons with Wausau are potentially useful in analyzing Lewiston's recent immigrant experience, readers should note that some predictability in estimating Hmong arrivals and attracting federal refugee resettlement funding was possible given Wausau's status as a refugee resettlement community. Lewiston's ability to predict need or initially seek funding was significantly undermined due to the uniqueness of the unanticipated movement of Somali secondary migrants and the lack of any resettlement funding within the community. All secondary migrants who relocate to any municipality arrive with no direct federal funding or services.81

What happened financially with immigrant/refugee populations of “high need” in Lewiston and Portland appears to be consistent with the findings of
other fiscal impact studies. Paul Hagstrom’s Mohawk Valley study found that high-need services and programming expenditures typically occurred within the first fifteen years for some first-generation refugee populations. Findings also suggest that immigrant service/program costs to states and municipalities are dependent on the economic and social conditions of the country of origin and that welfare use among refugees is more common than in non-refugee immigrant populations. With almost 800 Somalis living in the city by May 2002, and no real knowledge of future arrivals, officials estimated direct immigrant program/service costs in FY 2003 at $562,000; $382,000 of which would come from local property taxes (see appendix 1A).

Some members of the public and media characterized Lewiston’s FY 2003 tax effort as “insignificant” as it represented only 1% of the total amount of property tax dollars raised (see appendix 1A). This narrow analysis did not, however, acknowledge the efforts of the Collaborative to attract additional and unplanned supplemental funding. The Collaborative and Catholic Charities Maine have received more than $1.2 million in support from non-municipal funding sources over the last twenty months. Without these subsidies, programming would have been funded at the local level or not implemented at all.

There is some evidence to support the perception that financial concerns are particularly acute in Lewiston. In a study conducted by Bates College senior Abigail Bloom Newcomer, survey information indicates that Lewiston residents' economic, educational, and political background affects how they perceive Somali immigrants. The lower the income and education of respondents, the more negative their view of Somali residents—particularly among male respondents.

Although Newcomer cautions that the study did not demonstrate that all low-income, uneducated males express prejudice, it did show that they responded more negatively when voicing concerns about economic impacts and their relationship to the presence of Somalis in the community. This report provides perspective on how some Lewiston residents view immigration and Somalis in general, but a 33% response rate on the randomly selected, mailed survey could raise questions about the quality or value of the responses (those who felt more negatively toward Somalis may have been more willing to mail in the form). The information does, however, appear to illustrate a level of hostility, discomfort, and anxiety within some members of the population about immigration, “the system,” and “competition [for] resources.” The financial condition of the state, which recently approved an FY 2004-2005 biennium budget with a projected $1.2 billion revenue deficit, combined with federal government FY 2003 budget deficit estimates somewhere in the vicinity of $455 billion, does little to bolster the confidence of many residents and municipal officials.

Addressing the indirect or “soft” costs associated with new arrivals was an even greater challenge for Lewiston due to the economic variables present
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within the immigrant population. The direct costs of such variables were difficult to isolate because the benefits normally associated with these expenditures also apply to individuals outside the Somali community. Specifically, Lewiston officials were concerned by the indirect costs of supporting a largely unemployed Somali population. Aside from the obvious issue of unemployed adults requiring local or state/federal welfare, the municipality felt the need to address the possible consequences of long-term unemployment: higher levels of crime, social misbehavior, poor academic performance, and reductions in the mental and physical health of families.92

Ironically, this high level of unemployment among Somali adults occurred at a time when the city was experiencing historically low levels of unemployment generally, which suggests a greater potential for finding employers eager to hire. That said, the area's more rural economy generally produces a smaller pool of lower skill jobs (housekeeping, maintenance, construction labor, and food service) that, according to Juan Forero of New Jersey's Star Ledger regarding the arrival of Paraguayans in Bernardsville, New Jersey, often presents employment opportunities for low-skilled immigrants.93 The paucity of low-skill positions in the greater Lewiston-Auburn area served as an employment barrier that required a much more aggressive job training plan. Many believe that the city must explore new and creative job placement and training approaches to enhance employment prospects for Somali workers.94

Another example of a soft cost is Lewiston's high media profile over the last year. National and international media attention generated interest by several national civil rights advocacy groups working on behalf of Somali residents. Lewiston demonstrated its willingness to comply with all federal and state non-discrimination laws by inviting the U.S. Department of Justice to assist the community in October 2002. Intervention by these advocacy groups resulted in more aggressive monitoring of non-discrimination policies by the municipality, school department, and many nonprofit agencies.

Non-discrimination compliance training and programs are clearly legitimate and necessary costs, but the vigilance of these groups, coupled with the ever-present threat of litigation, elevated the need for a rapid and professional response that was initially very expensive. These groups operated on the premise that every municipality must be compliant. Lewiston officials suspected, however, that such high levels of technical compliance are non-existent in the majority of American cities and towns.95 Although city officials believed that everyone who sought municipal services benefited from compliance, they also realized that few communities could easily budget for these expenditures. Such costs are most often incrementally budgeted given the pressures to fund any number of "mandated" areas. Budgeting for full (or nearly full) implementation and compliance is rare unless circumstances obligate communities to do so.96
Touring downtown Lewiston over the last twenty-eight months would reveal significant economic development activity. According to Greg Mitchell, assistant city administrator overseeing development, the list of new endeavors has been impressive: A $9 million state municipal court building; a $5 million Maine Department of Human Services regional center; an expanded $3 million Lewiston Sun Journal operation; $75 million worth of investment at the Central Maine Medical Center; $10 million in affordable housing initiatives; and ongoing investment at the old Bates Mill complex (over $16 million to date), which has allowed Banknorth to import almost 800 jobs into the facility.

On a more subtle level, the presence of Somali residents is another visible change in the city. The downtown location of a Somali mosque, two Halaal general stores, and a new restaurant owned and operated by Somalis change the day-to-day interactions of people walking and working downtown. The area now has a slightly more international feel and flavor. The introduction of a new language, people of color, new religion, and different foods presents a very different aura to a place that was somewhat static in its physical landscape and cultural offerings.

On a public service level, the changes are significantly more dramatic. In addition to a very unique partnership that led to the formation of the Portland-Lewiston Refugee Collaborative, the city and state developed or expanded a number of new initiatives over the course of the last two years. These initiatives address specific statewide quality-of-life needs, reduce or eliminate some barriers to programs and services, and help immigrants/refugees and other resident populations become more independent and self-sufficient. The following list is representative of activity in the area:

**The Governor’s Immigrant & Refugee Task Force:** Former Maine State Governor Angus King created this task force in November 2002 to address the need for a more comprehensive statewide approach to working with immigrant and refugee populations. The body hoped to generate broader public interest and support for expanding Maine’s ability to better serve immigrant populations throughout the state as opposed to just in its two largest cities. The new administration of Governor John Baldacci recently indicated the probability of a renewed task-force effort over the next several months.

**The New Residents Committee:** Started in December 2002, this collaborative effort brings together the major state agencies (the departments of human services, labor, and education, and the Bureau of Developmental Services) that most often work with immigrant and refugee populations. The committee also works with the cities of Lewiston and Portland and several nonprofit agencies to
address issues that relate to Maine's newest immigrant residents. The committee's original statutory focus was the search for additional resources to support programs targeting the needs of immigrants. Currently, the committee is addressing related areas of concern such as data collection at the state agency level. This type of detailed information is necessary for effective program development.

