REPORT TO THE CONGRESS

January 31, 1986

Refugee Resettlement Program

U.S. DEPARTMENT OF
HEALTH AND HUMAN SERVICES

Social Security Administration
Office of Refugee Resettlement

Note: Portions of this report were revised in April 1986, after the original submittal to the Congress, as a result of the receipt by the Office of Refugee Resettlement of revised State data on cash assistance.

REPORT TO THE CONGRESS

January 31, 1986

Refugee Resettlement Program

U.S. DEPARTMENT OF
HEALTH AND HUMAN SERVICES

Social Security Administration
Office of Refugee Resettlement

EXECUTIVE SUMMARY

Section 413(a) of the Immigration and Nationality Act, as amended by the Refugee Act of 1980, requires the Secretary of Health and Human Services in consultation with the U.S. Coordinator for Refugee Affairs to submit a report to Congress on the Refugee Resettlement Program no later than January 31 following the end of each fiscal year. This report, which covers refugee program developments from October 1, 1984, through September 30, 1985, is the nineteenth in a series of reports to Congress on refugee resettlement in the U.S. since 1975 -- and the fifth to cover an entire year of activities carried out under the comprehensive authority of the Refugee Act of 1980. It consists of a text in four parts and five accompanying appendices and was prepared by the Office of Refugee Resettlement (ORR).

PART I

Part I lists the specific reporting requirements of Section 413(a) and identifies where each requirement is discussed in the text and appendices.

PART II

Part II describes the domestic refugee resettlement programs. Highlights from each section are listed below.

Admissions

- President Reagan set a refugee admissions ceiling of 70,000 for FY 1985. Approximately 68,000 refugees actually entered the United States during that period.

- As in FY 1984, the large majority of refugees admitted in FY 1985 came from Vietnam, Cambodia, and Laos -- about 50,000. Of the total refugee arrivals in FY 1985, 74 percent were from East Asia, 14 percent were from Eastern Europe and the Soviet Union, 9 percent were from the Near East and South Asia, 3 percent were from Africa, and less than one percent were from Latin America and the Caribbean.

Initial Reception and Placement Activities

- In FY 1985, 14 non-profit organizations were responsible for the reception and initial placement of refugees through cooperative agreements with the Department of State.

- During FY 1985, the Bureau for Refugee Programs in the Department of State conducted in-depth reviews of initial reception and placement activities in 12 sites around the United States.

Domestic Resettlement Program

- Refugee Appropriations: ORR obligated 475.1 million in FY 1985 for the costs of assisting refugees and Cuban and Haitian entrants as provided for under the Refugee Act of 1980. Of this, States received $329.2 million for the costs of providing cash and medical assistance to eligible refugees, aid to unaccompanied refugee children, social services, and State and local administrative costs.

- State-Administered Program: In order to receive assistance under the refugee program, a State is required by the Refugee Act and by regulation to submit a plan which describes the nature and scope of the State's program and gives assurances that the program will be administered in conformity with the Act.

  -- Cash and Medical Assistance: Based on information provided by the States in Quarterly Performance Reports to ORR, approximately 55.5 percent of eligible refugees who had been in the U.S. three years or less were receiving some form of cash assistance at the end of FY 1985. This compares with an approximate cash assistance utilization rate of 53.9 percent for September 1984 -- one year earlier. The rate continued to vary widely by State.

  -- Social Services: In FY 1985, ORR provided approximately $61.6 million for a broad range of social services to refugees and entrants such as English language training and employment-related training.

  -- Targeted Assistance: ORR received a final appropriation of $50.0 million for targeted assistance activities for refugees and entrants. Targeted assistance funds were directed to areas where, because of factors such as unusually large refugee and entrant populations, high refugee and entrant concentrations, and high use of public assistance, there existed a specific need for supplementation of other available service resources for the refugee and entrant population.

  -- Unaccompanied Refugee Children: Since 1979, when the unaccompanied minors program began, a total of 6,895 children have entered the program. The number remaining in the program as of September 30, 1985, was 3,828 -- an increase of 4 percent from the 3,684 a year earlier. States reporting the largest numbers of unaccompanied children served were New York (899), California (415), Illinois (325), and Minnesota (310).

-- Program Monitoring: ORR efforts to monitor the State-administered refugee resettlement program focused on five key areas in FY 1985: (1) Program management guidance; (2) technical assistance; (3) direct field monitoring and casefile review; (4) program analysis; and (5) followup. Where deficiencies in the State system suggested potential overpayment of refugee funds, formal audits were conducted by the HHS Office of the Inspector General.

- Matching Grant Program: Grants totaling $4 million were awarded under the matching grant program in FY 1985 whereby Federal funds of up to $1,000 per refugee were provided on a matching basis for national voluntary resettlement agencies to provide assistance and services to eligible refugees. In FY 1985, five voluntary agencies were selected by the Director of ORR for funding.

- Refugee Health: The Public Health Service continued to station public health advisors in Southeast Asia to monitor the health screening of U.S.-destined refugees; to maintain quarantine officers to inspect refugees at the U.S. ports-of-entry; to notify State and local health agencies of new arrivals, especially those requiring followup health care; and to administer funds to State and local health departments for the conduct of refugee health assessments. Obligations for health screening and followup medical services for refugees amounted to $8.4 million in FY 1985.

- Refugee Education: $21.6 million was distributed to school districts in FY 1985 to meet the special educational needs of children at the elementary and secondary levels.

- National Discretionary Projects: ORR obligated about $9.9 million in FY 1985 to support projects to improve refugee resettlement operations at the national, regional, State, and community levels. Among those projects were demonstration projects to increase the number of wage earners in refugee and entrant households, planned secondary resettlement grants, and a refugee mental health effort, to name a few. Sixteen States were awarded a total of $3.2 million to provide services to underserved populations and to fill important service gaps in their respective State programs through a Comprehensive Discretionary Social Services program initiated by ORR in FY 1985.

- Program Evaluation: During FY 1985, contracts were awarded for: A Study of the Economic and Social Adjustment of non-Southeast Asian Refugees in the United States; an Assessment of the MAA Incentive Grant Program; and an Evaluation of ORR's Discretionary Grant Support for Enhanced Skills Training and Multiple Wage Earners. The following study was contracted in FY 1984 and remains in progress: An Evaluation of the Refugee

Targeted Assistance Grants Program. The following evaluation activities were completed in FY 1985: A study entitled "Unrealized Potential: Case Management in the U.S. Refugee Program"; and a Study of Refugee Utilization of Public Medical Assistance.

- Data and Data System Development: Development and maintenance of ORR's computerized data system on refugees continued during FY 1985. Records were on file by the end of FY 1985 for approximately 890,000 out of more than one million refugees who have entered the U.S. since 1975.