**Lewiston Immigrant/Refugee Programs Manager:** This position was created for the City of Lewiston and approved for full funding in October 2002 by the Maine Department of Labor, utilizing Workforce Investment Act pass-through funds. The manager assists with the research, development, coordination, and funding of programs and services specifically targeted to Lewiston's immigrant populations and aids other Maine communities in developing strategies and responses to immigration.

**Coastal Enterprises, Inc.—The New American Sustainable Agriculture Project:** Developed in 2002, this collaborative project is a community-based initiative focused on working with Latino, Somali, and other interested residents who seek farming opportunities in the greater Lewiston-Auburn area. The project helps individuals buy and operate farms. The cities of Lewiston and Auburn agreed to provide city-owned land for the development of parcels for project participants.

**The New Mainers Employment Network:** This group formed in 2003 through the joint efforts of the Maine Department of Labor, Western Maine Community Action Office, the City of Lewiston, Catholic Charities Maine, the University of Southern Maine Center for Workplace Learning, Lewiston Adult Education, and the Portland-Lewiston Refugee Collaborative. Its purpose is to provide an opportunity for state, city, and nonprofit organization representatives who work with immigrant/refugee populations to share information, develop strategies, eliminate program redundancy, and discuss issues relative to the employment of immigrant populations and other residents requiring job training or placement services.

**The Business Advisory Group:** Created in 2003, this effort is coordinated through the City of Lewiston, the Maine Department of Labor, and the Western Maine Community Action Office to provide a forum for business owners and representatives to share their insights and input regarding matters associated with the hiring of immigrant residents.

**AmeriCorps*VISTA—Somali Resettlement Project:** As the project’s sponsoring entity for year two, the City of Lewiston will manage and coordinate the activities of its seven Volunteer In Service To America (VISTA) members. Local partners include the Maine
Department of Human Services; Maine Department of Labor—Lewiston Career Center; Community Concepts, Inc.; Sisters of Charity Health Systems; Androscoggin Valley Council of Governments; Literacy Volunteers of America-Androscoggin; and the University of Maine Center for Workplace Learning. Project members serve the local community to encourage self-sufficiency and eliminate poverty. VISTA will address issues related to transportation, childcare, literacy, employment training, job retention, financial literacy, public health, and more.

The Maine Refugee Advisory Council: This council initially organized in 1981 through the state’s Department of Human Services as a way for immigrant representatives and service providers (primarily Portland-based) to share information and collaborate on policy and programming. Beginning in 2002, the council evolved into a more statewide multi-agency, multi-community group but has recently seen no immigrant representation. It was recognized by the state DHS office for taking the lead in the development and implementation of the “Electronic Benefits Card” system for food stamp purchases, which also provides a feature for language interpretation services through AT&T.

The Refugee and Immigrant Mental Health Collaborative: This effort is coordinated through the Multicultural Coordinator’s Office of the Maine Bureau of Developmental Services. It formed in July 1999 as an informal gathering of mental-health service providers in response to reports of potentially significant Kosovo refugee relocations to the Portland area. Although large numbers of relocations did not occur, the efforts of this Collaborative identified gaps in the mental-health service sector for immigrant populations. Since 2001, the Collaborative has expanded its list of participants to include individuals and organizations from around the state.

Much of this local or statewide activity correlates directly to the public attention generated around the issue of Somali arrivals in Lewiston. Why state agencies did not initially express higher levels of interest in immigrant and refugee programming or policy has been the topic of much public debate. Some consensus surrounding this lack of interest and activity existed among Portland’s numerous immigrant/refugee service providers. Portland's exemplary work with immigrant and refugee populations over the last twenty-five years and Maine’s lack of diversity (the “whitest” state in the country at 96.9%) may have delayed the state’s proactive involvement. As long as Portland’s providers continued to meet the needs of its local immigrant and refugee populations, the state took a minimalist approach to services beyond Portland’s borders. The state was certainly aware of immigrant populations in other parts of Maine, but its lack of any tangible assistance for Lewiston’s Somalis in 2001 came as one of many surprises to Lewiston officials.
At the same time that Lewiston implemented actions to enhance program accessibility to Somali residents, it also pursued the more complex task of establishing effective communication links with the leadership of a population about which it knew little. Without providing a comprehensive review of Somali culture, it is reasonable to say that it follows historical nomadic traditions and clan hierarchy. During the initial arrivals, it was not unusual for several Somali individuals to visit at city hall almost weekly (each group typically not knowing the other) to announce their intentions to work with the city and represent their community. Over time, city officials grew to believe that many of these individuals originated from different communities (outside Maine) and various clan groups. City officials also reported that many Somalis publicly diminished the importance of clan affiliations when interacting with other Somalis in the community.

Beyond clan affiliations, communication difficulties were complicated by the confusion created with Somali and Muslim leadership roles. In one instance, a non-Somali Muslim male who lived in Lewiston (and stated that he was an Imam, Muslim religious leader, from Portland) advised city hall that all communications to Somali residents must pass through him. During this same period, the alleged Imam advised a U.S. Senator’s office of his accusations of discrimination against Somali students in the Lewiston public school system and also accused school officials of engaging in other alleged discriminatory activities.

City officials were never able to confirm the identity of this person and were advised by Somali representatives that they would not recognize the individual in any official or unofficial Somali or Muslim leadership capacity. Somalis found his actions so offensive that they provided the City Administrator’s Office with a letter dismissing his allegations and his claim of representation on their behalf.101

Although city officials at that time did not understand the complexities of the Somali social or cultural structure, they did arrive at one basic conclusion: There were precious few Somalis who could speak English fluently enough to communicate effectively and efficiently with the city. Officials met with dozens of Somali men and women within a few months of their initial relocation but could not discern who actually represented the Somali community. Although officials had access to information about the culture and the role of “elders” within it, the literature did not serve as a playbook to assist them in assessing who could serve as the formal leaders. Communication with the Somali leadership was more a matter of working with and through individuals (most often male) who spoke English rather than directly through elders. The ability to speak English often dictated which Somalis represented the community at meetings with local, state, and federal officials and the media.

The city established personal lines of communication with a dozen or more Somali males and females who were engaged in a variety of community activities. These residents volunteered their time to act as interpreters dur-
ing many meetings between Somali representatives and city organizations and served on several local social service agency boards. There was discussion among Somali residents about creating a single “formal” representative body, but they did not reach consensus as to how this representation would be achieved.

By January 2002, it was clear that officials needed to offer more than just local services for newly arrived Somalis, then estimated at 560. With the assistance of James Cassidy, CEO of the Sisters of Charity Health System; community leaders from local hospitals; Lewiston’s General Assistance Office; school staff; elected officials; the Somali community; and a few state agencies, the city organized a meeting to address ongoing social service and information needs. The meeting ultimately led to the planning of a May 2002 public “town hall meeting.” The Sisters of Charity meeting also resulted in the issuance of a city report to then Governor Angus King that provided information about service levels and addressed a myriad of local concerns.

The May 2002 public meeting had three purposes: Provide local citizens with an opportunity to ask questions and receive information on a variety of issues; address numerous rumors, including one that all Somalis received free car vouchers upon arrival in Lewiston; and provide residents with an opportunity to acquire information from immigration and refugee resettlement experts. A panel of professionals in this field partnered with city officials and Somali representatives in an attempt to address a variety of questions submitted by citizens who commented on immigration policy, tax burdens, program costs, and competing resource concerns.

Attendees who participated in exit interviews suggested that those residents who entered the public meeting with one set of impressions left with those impressions largely intact. Citizens who supported refugee and immigration policy were less inclined to question the Somalis’ decision to settle in Lewiston. Citizens who did not support such policy were more inclined to question the move. Many from both sides of the issue, however, expressed general concerns about the source of funding for current or future programs.

The town hall meeting also provided media with a reason to persist in their coverage of the Lewiston-Somali story. By June 2002, sufficient statewide media coverage had accumulated to attract the attention of Patrick Reardon of the Chicago Tribune. In Maine to write a story on Richard Russo, the Pulitzer-Prize-winning author, Reardon also wrote a story about Lewiston’s newest arrivals. National media coverage by “Fox News,” Public Radio International’s “The World,” and “ABC World News Tonight” followed.

The combination of this meeting and the city’s report to Governor King generated more interest in immigrant matters—local and statewide—from the governor’s office. The state responded with a higher level of collaborative effort from its front-line state agencies. In June 2002, Governor King directed Senior Policy Advisor Greg Nadeau to gather representatives from the City of Lewiston and other key state agencies (the DHHS and the departments of labor and education) to find ways to better integrate state services with local
efforts. The group discussed and recommended how the state might strengthen its partnership with Lewiston. This directive ultimately led to the formation of the Governor’s Immigrant/Refugee Task Force, which reflected the governor’s intention to develop a more comprehensive statewide strategy for working with immigrant/refugee populations.

Following the public issuance of Mayor Raymond’s open letter to the Somali community on 2 October 2002, a group of Somali residents met with the mayor in his office. On 11 October 2002, the city, in collaboration with Somali leadership, delivered a jointly crafted press statement to put an end to the week-long media frenzy. This gesture was very important and diffused much of the Somali criticism of the mayor’s letter, but public and media attention persisted. Telephone calls, emails, and letters poured into Lewiston City Hall from around the world. City staff estimates place the number of public contacts at more than two thousand over a two-week period, well beyond anything Lewiston officials expected.105

What frustrated many city officials was the absence of real public or civic involvement. Although many individuals from the city, nonprofits, and state agencies were highly engaged, few community-based civic organizations or academic institutions actively supported or welcomed the new arrivals. One citizen-based organization actually contacted city administration in February 2002, “warning” of problems that might be ahead for some Somali residents in downtown Lewiston. When questioned about the organization’s willingness to assist with the perceived problem, the individual responded that the organization’s function was advisory and not to get involved with hands-on activity.106

The absence of civic involvement was not solely relegated to citizen organizations. Much of the academic community also appeared to avoid any public involvement with Somali residents. Few, if any, churches discussed diversity, social change, or tolerance; civic and other advocacy groups expressed little to no interest in what was happening locally. One of very few community organizations to engage the Somalis early on was the Franco-American Heritage Center at St. Mary’s Church. Board members and staff from Sisters of Charity Health Systems hosted a social event in April 2002 to provide members of the public with an opportunity to meet Somali residents and enjoy their food and music.

Evidence suggests that the publication of the mayor’s letter served as a catalyst for higher levels of civic engagement. Many dormant organizations and individuals became significantly more involved with issues of cultural diversity within the community. Bates College, Lewiston-Auburn College, and the Central Maine Community College (then Central Maine Technical College) responded almost immediately by hosting a social function for the Somali community and the general public in October 2002. A local church organized a public walk in support of Somali residents. When a white-supremacist group (then called the World Church of the Creator) announced on 16 November 2002 that it would meet in Lewiston, the local reaction was to organize a broad constituency of about 200 individuals from a variety of...
local churches, civic and advocacy groups, elected officials, and concerned citizens (many of whom had not previously participated in any civic activity) formed an initiative called the Many and One Coalition. The group's crowning achievement was a counter-rally to the World Church of the Creator meeting on 11 January 2003. The event attracted some 4,500 people and significant national attention.107

Over the course of a year, local post-secondary institutions have taken action to welcome their Somali neighbors. Bates College hosted the March 2003 event “Toward Harmony,” and provided a public forum to discuss cultural diversity and social/cultural change within the community. Additionally, both Bates College and Lewiston-Auburn College expressed interest in utilizing the resources of their respective institutions to gather data and generate better information about local immigrant populations.

City officials also took another step in responding to local events by inviting the U.S. Department of Justice’s Community Relations Division to meet with community representatives in November 2002. The goal was to discuss how the city could increase civic discourse about Lewiston’s quickly changing social and cultural environment. The meetings led to the creation of a “community dialogue” process that was launched on 30 April 2003. This dialogue offered an opportunity for citizens to participate in facilitated, small-group discussions. They shared issues that the city and community needed to address and offered solutions. Although the level of public participation was relatively small (approximately 60 individuals over a three-week period) and included only a few Somalis, the process produced several group reports that, once consolidated into a single set of recommendations, will be shared with the city council.

Academic interest in the Somali population did not stop at Maine’s borders. Professors Richard Ford and Laura Hammond from Clark University in Worcester, Massachusetts led an effort involving some fifteen Clark students to conduct a community assessment for Somali residents in September 2003. This undertaking will incorporate some of the experiences encountered by Professor Ford and other participants in the Nabud iyo Caano (Peace and Milk) project in Somalia and Somaliland.108 The goal of the Lewiston project is to help Somali residents better understand their community and express their needs.

Another community initiative involved the Maine chapter of the National Coalition Building Institute and Lewiston’s Many and One Coalition, both of which collaborated with the National Conference for Community Justice to select the city as one of five national sites to screen the documentary film Two Towns of Jasper.109 The film details the tragic circumstances around the brutal murder of an African American man in Jasper, Texas. The organization uses the documentary as a way to generate public discussion and awareness about race, diversity, and social change.110

City officials hope that the efforts of the Maine and greater New England academic community will lead to a broader understanding of the city’s
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The Somali population. The community-building activities associated with Clark University; Lewiston's involvement with Brown University's refugee and immigration work through The Center for the Study of Race and Ethnicity in America; the city's academic staff contacts with the University of Massachusetts at Lowell, the University of Maine, and the University of Southern Maine; and the interest expressed locally by Bates College and Lewiston-Auburn College to conduct local research will all help shape programs and services provided to Somalis and other immigrant populations. Lewiston officials believe that accurate and useful data compilation is key to planning future programs.

The Race Card

During the height of public discussion in October and November 2002, Lewiston City Hall reported that the large majority of self-identified residents communicated that their feelings about Somali relocation had nothing to do with immigration, race, or discrimination. In a community still experiencing some of the negative income and educational impacts detailed earlier in this paper, residents identified the fiscal consequences and potential job losses associated with Somali relocation as primary concerns. Communications criticizing Mayor Raymond's letter, and the city's general response, as racist and discriminatory often came from citizens who lived outside the city.

Readers should note that no practical means existed for city officials to evaluate what factors influenced opinions among those who contacted city hall. In the absence of extensive and qualitative research, we cannot prove that specific demographic variables like education or income impacted attitudes about race and immigration. Newcomer's findings, in combination with Lewiston education and income data provided in this paper, suggest, however, that these variables may have influenced resident attitudes about Somali relocation to the city.