Key Federal Activities

- Congressional Consultations on Refugee Admissions: Consultations with the Congress on refugee admissions took place in September 1985 as required by the Refugee Act of 1980. President Reagan set a world-wide refugee admissions ceiling for the U.S. at 67,000 for FY 1986.

- Reauthorization of the Refugee Act of 1980, as amended: During FY 1985, the House passed legislation to reauthorize the Refugee Act of 1980, as amended. The Senate, however, did not complete action on the legislation by the close of FY 1985. Funds for the refugee program were appropriated under the Continuing Resolution for FY 1986.

PART III

Part III details the characteristics of refugees resettled in the U.S. since 1975, and includes a profile of the refugees, their geographic location and patterns of movement, the current employment status of Southeast Asian refugees, and the number of refugees who adjusted their immigration status during FY 1985.

Population Profile

- Southeast Asians remain the most numerous of the recent refugee arrivals although the number arriving in the United States declined slightly in FY 1985 compared with FY 1984. Approximately 761,000 were in the U.S. at the end of FY 1985, and, of these, about 7 percent had been in the U.S. less than one year, and only 19 percent had been in the country for three years or less.

- Vietnamese are still the majority group among the refugees from Southeast Asia, although the proportional ethnic composition of the entering population has become more diverse over time. By the end of FY 1985, Vietnamese made up 64 percent of the total, 19 percent were from Laos, and about 17 percent were from Cambodia.

- Southeast Asian refugees live in every State and several territories of the United States. Migration to California continued to affect refugee population distribution during FY 1985, but at the same time several States in other areas of the U.S. experienced significant growth due to both secondary migration and initial placements of refugees.

- About 79.7 percent of Southeast Asian refugees are residing in fourteen States. Of these fourteen States, the top thirteen were also the top thirteen States in terms of Southeast Asian populations one year previously, at the close of FY 1984. California, Texas, and Washington have held the top three positions since 1980.

Economic Adjustment

- The Fall 1985 annual survey of refugees contracted by ORR, which covered Southeast Asian refugees who had been in the U.S. five years or less, indicated that 44 percent of the sampled refugees aged 16 and over were in the labor force, as compared with 65 percent for the U.S. population as a whole. Of those, about 83 percent were actually able to find jobs, as compared with 93 percent for the U.S. population. Refugee labor force participation was thus lower than for the general U.S. population, and the unemployment rate was significantly higher.

- The kinds of jobs that refugees find in the United States generally are of lower status than those they held in their country of origin. For example, 39 percent of the employed adults sampled had held white collar jobs in their country of origin, but only 16 percent hold similar jobs in the U.S.

- The ability of Southeast Asian refugees to seek and find employment in the U.S. is the result of many factors: Condition of the labor market, demands of family life, health problems, and the decision to gain training and education prior to entering the job market.

- As in previous surveys, English proficiency was found to have clear effects on labor force participation, on unemployment rates, and on earnings. Refugees who spoke no English had a labor force participation rate of only 15 percent and an unemployment rate of 41 percent. For refugees who spoke English well, their corresponding labor force participation rate was 53 percent, and their unemployment rate was 13 percent.

- An examination of the differences between refugee households receiving cash assistance and those not receiving cash assistance highlights the difficulties facing refugees in becoming economically self-sufficient: First, cash assistance recipient households are notably larger than non-recipient households. Second, recipient households have, on average, fewer wage earners. These results illustrate the importance of multiple wage earners within a refugee household in generating sufficient income to be economically self-supporting.

- Based on data from the Internal Revenue Service, median incomes of refugees remained below those of other residents in the U.S. However, an upward trend provides a basis for optimism about future incomes.

Refugee Adjustment of Status

- In FY 1985, approximately 72,000 refugees adjusted their immigration status to that of permanent resident alien.

PART IV

Part IV discusses the plans of the Director of the Office of Refugee Resettlement to improve the refugee program. The Director highlights activities undertaken by ORR in FY 1985 and activities planned for FY 1986 to improve refugees' prospects for self-sufficiency and social adjustment, to implement refugee mental health initiatives, to promote refugee self-help efforts, and to improve Federal program administration.

REPORT TO THE CONGRESS

January 31, 1986

REFUGEE RESETTLEMENT PROGRAM

Department of Health and Human Services
Social Security Administration
Office of Refugee Resettlement

TABLE OF CONTENTS

Page

APPENDIX A: Tables

Page

I. INTRODUCTION

Section 413(a) of the Immigration and Nationality Act as amended by the Refugee Act of 1980 requires the Secretary of Health and Human Services, in consultation with the U.S. Coordinator for Refugee Affairs, to submit a report to Congress on the Refugee Resettlement Program not later than January 31 following the end of each fiscal year. The Refugee Act requires that the report contain:

- an updated profile of the employment and labor force statistics for refugees who have entered the United States under the Immigration and Nationality Act since May 1975 (Part III, pages 98-116 of the report);
- a description of the extent to which refugees received the forms of assistance or services under title IV Chapter 2 (entitled "Refugee Assistance") of the Immigration and Nationality Act as amended by the Refugee Act of 1980, since May 1975 (Part II, pages 18-55);
- a description of the geographic location of refugees (Part II, pages 7-14 and Part III, pages 91-97);
- a summary of the results of the monitoring and evaluation of the programs administered by the Department of Health and Human Services (Part II, pages 42-48 and 72-84) and by the Department of State (which awards grants to national resettlement agencies for initial resettlement of refugees in the United States) during the fiscal year for which the report is submitted (Part II, pages 15-17);

- a description of the activities, expenditures, and policies of the Office of Refugee Resettlement (ORR) and of the activities of States, voluntary resettlement agencies, and sponsors (Part II, pages 18-86, and Appendices C, D, E);
- the plans of the Director of ORR for improvement of refugee resettlement (Part IV, pages 119-127);
- evaluations of the extent to which the services provided under title IV Chapter 2 are assisting refugees in achieving economic self-sufficiency, obtaining skills in English, and achieving employment commensurate with their skills and abilities (Part II, pages 26-38, and Part III, pages 98-116);
- any fraud, abuse, or mismanagement which has been reported in the provision of services or assistance (Part II, page 48);
- a description of any assistance provided by the Director of ORR pursuant to Section 412(e)(5) (Part II, page 27);*
- a summary of the location and status of unaccompanied refugee children admitted to the U.S. (Part II, pages 39-41); and

---

* Section 412(e)(5) of the Immigration and Nationality Act authorizes the ORR Director to "allow for the provision of medical assistance... to any refugee, during the one-year period after entry, who does not qualify for assistance under a State plan approved under title XIX of the Social Security Act on account of any resources or income requirement of such plan, but only if the Director determines that --

"(A) this will (i) encourage economic self-sufficiency, or (ii) avoid a significant burden on State and local governments; and

"(B) the refugee meets such alternative financial resources and income requirements as the Director shall establish."