Additionally, the opinions of Lewiston residents about their city appear to differ from those of non-residents, which may explain some of the differences in responses to the mayor's letter. A survey recently published by the Lewiston-Auburn Economic Growth Council reveals some interesting data relative to this observation:

- Residents view the area's location, friendly people, low crime, size, good public schools, and convenience as its positive attributes (in that order). Non-residents see shopping, Bates and other area colleges, cultural events, access to healthcare, friendly people, and new growth as the area's best features.
- Residents view high taxes, blight, lacking employment opportunities for youth, lack of entertainment/cultural choices, crime, and
traffic congestion as the area’s most negative features. Non-residents believe that blight is the city’s biggest drawback, followed by crime, traffic, poverty, poor physical appearance, and lacking employment opportunities for youth.112

A quick analysis of Lewiston-Auburn Economic Growth Council data shows that although 79.4% of residents claim satisfaction with the overall direction of the community, the top resident responses suggest that their perceptions are influenced by more local and personal aspects: location, people, safety, and public schools on the positive side; property taxes, blight, and lack of employment opportunities on the negative side. Non-residents, on the other hand, appear to enjoy those positive community attributes that residents, for the most part, do not consider most important, including retail, post-secondary, cultural, and healthcare opportunities. They also appear to have a much greater negative perception of the city’s general character and safety.113

Beyond any discussion of demographic influences on attitudes, some members of the public and media have speculated that perceived racist or xenophobic attitudes toward Somalis in Lewiston may have been driven by the city’s lack of cultural diversity.114 This paper suggests, however, that determining what drives attitudes, beliefs, and behaviors is infinitely more complex than simply assuming that an overwhelmingly white community will exhibit racial disharmony when immigrants arrive.

Conclusion

What complicated the process of analyzing or describing the attitudes of people in Lewiston is the fact that immigration and refugee policies are not simply matters of race, ethnicity, or diversity. Community attitudes about and reactions to such policies may also be influenced by how much or little funding follows refugees who relocate to another community. If they arrive as resettled refugees, federal funding support and programming accompanies them, thus negating some of the local and state fiscal responsibilities for the first year, but this support will not address ongoing needs. If refugee groups arrive as secondary migrants or remain as resettled refugees beyond one year, programming, funding, and assessment are potentially more complex and problematic for local communities. Lewiston’s immigrant experience clearly reveals the inadequacies of funding for small, rural municipalities.

The budgets and corporate assets within many larger urban centers are useful in leveraging the few dollars that support secondary migrant arrivals. In cases like Lewiston, however, the only option appears to be competing for resources from the DHHS/ORR as opposed to falling under a federal funding system that recognizes the financial limits of a small community. Although Unanticipated Arrivals Grants have filled a critical need for both Lewiston and Portland, there is no certainty about the future of such funds.
Also, the matter of providing secondary migrant federal funding for those in country thirty-six months or less is problematic for all U.S. communities for two reasons: It does not cover the state costs of mandated programming for the full sixty-month period, and federal dollars are based on the issuance of Social Security numbers for secondary migrants who often do not possess them. Given that federal rules require immigrant access to program services, the government's decision not to fund the entire period of programming results in the issuance of an unfunded mandate. Rather than allocating dollars to states based on a deficient system that does not account for all secondary migrants, the federal government should distribute funding based on something all legal immigrants receive, such as their I-94 (Arrival/Departure Record Form).

For small communities like Lewiston that have largely homogeneous populations, program start-up costs are highly problematic without financial assistance from the state or federal government. If minimal public service infrastructure is in place to deal with a sudden influx of immigrants, state and federal law compliance drives much of the expenditure. Such compliance is beneficial because it provides equal access to programs, but enhanced program investments relating to compliance are often unbudgeted and costly. Revenues and expenditures are rarely trivial matters in any city. Federal programming requirements, although necessary, must be accompanied by adequate funding to buffer the short- and long-term need for services often required by refugee populations. Additionally, Lewiston has a small-urban-center economy without the large pool of low-skill positions that would avert chronic unemployment within the Somali community. Further efforts must occur to help Somali workers train for and find more nontraditional jobs not often available to non-English-speaking populations.

Much of the content within this paper relies on the experiences of communities outside Lewiston. The city needs more detailed information about its own Somali community to address ongoing programmatic needs. Very little information exists about general demographics, health, and other characteristics of the Somali population in Lewiston. With the assistance of New England academic institutions, research and survey resources invested into the community can assist officials in learning more about the city's newest residents. Information is the key to knowledge, and the academic community can fill a vital data-gathering function.

Under the watchful eye of numerous government and civil rights groups, the city continues to explore more effective ways to engage its immigrant populations. The City of Lewiston and the Portland-Lewiston Refugee Collaborative jointly developed more effective communication links with the Somali leadership and should increase collaborative efforts with Somali and other immigrant groups in a manner similar to the community empowerment process modeled by Clark University. Such creative outreach efforts will attract greater immigrant participation in local decision making.
One unique aspect of the very public nature of events in Lewiston was that local officials realized the complexity of discussing Somali arrivals within the context of national/international immigration and refugee policy. Unfortunately, national policy discussions rarely provided more insight for residents who tried to understand issues at a local level. Few wanted to hear about international fiscal, political, and military issues that influence immigration/refugee policy. Citizens typically look for a “side” to an issue and, at that point, immigrant/refugee policy becomes problematic because it has no clear-cut political ideology that translates easily into identifiable political party support or opposition. This absence of partisan alignment may contribute to the lack of comprehensive statewide policy actions in Maine.

In the very near future, the state must also reassess its declining population growth rate in light of arriving immigrants. Many New England urban centers such as Boston, Providence, and Worcester saw population increases in the 2000 Census, many of which were due to immigrant relocation. Every one of Maine’s top eight urban centers experienced a decline in population between 1990 and 2000. Portland, however, the only Maine community that served as a primary refugee resettlement site, lost only a fraction of its population.

On 22 April 2002, former Maine Attorney General James Tierney addressed a University of Maine audience and shared his concerns about Maine’s declining population, aging demographics, and lack of ethnic diversity. The Tierney speech generated some debate with regard to his suggestion that immigrants might serve to stem the tide of Maine’s shrinking populace. Iowa (which projects worker shortages for future job-growth needs over the next ten years) implemented state-level policies and practices that encourage immigrants to move to the state. Schenectady, New York Mayor Albert Jurczynski actively seeks the interest of Guyanese immigrants living in New York City to fill job openings and occupy vacant housing. Some hail the Iowa and Schenectady recruiting efforts as inventive; others criticize them as cost intensive and socially destabilizing.

If population growth is key to economic growth, Maine residents must publicly discuss the importance of developing a comprehensive, statewide strategy to reverse declining population and handle the immediate fiscal impacts of emigration and immigrant relocation to its largest population centers. Debating whether or not immigrants should move to Maine serves no useful purpose. There are no federal or state restrictions that control the relocation of immigrants and refugees from one state to another. Maine has the fifth lowest population growth rate and the fourth oldest demographic in the country. Policy leaders must take these facts into full consideration when they discuss the role of new immigrant residents in an overall population-growth strategy for Maine. Education, job training, technology, global trade, and cultural opportunities must also be included in such discussions.