- a summary of the information compiled and evaluation made under Section 412(a)(8) whereby the Attorney General provides the Director of ORR information supplied by refugees when they apply for adjustment of status (Part III, pages 117-118).

In response to the reporting requirements listed above, refugee program developments from October 1, 1984, until September 30, 1985, are described in Parts II and III. Part IV looks beyond FY 1985 in discussing the plans of the Director of the Office of Refugee Resettlement to improve refugee resettlement and program initiatives which continue into FY 1986. This report is the sixth prepared in accordance with the Refugee Act of 1980 -- and the nineteenth in a series of reports to Congress on Refugee Resettlement in the United States since 1975.

II. REFUGEE RESETTLEMENT PROGRAM

ADMISSIONS

The Refugee Act of 1980 defines the term "refugee" and establishes the framework for selecting refugees for admission to the United States.* In accordance with the Act, the President determines the number of refugees to be admitted to the U.S. during each fiscal year after consultations are held between Executive Branch officials and the Congress prior to the new fiscal year. The Act also gives the President authority to respond to unforeseen emergency refugee situations.

---

* Section 101(a)(42) of the Immigration and Nationality Act as amended by the Refugee Act of 1980 defines the term "refugee" to mean:

> "(A) any person who is outside any country of such person's nationality or, in the case of a person having no nationality, is outside any country in which such person last habitually resided, and who is unable or unwilling to return to, and unable or unwilling to avail himself or herself of the protection of that country because of persecution or a well-founded fear of persecution on account of race, religion, nationality, membership in a particular social group, or political opinion, or
>
> "(B) in such special circumstances as the President, after appropriate consultation (as defined in section 207(e) of this Act) may specify, any person who is within the country of such person's nationality or, in the case of a person having no nationality, within the country in which such person is habitually residing, and who is persecuted or who has a well-founded fear of persecution on account of race, religion, nationality, membership in a particular social group, or political opinion. The term 'refugee' does not include any person who ordered, incited, assisted, or othewise participated in the persecution of any person on account of race, religion, nationality, membership in a particular social group, or political opinion."

As part of the consultation process for FY 1985, President Reagan established a ceiling of 70,000 refugees. Approximately 68,000 actually entered the United States during that period.

Applicants for refugee admission into the United States must meet all of the following criteria:

-- The applicant must meet the definition of a refugee in the Refugee Act of 1980.

-- The applicant must be among the types of refugees determined during the consultation process to be of special humanitarian concern to the United States.

-- The applicant must be admissible under United States law.

-- The applicant must not be firmly resettled in any foreign country. (In some situations, the availability of resettlement elsewhere may also preclude the processing of applicants.)

Although a refugee may meet the above criteria, the existence of the U.S. refugee admissions program does not create an entitlement to enter the United States. The annual admissions program is a legal mechanism for admitting an applicant who is among those persons for whom the United States has a special concern, is eligible under one of those priorities applicable to his/her situation, and meets the definition of a refugee under the Act, as determined by an officer of the Immigration and

Naturalization Service. The need for resettlement, not the desire of a refugee to enter the United States, is a governing principle in the management of the United States refugee admissions program.

This section contains information on refugees who entered the United States and on persons granted asylum in the United States during FY 1985.* Particular attention is given to States of initial resettlement and to trends in refugee admissions. All tables referenced by number are located in Appendix A.

---

* The procedure for granting asylum to aliens is authorized in section 208(a) of the Immigration and Nationality Act: "The Attorney General shall establish a procedure for an alien physically present in the United States or at a land border or port of entry, irrespective of such alien's status, to apply for asylum, and the alien may be granted asylum in the discretion of the Attorney General if the Attorney General determines that such alien is a refugee within the meaning of section 101(a)(42)(A)".

Arrivals and Countries of Origin

In FY 1985, approximately 68,000 refugees entered the United States, as compared with 71,000 in FY 1984. This represents a decline of four percent. Of the total refugee arrivals in FY 1985, 74 percent were from East Asia, 14 percent were from Eastern Europe and the Soviet Union, 9 percent were from the Near East/South Asia, 3 percent were from Africa, and less than one percent were from Latin America and the Caribbean. The proportion from East Asia was stable in FY 1985, compared with the previous year, while the proportions from other areas changed only slightly. In terms of absolute numbers, admissions from most areas of the world were roughly comparable in 1985 to their 1984 levels.

During FY 1985, 6,514 persons were granted asylum in the United States. This represents a drop of 44 percent as compared with 11,627 successful asylum applicants in FY 1984, which had been an unusually high year.

- Southeast Asian Refugees

In FY 1985, 49,853 Southeast Asian refugees arrived in the United States, slightly below the admissions ceiling of 50,000 previously established. This represents a 4 percent drop from the 52,000 refugees admitted from Southeast Asia during FY 1984. Since the spring of 1975, the United States has admitted 760,854 refugees from Southeast Asia as of September 30, 1985 (Appendix A, Table 1). Monthly arrivals during FY 1985 averaged approximately 4,200, with a rather stable flow being maintained during the year (Table 2).

Compared with FY 1984, most States received a similar number of Southeast Asian refugees in FY 1985. The proportional share of refugees resettled in each State continued to be similar to that established in earlier years, since family reunifications account for the majority of current placements. California continued to lead the list of States receiving the most refugees, with more than 16,000 arrivals, 32.3 percent of the total.

In FY 1985, Florida replaced Georgia as 10th on the list of the 10 States receiving the most new Southeast Asian arrivals during the fiscal year. The top nine States remained the same as in FY 1981 through FY 1984, with small shifts in rank. The proportion of refugees placed in the top 10 States was 69.8 percent in FY 1985 as compared with 69.6 percent in FY 1984. The top 10 States in terms of Southeast Asian refugee arrivals during FY 1985 are listed below:

State	Number of New Southeast Asian Refugees	Percent
California	16,107	32.3%
Texas	4,219	8.5
Massachusetts	2,520	5.0
Washington	2,443	4.9
New York	2,185	4.4
Illinois	1,776	3.6
Pennsylvania	1,744	3.5
Minnesota	1,480	3.0
Virginia	1,211	2.4
Florida	1,104	2.2
TOTAL	34,789	69.8
Other States	15,064	30.2
TOTAL	49,853	100.0%

As in past years, Texas continued to be the State with the second highest number of new refugee arrivals from Southeast Asia, with more than 4,000 new refugees, approximately 9 percent of the total. The State of Massachusetts continued to grow in importance as a resettlement site, gaining third place with more than 2,500 arrivals. The States of Washington and New York rounded out the list of the top five States, with more than 2,000 refugee placements each.

Georgia dropped from 10th place in FY 1984 to 11th place in FY 1985, with just over 1,000 Southeast Asian refugee arrivals. Arizona, which continued to accept significant numbers of refugees in FY 1985 through its participation in the Favorable Alternate Sites Project, ranked 12th in FY 1985.

In FY 1985 the proportion of refugee arrivals from Vietnam was just over half of the arriving Southeast Asians, at 51 percent, compared with 48 percent in FY 1984. The proportion from Cambodia was 39 percent in FY 1985 compared with 38 percent in FY 1984, while the share of refugees from Laos decreased to 10 percent from 14 percent in FY 1984. Vietnamese refugees were the majority group among the new Southeast Asian arrivals in most States during FY 1985 as in earlier years. However, 19 States received more Cambodians than Vietnamese, and the majority of the refugees placed in Wisconsin were from Laos. Among the smaller States, Montana, West Virginia, and Wyoming also received a majority of refugees from Laos. While California occupied first place as a resettlement site for each of the three nationality groups, resettlement patterns by ethnicity diverged below that level. For example, Massachusetts was the second most common State for Cambodian resettlement, with Texas ranking third. Texas was second in rank for Vietnamese and Lao, but New York and Minnesota respectively were third for these groups.

As in previous years, the arriving Southeast Asian refugee population can be described demographically as young. In FY 1985 the median age of the arriving Vietnamese refugees was 20.8 years at the time of arrival, while the refugees from Cambodia and Laos were only 17.7 and 18.9 years of age, respectively. One-third of the Vietnamese and 27 percent of the Lao and Cambodians were children of school age. Additionally, 24 percent of the Cambodians and 20 percent of the Lao were preschool-age children, while 8 percent of the Vietnamese were in this age group. About 2 percent of the Southeast Asians were age 65 or older. Numbers of males and females were about equal in the entering Cambodian and Lao populations, but among the Vietnamese, 57 percent of the arriving refugees were males. Vietnamese males outnumbered females by nearly two to one in the age group between 12 and 21.

- Eastern European and Soviet Refugees

The number of refugees arriving from the Soviet Union declined for the fifth straight year, as the Soviet government continued to restrict emigration. Fewer than 700 Soviet refugees arrived in the U.S. in FY 1985, compared with just over 700 in FY 1984 and more than 20,000 yearly in 1979 and 1980. Since 1975, more than 100,000 Soviet refugees have been resettled in the United States.

As in past years, New York was the most common destination for Soviet refugees, with 39 percent of the total placements, down from 47 percent in FY 1984. California was second with 23 percent, followed by Massachusetts (12 percent) and Illinois (5 percent). This geographic distribution continues the pattern of previous years. A complete listing by State of the resettlement sites of Soviet and Eastern European refugees appears in Table 4.

Refugees from the Soviet Union are the oldest of the arriving nationality groups, with a median age at the time of arrival of 40.5 among the FY 1985 arrivals. Women outnumbered men with 55 percent of the total, and their median age was significantly higher, at 43.5 compared with 37.3 for the men. Only about 14 percent of the Soviets were children of school age, while 18 percent were age 65 or older.

During FY 1985, the number of refugees from Eastern Europe was approximately 9,000, a small decline from the 10,000 resettled in FY 1984. The majority arrived from Romania, with about 4,500, and Poland, with 2,800, with smaller numbers from Czechoslovakia (950), Hungary (500), and other countries. The number of refugees from Eastern Europe resettled since 1975 now totals about 65,000.

California received the most Eastern European refugees in FY 1985, with New York in second place. Together these States resettled about 42 percent of the refugees from Czechoslovakia, Hungary, Poland, and Romania who arrived in FY 1985. Other States that received significant numbers in FY 1985 were Illinois (particularly Poles and Romanians), Michigan (Poles and Romanians), Texas (Poles and Romanians), Idaho (refugees from Czechoslovakia), Florida (Romanians), and New Jersey (Poles). Table 4 contains a complete listing by State of the numbers resettled of these four nationality groups.

In age-sex structure, the refugees arriving in FY 1985 from these four Eastern European countries are rather similar to each other, but different from the Soviets. Their median ages range from 26 to 29, with only small differences in age distribution between men and women. On average, the men are one or two years older. These findings are like those of earlier years. Between 13 and 24 percent are children of school

age at the time of entry. Among Eastern European refugees, the age category 25 to 34 predominates, with anywhere from 25 to 45 percent of the arrivals from each country. Almost none are over age 65, except for Romanians, with 1.7 percent over age 65. More than 60 percent of the refugees from Czechoslovakia, Hungary, and Poland are males, while among Romanians the males hold a 53 percent majority.

- Latin American Refugees

More than 150 Cuban refugees arrived in the United States in FY 1985, an increase over the previous year but a small number compared to most earlier years. Since 1959, more than 800,000 Cuban refugees have been admitted to the U.S. (None of these figures includes the 125,000 Cuban "entrants" who arrived during the 1980 boatlift.) As in past years, the majority of the Cuban refugees arriving in FY 1985 settled in Florida. New Jersey, California, Illinois, and New York absorbed most of the rest.

- Ethiopian Refugees

Almost all of the refugees arriving from Africa are Ethiopians. A few persons have been resettled from several other African countries. In FY 1985 about 1,700 Ethiopians arrived with refugee status, which represents a decline of nearly one-third from FY 1984. They were more widely dispersed about the U.S. than are most refugee groups. The largest number settled in California, which received 18 percent. Significant numbers also settled in Texas (11 percent), New York (8 percent), Arizona, and the Washington, D.C., area. Table 5 contains a complete listing of the States of arrival of this group.

On average, the Ethiopian refugees are younger than those from Eastern Europe but older than those from Southeast Asia. The median age of those arriving in FY 1985 was 23.8 years; men averaged 24.9 years while the average age of the women was 21.5 years. Sixty-six percent of the arriving Ethiopians were men. Again, this age/sex profile is like that of Ethiopians who arrived in earlier years.

- Near Eastern Refugees

Iran accounted for the largest number of refugees arriving from the Near East during FY 1985 as in FY 1984, with about 3,400 arrivals. Approximately 2,200 refugees arrived from Afghanistan and about 240 from Iraq. The total number of refugees arriving from the Near East increased by about 17 percent in FY 1985 compared with the previous year. More refugees arrived from Iran than in any previous year, and the numbers from Afghanistan and Iraq increased, compared to 1984 levels.

California was the most common destination for refugees arriving from the Near East: 40 percent of the Afghans and 53 percent of the Iranians settled there. The most common destinations for refugees from Iraq were Michigan, where 41 percent of the Iraqis were placed, and California, which received 31 percent of the Iraqis. New York was the second most frequent State of placement for refugees from Afghanistan and Iran. Afghans also settled in Virginia and Iranians in Texas in significant numbers. Table 5 contains a complete tabulation by State of the initial resettlement locations of these three groups.