In the interim, beneficial social changes have occurred because of Lewiston’s experience. Its observation that general assistance often performs
the intake function for many secondary migrants has generated interest by the Maine Welfare Directors Association to develop a handbook for municipal general assistance administrators that will provide instruction for those who interview immigrant and other non-English-speaking persons requiring service in Maine.

At the state level, organizations such as the Lewiston Career Center have instituted administrative changes that address the increased occupational activity of immigrant populations. Administrators state that the internal changes have not only led to improved service for local immigrant populations but also produced day-to-day operational benefits recognized throughout the organization. Changes to a number of social service agencies have allowed them to more successfully deal with changing community demographics.

The city is now better equipped to help individuals who are non-English speaking, hearing impaired, or speech impaired. New Somali arrivals initially influenced interpretive and translation services, but many other non-English-speaking and hearing/speech-impaired individuals also benefit from a more sensitized environment. In addition, improved access for non-English speakers incorporates a number of other enhancements related to the Americans with Disabilities Act. Within the last year, the city has worked to better incorporate telecommunication device for the deaf (TDD) technology into its organization. Moreover, Lewiston initiated a full review of its compliance requirements relative to access in public buildings, parks, and programming and has made additional improvements.

Meeting the needs of Somalis and other immigrants in Lewiston and throughout the state is dependent upon Maine's definition of its future role. The state cannot “assign” the responsibility of developing more diverse communities to Portland and Lewiston. Immigrants will continue to move into Maine, and many accompanying decisions will depend on the state’s ability to equip communities with solutions and resources that address the specific needs of Maine’s newest residents. If Maine desires a more culturally and ethnically diverse population, it must first enable a broader range of communities to become inviting places for immigrants to reside. Portland and Lewiston have demonstrated a willingness to respond quickly and creatively in providing services for immigrants choosing Maine as their home. Likewise, some state agencies have made a commitment to partner with Lewiston and Portland, thus elevating their involvement and intervention to a statewide level. This step demonstrates the need for executive leadership on matters of statewide importance. It is this author’s sincere hope that Governor John Baldacci will recognize, as did his predecessor Angus King, the importance of the executive branch maintaining its leadership role with regard to these issues. The Governor’s Refugee/Immigrant Task Force is currently positioned to serve a critical informational and advisory role if the governor elects to utilize its current structure. Governor Baldacci’s decision about the future of the task force is pending.
Notes

1. “Secondary migrants” is a phrase utilized by many federal, state, and local agencies to identify those immigrants who have arrived as refugees—technically in country thirty-six months or less, who move from their initial community of resettlement. This report will define all resettled refugees who move from one U.S. community of resettlement to another as such.

2. See U.S. Bureau of the Census, Census 200 Summery File 1: QT-P3 Race and Hispanic or Latino, generated by Philip Nadeau using American Factfinder. All American Factfinder tables generated by Philip Nadeau are available upon request from pnadeau@ci.lewiston.me.us.


4. Although there has been significant public discussion as to what the mayor said or meant, the description of the letter as an attempt to communicate to out-of-state Somalis is consistent with statements made by Mayor Raymond to the Lewiston Sun Journal. See Doug Fletcher, “Mayor had Best Intentions; Refuses to Apologize,” Lewiston Sun Journal, 12 October 2002, 1. Any discussion or analysis as to the letter’s intent or whether it was appropriate for the mayor to write such a letter will remain for other studies to consider.


7. The only means the city had to record the presence of secondary migrants at the beginning of 2001 was to track their arrival based on applications they made for general assistance, the Maine equivalent of local welfare. Tracking for secondary migrant arrivals is now also coordinated through the Portland-Lewiston Refugee Collaborative. The first recorded case of a Somali person applying for general assistance was February 2001. Sue Charron (Director, General Assistance Office), interviews with author, Lewiston, Maine, January–April, 2001.

8. Although the terms “refugee” and “immigrant” often appear interchangeably, this paper uses the term “refugee” to describe an individual “who has been forced to leave his/her homeland and is unable to return because she or he has experienced persecution or has a well-founded fear of persecution” and who has achieved refugee status in accordance with provisions outlined in the Refugee Act of 1980. See Exodus World Service, “Definition of a Refugee,” (2001). http://www.e-w-s.org/html/refugee.html

Refugees who enter the U.S. can apply for Lawful Permanent Resident status after one year and become naturalized citizens in a minimum of five years. See Hebrew Immigrant Aid Society, “Getting Your Green Card: Immigration at a Glance” (2001). http://www.hias.org/immigration/imm_brochures/green-card.pdf The term may also describe resettled refugees who have not become
naturalized citizens but have lived in the U.S. for many years as Lawful Permanent Residents or documented immigrants. For the purposes of this paper, the term “immigrant” refers to any legally documented person who enters the country and has not been naturalized as a U.S. citizen.

9. This term is used by many Lewiston residents to describe their ancestral roots.


15. See Leamon, Historic Lewiston.

16. See Bélanger, “Quebec History.”

17. See Lewiston Historical Commission, Bales to Bedspreads (Auburn: Central Maine Technical College, 2000).

18. See Judd, Churchill, and Eastman, Maine.


21. This work uses the term “mature industry” to define textile and shoe manufacturing industries, which are largely nonexistent in the community today.


23. See Bélanger, “Quebec History.”


26. See University of Maine System, “Board of Trustee Minutes” (meeting held at the University of Maine at Fort Kent, 13 September 1999). http://www.maine.edu/mins99sept.html


32. Ibid. See also Maine Department of Labor, Historical Unemployment Rates for Lewiston-Auburn MSA, Maine and the United States (Augusta, ME: Division of Labor Market Information Services, Local Area Unemployment Statistics Program, 29 April 2002).

33. See U.S. Bureau of the Census, Census 2000 Summary File 3: Sample Data of 111 Communities—Poverty Rates, generated by Philip Nadeau using American Factfinder. 2002 figures showing Lewiston with the highest poverty rate in the state are from Census Tract 201, which depicts the downtown area of the city roughly bordered east to west by Birch Street and Lowell Court and north to south by Blake Street down to the Androscoggin River.

34. See Greg Mitchell (Assistant City Administrator) interview with author, Lewiston, Maine, 3 March 2003.


37. See U.S. Committee for Refugees and Immigrants, “Refugees Admitted to the United States, By Nationality, FY 1989-2001,” Worldwide Refugee Information (2001). http://www.refugees.org/countryreports.aspx? Authorized refugee numbers will almost always differ from those actually relocated. Under the Refugee Act of 1980, the president, in consultation with Congress and the U.S. Department of State, authorizes a set number of eligible refugees, as determined by the Department of Homeland Security's Bureau of Citizenship and Immigration Services (formerly the Immigration and Naturalization Service) to relocate into the U.S. The actual number resettled each year is dependent on the ability of nonprofit volunteer resettlement agencies, also called “Volags,” to relocate authorized individuals. Additionally, security clearances, funding, and other variables may impact a refugee's ability to relocate into the U.S.


40. See Portland-Lewiston Refugee Collaborative, “DHS/ACF Office of Refugee Resettlement Category 2 Unanticipated Arrivals Grant,” 1 July 2003. Available upon request from pnadeau@ci.lewiston.me.us.


42. Estimates provided by the Hennepin County Office of Multi-Cultural Services in Minneapolis, MN (22 May 2003) placed the number of Somalis statewide at roughly 75,000—added to the Somali population estimated in the greater Atlanta area by city officials in Clarkston, GA (6,000 or more); city officials in Columbus, OH (10,000 or more); and those populations in Memphis, TN; Portland-Lewiston, ME; Portland, OR; etc., the total is approximately 100,000.