The refugees arriving from the Near East during FY 1985 were relatively young, although older on average than the Southeast Asians. The median age of both Afghans and Iraqis was between 22 and 23, and the ages of the men and women in these groups did not differ greatly. The Iranian refugees were slightly older on average, with a median age of 25.7, and women averaging two years older than men. Approximately 25

percent of the Afghans and the Iraqis were children of school age, while the comparable figure was 16 percent for the Iranians. About four percent of the Afghan refugees and two percent of the Iranians were over age 65. Men outnumbered women in all groups, with the sex ratio ranging from 56 percent males in the Afghan population to 60 percent among the Iranians.

- Other Refugees and Asylees

During FY 1985, the number of applications for refugee status granted worldwide by the Immigration and Naturalization Service (INS) declined to 59,436 from the FY 1984 total of 77,932. The FY 1985 figure includes approvals granted to 1,865 Cubans, most of whom did not arrive due to the suspension by Cuba of the migration agreement under which they would have traveled. Otherwise, the numbers approved were closely related to the numbers actually arriving, allowing for an average time lag of several months between approval of the application and arrival in the U.S. Table 7 contains a tabulation of applications for refugee status granted by INS, by country of chargeability, under the Refugee Act of 1980 for each year from 1980 through 1985.

INS approved claims for political asylum status from 4,585 cases, covering 6,514 persons, in FY 1985. This represents a drop of 45 percent from the number of cases approved in FY 1984, but a high number compared to earlier years. A complete listing of the countries from which persons came who were granted asylum during each year from FY 1980 through FY 1985 is shown in Table 8. During this six-year period, more than half of all favorable asylum rulings went to Iranians. Sixty-one percent of all favorable asylum rulings in FY 1985 were granted to Iranians. More than 450 Poles and more than 400 Nicaraguans were also given political asylum in FY 1985. Other countries from which more than 50 asylees came, in order, were Ethiopia, Romania, El Salvador, Cuba, Afghanistan, and Libya.

RECEPTION AND PLACEMENT ACTIVITIES

In FY 1985, the initial reception and placement of refugees in the United States was carried out by 14 non-profit organizations through cooperative agreements with the Bureau for Refugee Programs of the Department of State. For each refugee resettled, voluntary agencies received $560 which was to be used, along with other cash and in-kind contributions from private sources, for core services during the refugee's first 90 days in the United States. Program participation was based on the submission of an acceptable proposal.

The Cooperative Agreements

The cooperative agreements outline the core services which the agencies are responsible for providing to the refugees, either by means of agency staff or through other individuals or organizations who work with the agencies. The core services include:

Pre-arrival -- identifying individuals outside of the agency who may assist in refugee sponsorship, orienting such individuals, and developing travel and logistical arrangements;

Reception -- assisting in obtaining initial housing, furnishings, food, and clothing for a minimum of thirty days; and

Counseling and referral -- orienting the refugee to the community, specifically in the areas of health, employment, and training with the primary goal of refugee self-sufficiency at the earliest possible date.

In addition, these agencies were expected to consult with public agencies in order to plan together an appropriate program of refugee resettlement. The cooperative agreements also include requirements for special services to children traveling without their parents and for the collection of transportation loans.

Monitoring of Reception and Placement Activities

In FY 1985, the Bureau's monitoring program included 12 in-depth reviews of refugee resettlement in Talmage and San Diego, California; Minneapolis/St. Paul, Minnesota; New Orleans, Louisiana; Tucson and Phoenix, Arizona; Denver, Colorado; Wichita, Kansas; Atlanta, Georgia; St. Louis, Missouri; Chicago, Illinois; Salt Lake City, Utah; and Columbus, Ohio. As a result of the monitoring, strengths and weaknesses of voluntary agency programs have been identified and, where needed, corrective action has been recommended. Followup visits to Philadelphia, Pennsylvania, and Providence, Rhode Island, sites initially reviewed in FY 1984, were continued in FY 1985.

Other Bureau management activities respecting the reception and placement program included tracking of refugee placements, oversight of sponsorship assurances, exchange of information and liaison with the private voluntary agencies, and review of voluntary agencies' financial reports.

Chicago Resettlement Demonstration Project

During FY 1985, the Bureau continued to fund a resettlement demonstration project in Chicago, Illinois. The demonstration project, developed by six voluntary agencies, concentrates on the initial six months a refugee is in the U.S. and emphasizes intensive in-house job development and case management work with each refugee family. Income maintenance and medical assistance are funded through the voluntary agencies, obviating any need for employable refugees to apply for public assistance. The goal of the project is to assist refugees in attaining self-sufficiency at an early date through an intensive service delivery program. The objective is to place 75 percent of employable refugees in appropriate jobs within the six-month period. The project will continue through March of 1986.

DOMESTIC RESETTLEMENT PROGRAM

Refugee Appropriations

In FY 1985, the refugee domestic assistance program functioned under the authority of the Second Continuing Resolution (P.L. 98-473). The total funding which HHS obligated under the program in FY 1985 was $475.1 million.

Of that amount, $267.6 million was used to reimburse States for the cost of cash and medical assistance provided to eligible refugees, aid to unaccompanied refugee children, the supplementary payments States made to refugees who qualified for Supplemental Security Income (SSI), and the administration of the program by States and local welfare agenies.

About $61.6 million was awarded to help States provide refugees with English language training, vocational training, and other social services, the purpose of which is to promote economic self-sufficiency and reduce refugee dependence on public assistance programs. States also received $3.0 million to utilize refugee mutual assistance associations (MAAs) as qualified providers of social services to refugees and to strengthen their service delivery capacity.

During FY 1985, demonstration project grants totaling about $7.2 million were awarded to the States of California and Oregon. The purpose and scope of these projects are discussed on pages 121-123 of the report.

In FY 1985, ORR awarded $6.9 million under the national discretionary funds program to finance a variety of special projects. About half of that amount, $3.3 million, was awarded to States to implement a comprehensive social services strategy which emphasized employment-related services to underserved populations as well as services in newly-established or small refugee communities.

As in the two previous years, ORR continued to fund a targeted assistance program. This program totaled $89 million in FY 1985.* The objective of the program is to assist refugee/entrant populations in heavily concentrated areas of resettlement where State, local, and private resources have proved insufficient. In FY 1985, States received $74.8 million for refugee and entrant targeted assistance projects, and $3.2 million for major initiatives such as: (1) increasing the number of wage earners in refugee and entrant households; (2) providing enhanced skills training, job placement, and followup assistance for employment and self-employment of targeted refugee and entrant populations; (3) assisting Highland Lao/Hmong refugees in attaining self-sufficiency; and (4) broadening refugee opportunities to achieve economic independence through entrepreneurship and small business ownership. Also, $6 million was targeted for health care to qualified entrants in Florida, and $5 million was made available to the Dade County, Florida, school district which was heavily impacted by entrant children.