43. Given the inaccuracies that tend to be built into estimating secondary migrant populations, the number has a tendency to go higher.

44. Jill Middlebrooks (Hennepin County Office of Multi-Cultural Services) and Ellie Zoehlke (Minneapolis Department of Health and Family Support), interviews with author, from Lewiston, Maine, 22 May 2003.

45. Matt Ward (former Director of Refugee Immigrant Services, Catholic Charities of Maine), interview with author, Camden, Maine, 9 February 2002.


53. Ibid.

54. Ibid.


It is important to note that the initial decision of an agency to resettle refugees in a given community is driven by a broad range of regional conditions and assets: the size of the community, economic conditions, social service resources, transportation, healthcare, employment, educational opportunities, job training, ESOL services, etc.


Ibid.


These numbers are based on applications and not actual awards. The Maine General Assistance Program is state administered and based solely on eligibility criteria that are uniformly applicable to any Maine resident. See Nadeau, Immigrant & Refugee Activity Report.

See Victoria Scott, Untitled Report to Governor Baldacci (20 May 2003). Available upon request from pnadeau@ci.lewiston.me.us.


Catholic Charities Maine is the state’s largest refugee resettlement agency. Most services and cash assistance offered to refugees resettled in Maine by CCM are funded through monies paid by the Office of Refugee Resettlement and then passed through the state Department of Human Services for much of the first year.

Title VI of the 1964 Civil Rights Act requires that all agencies receiving federal funds provide access to services and programs through interpretive services and translated material for those individuals who cannot speak or have difficulty speaking English.

Refugees who require services beyond the first year and secondary migrants are primarily serviced by the Portland-Lewiston Collaborative.

See Portland-Lewiston Refugee Collaborative, “Unanticipated Arrivals Grant: No-cost Extension Application,” 12 December 2002. Available upon request from pnadeau@ci.lewiston.me.us.

See Nadeau, Report to Governor.


77. See Putnam and Noor, “Fact Sheet #9.”


81. The DHHS/ORR does provide funding to support secondary migrant social service needs with dollars it directs to the State of Maine to support programs administered by its department. This fund is, however, only for those documented immigrants who have a Social Security number (SSN) and only for those who have been in the country for at least thirty-six months (keeping in mind that federal law requires states to provide services for no less than sixty months). Federal support does not currently exist for immigrants who may be in country legally but possess no SSN, undocumented immigrants who file for political asylum (which may take up to a year or more to approve), and those who have been in country longer than thirty-six months.

82. This paper defines “high-need” populations as those groups or individuals who require all or some combination of city/state services that include interpretation or translation; general assistance; Temporary Assistance to Needy Families; food stamps; ESOL services; and other specialized programming to address such health issues as post-traumatic stress disorder and general nutrition in addition to housing assistance, job training, childcare, and general life-skills training.


84. See Garvey and Espenshade, “Fiscal Impacts.”


86. See Nadeau, Report to Governor.


90. Ibid.


92. Sue Charron, myself, City Administrator James Bennet, and School Superintendent Lee Levesque based these consequences on our collective experience in public policy.


94. This belief was shared in conversations including Sue Charron, myself. James Bennett (U.S. Department of Justice Official), City Councillor Rene Berneir, and Rusty Cyr from the Maine Department of Labor, 2 December 2002-10 June 2003.

95. Discussion between Sue Charron and Portland DHHS (Charron interviews, January-April 2001) and James Bennett and myself, 2 December 2002.

96. Author’s opinion based on ten years of experience in municipal government.


98. M___ Finnegan and P___ Ryan (Untitled letter addressed to Immigration and Refugee Management task force members 18 April 2003.) Available upon request from pnadeau@ci.lewiston.me.us.


101. This letter was presented to Sue Charron, Lewiston Police Chief William Welch and me—a copy of the letter is not available as it was turned in to the Lewiston Police Department as part of a separate investigation. There is, however, an available copy of Mayor Kaileigh Tara’s letter responding to the individual self-identified as “Mr. Talib Islam,” the person involved in this incident. This letter confirms the receipt of the Somali representatives’ communication stating that Mr. Talib did not represent the community. This communication is available on file from pnadeau@ci.lewiston.me.us.


103. See Nadeau, Report to Governor.
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106. Carol Ansheles (former Executive Director, Empower Lewiston), telephone conversation with author, Lewiston, Maine, 15 February 2002. Her stated reluctance to get involved stemmed from the fact that she was the only full-time person in the organization, a circumstance that did not allow her time for intervention.

107. Some people have speculated that the World Church of the Creator meeting occurred because of Mayor Raymond’s letter. See Porter, “Stain of Racism”; Mark Abley, “Somalis Caught in Storm,” Montreal Gazette, 11 January 2003. Citizens also expressed this view in assorted e-mails available by request from pnadeau@ci.lewiston.me.us.


110. Meryl Troop, e-mail message to Victoria Scott, 29 July 2003.

111. Perham-Whittier Interview, 4 February 2003. The City Administrator’s Office also received numerous telephone calls, e-mails, and letters on this issue, the two are of which are on file and available from pnadeau@ci.lewiston.me.us.


113. Ibid.


115. See Ford, Abokor, and Abdillahi, Nabud iyo Caano.


117. Ibid.
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Appendix 1A
City of Lewiston Immigrant/Refugee Local Tax Impact Analysis: September 17, 2002

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>CITY BUDGET</th>
<th>FY 03 Im/Rf Exp. Anticipated</th>
<th>SCHOOL BUDGET</th>
<th>ESL Programming</th>
<th>FY 03 Im/Rf Exp. Anticipated</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>GA Program Costs</td>
<td>$199,550</td>
<td>Community Coordinator</td>
<td>$33,777</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>GA Admin Costs</td>
<td>$46,004</td>
<td>Teacher - LHS</td>
<td>$59,565</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>GA Misc Costs</td>
<td>$200</td>
<td>Teacher - LMS</td>
<td>$37,866</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>Teacher - Elem.</td>
<td>$34,859</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>Ed Tech #3255</td>
<td>$15,143</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>Ed Tech #3305</td>
<td>$14,260</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>Ed Tech #2950</td>
<td>$14,695</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>Ed Tech TBA</td>
<td>$14,695</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>Total Wages &amp; Benefits</td>
<td>$255,159</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>plus Computer Hardware</td>
<td>$8,290</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>Plato Software - LHS</td>
<td>$29,800</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Total Im/Rf GA Costs</td>
<td>$245,754</td>
<td>Rosetta Stone Software</td>
<td>$23,000</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>LESS Est. State Reimbursement</td>
<td>($99,775)</td>
<td>LESS State of ME Reimbursement</td>
<td>($80,000)</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Total Local Im/Rf GA Costs</td>
<td>$145,979</td>
<td>Total Local Im/Rf ESL Costs</td>
<td>$236,250</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

TOTAL LOCAL SHARE CITY & ED IM/RF COSTS $382,229
Total City/School FY2003 Budget $69,316,122
LESS Non-Prop Tax Revenues ($30,068,571)
TOTAL LOCAL SHARE (Prop Taxes) $39,247,551
% of Local Share for Im/Rf Programs 0.97%
% of Total City/School Im/Rf Budget Measured Against Total City/School Budget 0.81%
Annual Tax Impact on $80K Homeowner $23.19
(mil rate 28.89 X $80K=$2,391 X 0.97%) or .44 per week
Appendix 1B