Under the matching grant program, voluntary resettlement agencies were awarded $4 million in FY 1985 in matching funds for assistance and services in resettling Soviet and other refugees. Funds were provided for this activity in lieu of regular State-administered cash and medical assistance and social services.

---

* Of the total amount available for targeted assistance, $39 million was carried over from FY 1984.

Obligations for health screening and followup medical services for refugees amounted to $8.4 million in FY 1985. Funds were used by: (1) Centers for Disease Control (CDC) personnel overseas to monitor the quality of medical screening for U.S.-bound refugees; (2) Public Health Service quarantine officers at U.S. ports-of-entry to inspect refugees' medical records and notify appropriate State and local health departments about conditions requiring followup medical care; and (3) Public Health Service regional offices to award grants to State and local health agencies for the conduct of refugee health assessments.

In the area of education assistance to refugee children, ORR made available $16.6 million in FY 1985 funds to the Department of Education via an interagency agreement; an additional $5.0 million in prior-year funds was also obligated by the Department of Education during the year. The funds were to help schools develop special curricula, fund bilingual teachers and aides, and provide guidance and counseling required to bring these children into the mainstream of the American educational system.

Finally, to provide program direction, monitoring, and technical assistance to States and the voluntary agencies which administer Federal funds and to manage the entire refugee and entrant domestic assistance program, ORR incurred direct Federal administrative costs of $5.8 million.

ORR Budget Authority and Obligations of Refugee Assistance Funds: FY 1985
(Amounts in $000)

A.	Refugee Resettlement Program	
	1. State-Administered Program:	
	a. Cash Assistance, Medical Assistance, State Administration, Unaccompanied Minors, and SSI	$267,556
	b. Social Services (States' Formula Allocation)	61,645
	Subtotal, State-Administered Program	329,201
	2. Refugee Demonstration Projects	7,185
	3. MAA Incentive Grant Program	2,981
	4. Discretionary Projects and Other Special Projects	6,913
	5. Targeted Assistance: (FY 1985)	
	a. Refugees and Entrants	38,485
	b. Health Care for Entrants	5,974
	c. Education - Entrant Children	5,000
	d. Multiple Wage Earners/Highland Lao	541
	Subtotal, Targeted Assistance	50,000
	6. Targeted Assistance: (FY 1984 Carryover)	
	a. Refugees and Entrants	36,349
	b. Special Projects	2,677
	Subtotal, Targeted Assistance	39,026
	Total, Refugee Resettlement Program	435,306
B.	Voluntary Agency Matching Grant Program	4,000
C.	Preventive Health: Screening and Health Services	8,399
D.	Education Assistance for Children	21,576*
E.	Federal Administration	5,801
	Total, Refugee Program Budget Authority and Obligations	475,082

* Includes $4,977,272 which was authorized in FY 1984 and obligated in FY 1985.

CMA[a/], Social Services, and Targeted Assistance Obligations: FY 1985 Funds

State	CMA	Social Services	MAA Incentive	Targeted Assistance
Alabama	$ 388,978	$ 285,195	$ 14,039	
Arizona	2,302,597	467,896	22,343	
Arkansas	173,192	126,859	6,215	
California	110,856,000	20,747,950	1,021,312	$38,700,287 d/
Colorado	2,661,635	742,210	36,110	500,518 c/
Connecticut	3,076,005	836,985	41,200	
Delaware	18,945			
Dist. of Columbia	1,040,298	262,378	12,669	54,738 c/
Florida	1,035,623	1,496,889	73,684	10,300,444 b/
Georgia	1,505,119	964,725	47,488	
Hawaii	2,058,000	300,969		357,097 b/
Idaho	769,377	158,652	7,810	
Illinois	10,586,849	2,660,454	130,222	4,266,431 d/
Indiana	350,445	227,592	11,055	
Iowa	3,275,866	573,694	27,649	
Kansas	2,290,678	894,598	43,511	1,016,680 d/
Kentucky	309,300	235,842	11,339	
Louisiana	1,378,811	952,089	46,866	694,540 d/
Maine	864,225	247,846		
Maryland	2,349,337	893,021	43,742	844,941 d/
Massachusetts	14,239,461	2,527,803	124,430	2,199,396 d/
Michigan	3,061,998	1,065,146	52,432	
Minnesota	10,630,743	1,497,521	72,977	2,589,507 d/
Mississippi	486,022	183,803	8,875	
Missouri	1,237,322	537,134	28,900	239,757 c/
Montana	158,680	75,000	5,000	
Nebraska	427,184	197,676	9,361	
Nevada	334,152	252,698		
New Hampshire	400,198	103,653		
New Jersey	3,012,082	886,287	43,627	1,879,373 d/
New Mexico	261,085	139,051	6,823	
New York	33,341,596	3,942,638	193,306	1,342,148 b/
North Carolina	871,210	582,632	28,532	
North Dakota	420,526	119,559	5,885	
Ohio	3,207,278	902,288	44,415	
Oklahoma	894,773	675,372	30,684	

State	CMA	Social Services	MAA Incentive	Targeted Assistance
Oregon	$ 8,103,165	$ 1,242,381	$ 60,511	$ 2,319,295 d/
Pennsylvania	4,394,156	2,167,922	106,715	1,587,567 d/
Rhode Island	1,910,962	390,575	19,201	1,133,919 d/
South Carolina	297,053	151,262	7,323	
South Dakota	113,901	109,231	5,377	
Tennessee	414,784	595,782	29,327	
Texas	4,063,890	4,395,927	216,006	731,654 b/
Utah	1,762,978	663,660	32,466	565,714 d/
Vermont	487,006	75,000		
Virginia	5,472,244	2,073,029	101,478	2,162,437 d/
Washington	17,717,475	2,529,183	123,615	1,347,570 b/
West Virginia	34,673	58,881		
Wisconsin	2,484,230	541,069	26,634	
Wyoming	23,442	75,000		
TOTAL	$267,555,549	$61,833,007	$2,981,154	$74,834,013

a/ Funds for cash assistance, medical assistance, and related State administrative costs, including aid to unaccompanied minors.
b/ FY 1985 funds only.
c/ Funds carried over from FY 1984 only.
d/ Both FY 1985 funds and FY 1984 carryover.

State-Administered Program

- Overview

Federal resettlement assistance to refugees is provided by ORR primarily through a State-administered refugee resettlement program. Refugees who meet INS status requirements and who possess appropriate INS documentation, regardless of national origin, may be eligible for assistance under the State-administered refugee resettlement program, and most refugees receive such assistance. Soviet and certain other refugees, while not excluded from the State-administered program, currently are provided resettlement assistance primarily through an alternative system of ORR matching grants to private resettlement agencies for similar purposes.

Under the Refugee Act of 1980, States have key responsibilities in planning, administering, and coordinating refugee resettlement activities. States administer the provision of cash and medical assistance and social services to refugees as well as maintaining legal responsibility for the care of unaccompanied refugee children in the State.

In order to receive assistance under the refugee program, a State is required by the Refugee Act and by regulation to submit a plan which describes the nature and scope of the program and gives assurances that the program will be administered in conformity with the Act. As a part of the plan, a State designates a State agency to be responsible for developing and administering the plan and names a refugee coordinator who will ensure the coordination of public and private refugee resettlement resources in the State.

This section describes further the components of the State-administered program -- cash and medical assistance, social services, targeted assistance, and aid to unaccompanied refugee children -- and then discusses efforts initiated within ORR to monitor these activities.

- Cash and Medical Assistance

Many working age refugees from all parts of the world are able to find employment soon after arrival in their new communities. For those who need services before placement in jobs, a delay in employment may occur, during which time adequate financial support may be available through the local resettlement agency. Many refugees, however, require additional time, assistance, and training prior to job placement, and the resettlement agencies are generally unable to fund longer term maintenance.

Refugees who are members of families with dependent children may qualify for and receive benefits under the program of aid to families with dependent children (AFDC) on the same basis as citizens. Under the refugee program, the Federal Government (ORR) reimburses States for their share of AFDC payments made to refugees during the first 36 months following their initial entry into the United States. Similarly, aged, blind, and disabled refugees may be eligible for the Federal supplemental security income (SSI) program on the same basis as citizens. In States which supplement the Federal SSI payment levels, ORR bears the cost of such State supplements paid to refugees during their first 36 months. Needy refugees also are eligible to receive food stamps on the same basis as non-refugees. Refugees who qualify for Medicaid according to all applicable eligibility criteria receive medical services under that program. The State share of Medicaid costs incurred on a refugee's behalf during his or her initial 36 months in this country is reimbursed by ORR.

Needy refugees who do not qualify for cash assistance under the AFDC or SSI programs may receive special cash assistance for refugees -- termed "refugee cash assistance" (RCA) -- according to their need. In order to receive such cash assistance, refugee individuals or families must meet the income and resource eligibility standards applied in the AFDC program in the State. This assistance is available for up to 18 months after the refugee arrives in the U.S.

In all States, refugees who are eligible for RCA are also eligible for refugee medical assistance (RMA) for up to 18 months. This assistance is provided in the same manner as Medicaid is for other needy residents. Refugees may also be eligible for only medical assistance, if their income is slightly above that required for cash assistance eligibility and if they incur medical expenses which bring their net income down to the Medicaid eligibility level.*

---

* Section 412(e)(5) of the Immigration and Nationality Act authorizes the Director of ORR to "allow for the provision of medical assistance...to any refugee, during the one-year period after entry, who does not qualify for assistance under a State plan approved under title XIX of the Social Security Act on account of any resources or income requirement of such plan, but only if the Director determines that --

"(A) this will (i) encourage self-sufficiency, or (ii) avoid a significant burden on State and local governments; and

"(B) the refugee meets such alternative financial resources and income requirements as the Director shall establish."

In FY 1985, the Director of ORR utilized this authority to enable Arizona to continue an effective program of refugee medical assistance while the State, which had not previously participated in Medicaid, tests a Medicaid demonstration project.

During the second 18 months of residence in the United States, a refugee who is not eligible for AFDC, SSI, or Medicaid would have to qualify under an existing State or local general assistance (GA) program on the same basis as other residents of the locality in which he or she resides. ORR then reimburses the full costs of this assistance for a refugee's second 18 months of residence in the United States.

Based on information provided by the States in their Quarterly Performance Reports to ORR, approximately 55.5 percent of refugees who had been in the United States three years or less were receiving some form of cash assistance at the end of FY 1985. This compares with an approximate 53.9 percent cash assistance utilization rate for the end of September 1984 -- one year earlier.*

At the close of FY 1985, seven of the 14 States with the largest estimated populations of Southeast Asian refugees showed a decline in their dependency rates from the close of FY 1984.

State	Percentage Point Decline in Dependency Rate
Texas	-3.8%
New York	-6.6%
Pennsylvania	-0.7%
Illinois	-0.6%
Virginia	-3.0%
Louisiana	-2.0%
Michigan	-0.4%

* These percentages are based on the total U.S. time-eligible refugee population including refugees resettled through the matching grant program.

The following table shows cash assistance utilization among time-eligible refugees as of September 30, 1985, compared with the same information one year earlier -- in terms of absolute numbers of recipients as well as utilization rates by State.

Cash Assistance Dependency Among Time-Eligible Refugees
September 30, 1985, and September 30, 1984

	Total Cash Recipients as of:		Estimated 36-month Refugee Population as of:		Dependency Rates		Increase/ Decrease from 9/30/84 to 9/30/85
	9/30/85	9/30/84 a/	9/30/85	9/30/84 b/	9/30/85	9/30/84	c/
Alabama	254	248	942	1,053	27.0%	23.6%	3.4%
Alaska	n/a	n/a	n/a	n/a	n/a	n/a	n/a
Arizona	95	129	2,120	1,680	4.5	7.7	-3.2
Arkansas	33	140	808	467	4.1	30.0	-25.9
California	59,436 d/	66,134	65,730	77,419	90.4	85.4	5.0
Colorado	638	701	2,044	2,751	31.2	25.5	5.7
Connecticut	522	623	2,519	3,133	20.7	19.9	0.8
Delaware	4	11	31	53	12.9	20.8	-7.9
District of Columbia	45	101	541	981	8.3	10.3	-2.0
Florida	1,696	1,199	4,606	4,322	36.8	27.7	9.1
Georgia	784	722	3,388	3,615	23.1	20.0	3.2
Hawaii	596	875	839	1,088	71.0	80.4	-9.4
Idaho	199	253	865	588	23.0	43.0	-20.0
Illinois	2,884	3,456	8,415	9,914	34.3	34.9	-0.6
Indiana	227	304	653	847	34.8	35.9	-1.1
Iowa	486	527	1,888	2,082	25.7	25.3	0.4
Kansas	1,482	1,697	2,620	3,268	56.6	51.9	4.6
Kentucky	237	166	676	852	35.1	19.5	15.6
Louisiana	535	711	2,903	3,484	18.4	20.4	-2.0
Maine	499	450	936	915	53.3	49.2	4.1
Maryland	1,114	1,371	3,231	3,324	34.5	41.2	-6.8
Massachusetts	7,004	6,805	8,750	9,535	80.0	71.4	8.7
Michigan	1,265	1,458	3,474	3,957	36.4	36.8	-0.4
Minnesota	3,465	3,552	5,082	5,499	68.2	64.6	3.6
Mississippi	106	55	401	668	26.4	8.2	18.2
Missouri	676	1,003	2,340	2,136	28.9	47.0	-18.1
Montana	25	56	77	134	32.5	41.8	-9.3
Nebraska	110	338	464	703	23.7	48.1	-24.4
Nevada	141	229	900	854	15.7	26.8	-11.1