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Year</th>
<th>Lew. Labor Force</th>
<th>Lewiston</th>
<th>L-A MSA*</th>
<th>Maine</th>
<th>U.S.</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>2001</td>
<td>21,669</td>
<td>3.90%</td>
<td>4.0%</td>
<td>4.0%</td>
<td>4.8%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2000</td>
<td>22,315</td>
<td>3.00%</td>
<td>3.2%</td>
<td>3.5%</td>
<td>4.0%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1999</td>
<td>21,286</td>
<td>3.70%</td>
<td>3.8%</td>
<td>4.1%</td>
<td>4.2%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1998</td>
<td>20,491</td>
<td>4.50%</td>
<td>4.6%</td>
<td>4.4%</td>
<td>4.5%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1997</td>
<td>20,662</td>
<td>5.90%</td>
<td>5.8%</td>
<td>5.4%</td>
<td>4.9%</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

*Lewiston-Auburn Metropolitan Statistical Area

Source: Maine Department of Labor Data

Appendix 1C
Income Levels: 1990-2000

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th></th>
<th>Lewiston</th>
<th>Maine</th>
<th>U.S.</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Family Median Income</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2000</td>
<td>$40,061</td>
<td>$45,179</td>
<td>$50,046</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1990</td>
<td>$30,903</td>
<td>$32,422</td>
<td>$35,225</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Household Median Income</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2000</td>
<td>$29,191</td>
<td>$37,240</td>
<td>$41,994</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1990</td>
<td>$24,051</td>
<td>$27,854</td>
<td>$30,056</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Per Capita Income</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2000</td>
<td>$17,905</td>
<td>$19,533</td>
<td>$21,587</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1990</td>
<td>$12,277</td>
<td>$12,957</td>
<td>$14,420</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Source: U.S. Bureau of the Census Data

Appendix 1D

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Census</th>
<th>Population</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>2000</td>
<td>35,690</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1990</td>
<td>39,757</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1980</td>
<td>40,481</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1970</td>
<td>41,776</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1960</td>
<td>40,804</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Source: State Planning Office
Appendix 1E
City of Lewiston Race & Ancestry Data: 2000

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Total Population</th>
<th>35,690</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Population of one race</td>
<td>35,097</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>White alone</td>
<td>34,172</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Black or African American alone</td>
<td>383</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>American Indian and Alaska Native alone</td>
<td>100</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Asian alone</td>
<td>301</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Native Hawaiian and Other Pacific Islander alone</td>
<td>11</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Some other race alone</td>
<td>130</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Population of two or more races:</td>
<td>593</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Total specified ancestries tallied</td>
<td>35,573</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Ancestries</th>
<th>Ancestries</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Acadian/Cajun</td>
<td>European</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Afghan</td>
<td>Finnish</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Albanian</td>
<td>French (except Basque)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Alsatian</td>
<td>French Canadian</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Arab</td>
<td>German</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Egyptian</td>
<td>German Russian</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Iraqi</td>
<td>Greek</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Jordanian</td>
<td>Guyanese</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Lebanese</td>
<td>Hungarian</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Moroccan</td>
<td>Icelander</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Palestinian</td>
<td>Iranian</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Syrian</td>
<td>Irish</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Arab/Arabic</td>
<td>Israeli</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Other Arab</td>
<td>Italian</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Armenian</td>
<td>Latvian</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Assyrian/Chaldean/Syriac</td>
<td>Lithuanian</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Australian</td>
<td>Luxemburger</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Austrian</td>
<td>Macedonian</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Basque</td>
<td>Maltese</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Belgian</td>
<td>New Zealander</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Brazilian</td>
<td>Northern European</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>British</td>
<td>Norwegian</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Bulgarian</td>
<td>Pennsylvania German</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Canadian</td>
<td>Polish</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Carpatho Rusyn</td>
<td>Portuguese</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Celtic</td>
<td>Romanian</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Croatian</td>
<td>Russian</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Cypriot</td>
<td>Scandinavian</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Czech</td>
<td>Scotch-Irish</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Czechoslovakian</td>
<td>Scottish</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Danish</td>
<td>Serbian</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Dutch</td>
<td>Slavic</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Eastern European</td>
<td>Slovak</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>English</td>
<td>Slovene</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Estonian</td>
<td>Soviet Union</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
Appendix 1F
City of Lewiston Race & Ancestry Data: 2000 (continued)

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Ancestries</th>
<th>Ancestries</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Subsaharan African:</td>
<td>Turkish: 12</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Cape Verdean:</td>
<td>Ukrainian: 14</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Ethiopian:</td>
<td>United States or American: 2,017</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Ghanian:</td>
<td>Welsh: 78</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Kenyan:</td>
<td>West Indian (excluding Hispanic groups): 56</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Liberian:</td>
<td>Bahamian: 0</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Nigerian:</td>
<td>Barbadian: 0</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Senegalese:</td>
<td>Belizean: 0</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Sierra Leonean:</td>
<td>Bermudan: 7</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Somalian:</td>
<td>British West Indian: 0</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>South African:</td>
<td>Dutch West Indian: 0</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Sudanese:</td>
<td>Haitian: 10</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Ugandan:</td>
<td>Jamaican: 30</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Zairian:</td>
<td>Trinidadian and Tobagonian: 9</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Zimbabwean:</td>
<td>U.S. Virgin Islander: 0</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>African:</td>
<td>West Indian: 0</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Other Subsaharan African:</td>
<td>Other West Indian: 0</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Swedish:</td>
<td>Yugoslavian: 0</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Swiss:</td>
<td>Other groups: 2,605</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Source: U.S. Bureau of the Census Data
How does/will this work inform Maine’s immigration policy and other policy decisions that impact immigrant/refugee groups?

I would have to say that because immigrant/refugee statewide policy and related stories are no longer “above the fold,” the business of developing statewide policy now seems to be more of an internal administrative exercise. I believe that many well-intentioned state agencies are doing what they can to serve a growing immigrant population without the benefit of a well-defined state vision. This vision can only come from a fully coordinated state-level policy discussion on how Maine’s immigrant/refugee populations relate to such issues as our declining population growth rate, aging population, job-growth needs, affordable housing, education strategies, agency service delivery and rulemaking, and statutory changes that reflect our state’s changing demographics.

Without a clear state-wide vision, we are most likely left with a fragmented, inefficient, and potentially ineffective system of state and localized programming efforts that will leave municipalities, schools, and state agencies to essentially figure things out on their own. Maine must see the arrival and presence of immigrants in our state as something that represents the new fabric of Maine and not just its two biggest cities. Recently, Lewiston’s efforts, along with those of several other Maine cities, the Maine Welfare Directors Association, and the Maine Municipal Association (MMA) led to the development of a special handbook for all Maine General Assistance administrators who may soon be working with immigrant families for the first time. This is but a small example of how the state must now approach policy in ways that are truly useful for all Maine municipalities as the prospects of immigrant families relocating to any Maine town becomes a greater probability.

From a federal perspective, things become much more complicated. Lewiston has argued that federal refugee resettlement funding policy is antiquated and insufficiently responsive. The twenty-five-year-old federal refugee system never really anticipated the fiscal needs of smaller cities and towns that experience high levels of refugee resettlement or secondary migrant relocation. In the face of inadequate federal funding, Lewiston and Catholic Charities Maine are now working on what may be a first-of-its-kind collaborative to provide services to
immigrant families. The challenge will be in persuading Washington that this kind of approach is worthy of long-term support.

Additionally, the City of Lewiston and the Maine Municipal Association recently submitted the issue of refugee resettlement/secondary migrant funding to the congressional delegation as part of a federal issues paper. MMA’s decision to work with Lewiston on this issue is encouraging and may be the first time an organization representing Maine government officials has highlighted refugee/immigrant funding policy as a state priority.

SMR It’s clear from the piece what Lewiston did to address issues resulting from the rapid influx of secondary migrants; what part did the Somali community play in this process?

Very early on, it was evident that there were members of the Somali community who demonstrated a genuine willingness to assist the city in any way possible. Several individuals had, at one time or another, served as city hall’s regular contacts for a variety of needs: Requests for press interviews; interpretation; housing; transportation; information distribution; and working with city, state, and nonprofit agencies. Without these individuals, working with the Somali community as a whole would have been very problematic. Many of these same individuals also worked on a variety of community events that introduced Somali food, music, and culture to the community.

What many Somalis also desired was to access funding for a variety of service delivery needs (translation, ESOL training, job training, etc.) that residents were receiving. The problem was, and continues to be, that there are few Somali adults in Lewiston who have the combination of English-speaking ability, administrative expertise, education, organizational training, and formal training in specific skill sets to provide the direct services themselves. Our three-year-old Americorps/Vista project has directed its resources to help local Somali professionals develop and operate effective MAAs and deliver many of these services. We are confident that it can be done; the question is how long this process will take, and I think the jury is still out on how successful the Americorps project will be.

SMR Questions of appropriateness aside, what effect(s) did the mayor’s letter have on the Somali community and what steps has the city taken to address their concerns and also combat accusations of discrimination?

City and community-wide, there are multiple programs to insure that anyone who experiences discrimination has an outlet to report it. Our
police department is recognized by the State Attorney General’s (AG) Office as being very aggressive in its reporting of hate-crime-related activity. If there is even a hint of racism involved in an incident between individuals, and the information is brought forward to our police department, reports are issued to the state AG’s office immediately. The municipality has also worked with agencies like the Maine Community Policing Institute, the National Coalition Building Institute, and the Department of Justice to raise awareness about racism and discrimination.

On the school side, Superintendent Leon Levesque has supported a variety of public school multicultural program efforts such as Lewiston High School’s Civil Rights Team (a collaborative effort with the State Attorney General’s Office). This team, and the hiring of Mohammed Abdi as the school system’s liaison for immigrant families (which occurred within the first year of the relocations), has been very effective in raising awareness and providing information to immigrant parents and students. Some of the best community work to combat racism and intolerance is being accomplished throughout our public school system.

SMR How did Lewiston’s relations with its immigrant/refugee population alter after the Mayor’s letter? Which changes seem permanent and which were transitory?

What has not changed is the need for city hall to have a permanent “go-to” group within the Somali community that provides all parties with easy and dependable access. What is transitory, however, is the make-up of the individuals who have served as our Somali community contacts. Many have chosen not to continue which, in my opinion, has much to do with the intense public and media attention to which they were personally exposed during that period. Some have taken on work that prevents them from participating, while others have simply moved away. Today, only a few who serve as Somali community contacts were part of the original group that worked with the city in the first two years following the initial relocations. The work they do, however, is as important today as it was early on.

Other permanent changes include enhancements to resident programming and services access. The enhancements, undertaken shortly after the first relocations, alerted us to improve access for limited- and non-English-speaking persons and also re-examine our access for the physically challenged. One form of “access” was not necessarily related to the other, but the entire experience of having to re-examine how to
achieve universal programming and services access made the city work harder to identify needed improvements in all areas of our operation. The city’s commitment to universal public access has not only addressed “technical” compliance but has also provided our employees, and our citizens, with resources and facilities that are more efficient and responsive.

SMR You state that telephone contacts with national Somali population centers indicated that the “social service need would be much higher for the new arrivals than for any other population in Lewiston at that time.” Was that, in fact, the case? If so, why were the needs of Somali immigrants higher than those of other immigrant groups? If it was not the case, why did Lewiston’s experience differ from these other population centers?

I believe that the information we collected early on about our Somali residents is consistent with the information gathered over the last four years and the literature I researched for this paper. I have seen former refugees exposed to experiences that have the potential of negatively impacting learning, health, families, and employment. Experiences many Somalis had in other states and refugee camps as they relate to deaths and injuries from civil war, torture, famine, inadequate healthcare and nutrition, family separation, poor living conditions, and inadequate educational opportunities, in my opinion, appear to contribute to Somali family calls for service and programming. Couple these variables with the complexities of relocating to a part of the world where culture, social customs, and workplaces are vastly different, one begins to understand the challenges that many Somali residents face every day.

Most concerning is that information gathered by the city has not identified many Somali adults who possess the kind of English-speaking, educational, and/or job skills that are easily translatable into employment opportunities in this market. Though our local economy is experiencing historically low unemployment levels, anecdotal evidence suggests that Somali adult unemployment is above 50%. The disparity between the area’s overall low unemployment and higher Somali adult unemployment, in my opinion, may be attributable to a job market that has only a handful of entry-level opportunities, which are often sought out by individuals with limited English-speaking ability and/or low education levels in larger metropolitan areas like Boston, New York, or Atlanta.

The employment issue also underscores another major problem—the inability to gather and analyze verifiable local data that will help us develop and measure workable programming (e.g., opportunities for
Somali adult workers). We are currently seeking ways to better identify what we are doing locally through more research, and we have reached out to the state and to some of the major academic institutions in the country to assist us. I believe that our ability to properly identify need and how to meet the need will provide greater assurances that services and programming developed to improve the lives of our new residents generate the intended effect.

SMR What would city officials do differently should they ever find the city in a similar circumstance?

In my opinion, it would be to figure out how to get more community involvement early on. Engaging an entire community with a quickly developing situation that involves what Dr. Mark Grey of the University of Northern Iowa describes as “sudden ethnic diversification,” is no easy task. In my view, although city hall and many nonprofits were very engaged with our new residents, we could not generate a high level of community-wide willingness to interact with the newly arriving Somali families before Mayor Raymond’s letter. Prior to the letter, the general public’s attitude seemed much more resigned to merely inquiring or commenting on what was reported by the media or by word-of-mouth—some of which was incomplete or incorrect. This “detachment” appeared to evaporate when Mayor Raymond issued his public letter to the Somali community. The once dormant community-at-large attitude about actively engaging with our new residents experienced a very noticeable about-face.

I cannot speculate on what drove the initial disinterest, but my gut reaction is that working harder and being more insistent on engaging the academic, civic, and religious groups earlier on could have contributed to a more effective way of developing residential stakeholders and better informing citizens. The media is always an important tool to communicate general information to the public but may be less effective when there is a need to communicate detailed and sometimes complex information quickly at the grass-roots level—particularly to those inclined to be less interested in local news. Smaller groups of people working on the streets, knocking on people’s doors, and speaking through the pulpits and local newsletters could have been very effective in getting the message out earlier.