	Total Cash Recipients as of: 9/30/85	9/30/84 a/	Estimated 36-month Refugee Population as of: 9/30/85	9/30/84 b/	Dependency Rates 9/30/85	9/30/84	Increase/ Decrease From 9/30/84 to 9/30/85
New Hampshire	74	39	367	379	20.2%	10.3%	9.9%
New Jersey	976	1,118	2,969	3,219	32.9	34.7	-1.9
New Mexico	149	318	450	511	33.1	62.2	-29.1
New York	5,253	6,186	16,201	15,859	32.4	39.0	-6.6
North Carolina	196	204	1,778	2,141	11.0	9.5	1.5
North Dakota	100	80	420	437	23.8 e/	18.3	5.5
Ohio	1,616	1,527	2,816	3,387	57.4	45.1	12.3
Oklahoma	234	361	1,854	2,310	12.6	15.6	-3.0
Oregon	1,721	2,166	2,686	4,560	64.1	47.5	16.6
Pennsylvania	3,628	4,554	6,620	8,202	54.8	55.5	-0.7
Rhode Island	838	819	1,436	1,452	58.4	56.4	2.0
South Carolina	60	79	390	549	15.4	14.4	1.0
South Dakota	33	52	371	402	8.9	12.9	-4.0
Tennessee	494	452	1,860	2,209	26.6	20.5	6.1
Texas	2,138	2,985	14,654	16,260	14.6	18.4	-3.8
Utah	659	740	1,939	2,450	34.0	30.2	3.8
Vermont	45	84	196	245	23.0	34.3	-11.3
Virginia	1,778	2,332	6,354	7,533	28.0	31.0	-3.0
Washington	5,544	5,164	7,492	9,317	74.0	55.4	18.6
West Virginia	9	6	66	96	13.6	6.3	7.4
Wisconsin	927	723	1,924	2,028	48.2	35.7	12.5
Wyoming	1	6	28	50	3.6	12.0	-8.4
Guam	15	15	36	48	41.7 e/	31.3	10.4
Total U.S.	111,046	123,324	200,150	228,966	55.5%	53.9%	1.6%

NOTES:

a/ Caseload data are derived from the Quarterly Performance Reports (Form ORR-6) submitted by 49 States (Alaska does not participate in the refugee program), the District of Columbia, and Guam for all time-eligible refugees and entrants. Caseload data include AFDC, RCA, GA, and SSI recipients as reported by the States as of 9/30/85, with the exception of date from North Dakota and Guam, which are derived from States' reports as of 6/30/85.

b/ Base population estimates include 195,460 refugees resettled in the prior three fiscal years, 3,567 refugees resettled under the matching grant program, and 1,176 Cuban and Haitian entrants. State estimates include adjustments for secondary migration based on Forms ORR-11 submitted by the States, other State data sources, and censuses of refugee school children. Though the estimates are shown to the last digit, they must be considered approximate. At the national level, secondary migration is not a factor and the time-eligible population is an actual count.

c/ Percentage changes are calculated from unrounded data.

d/ California's cash assistance data include 31,986 recipients participating in the State's Refugee Demonstration Project (RDP) as of 9/30/1985. For national consistency, the RDP recipients in California are counted under the AFDC caseload.

e/ Cash assistance data as of 6/30/85.

Use of Cash Assistance by Nationality

The Refugee Assistance Amendments of 1982 require ORR to compile and maintain data on the proportion of refugees receiving cash or medical assistance by State of residence and by nationality. The most recent annual round of data collection took place in 1985; States reported on their cash/medical assistance caseloads as of June 30, 1985. Reports cover only the ORR-reimbursable, time-eligible caseload -- i.e., refugees who have been in the U.S. less than three years.

Table 11 (Appendix A) summarizes the findings of the 1985 data collection with all 49 participating States, the District of Columbia, and Guam reporting.* A caseload of 108,558 is covered, including SSI recipients in some States, which is equal to 95 percent of the total nationwide caseload at that time. Of that caseload, nearly half was reported to be Vietnamese, and Southeast Asians of all nationalities comprised 83 percent. (They are about 69 percent of the time-eligible population.) Soviet and Eastern European refugees comprise less than 6 percent of the reported caseload while they are more than 17 percent of the time-eligible population. Other single nationality groups contribute only small fractions to the national caseload.

Dependency rates calculated by nationality range between 10 and 76 percent of time-eligible refugees. These calculations show the highest dependency among the Southeast Asians. In the three States where Southeast Asians could not be differentiated, they were recorded in the table as Vietnamese--the majority group--which inflates the total for the Vietnamese and deflates those for the Cambodians and Lao slightly. If dependency is assumed to be distributed in these States in the same

---

* Alaska does not participate in the Refugee Resettlement Program.

proportion as their Southeast Asian arrivals in 1983-85, the best estimates of nationwide dependency rates are about 68 percent for Vietnamese, 76 percent for Lao (including Hmong), and 54 percent for Cambodians.

Among the other nationality groups, refugees from Afghanistan and the USSR have dependency rates near 38 percent. The dependency rate for Cubans is 29 percent, and that for Ethiopians is 25 percent. Refugees from Iraq and Eastern Europe (other than Poland) show dependency of about 19 percent, while refugees from Poland have the lowest dependency rate, at roughly 10 percent.

- Social Services

ORR provides funding for a broad range of social services to refugees, both through States and in some cases through direct service grants. During FY 1985, as in previous fiscal years, ORR allocated social service funds on a formula basis. Under this formula, about $61.6 million of the social service funds were allocated directly to States according to their proportion of all refugees who arrived in the United States during the three previous fiscal years and were not resettled under a matching grant program (a description of this program is included in a later section). States with fewer than 500 refugees received a minimum of $75,000 in social service funds.

Additionally, $3.0 million of available social service funds were allocated to States for the purpose of providing funds to refugee/entrant mutual assistance associations (MAAs) as an incentive to include such organizations as social service providers. The funds were allocated on the same 3-year proportionate population basis as were the regular social service funds. States which chose to receive these optional funds were provided the allocation upon submission of an assurance that the funds would be used for MAAs.

The $6.9 million remaining in social service funds were used on a discretionary basis to fund a variety of initiatives and individual projects intended to contribute to the effectiveness and efficiency of service delivery in the refugee resettlement program. A description of these activities is provided on pages 56-71.

ORR policies allow a variety of relevant services to be provided to refugees in order to facilitate their general adjustment and especially to promote rapid achievement of self-sufficiency. Services which are related directly to the latter goal are designated by ORR as priority services. In FY 1985, ORR required that 85 percent of a State's social service funds be used for services identified as priority services in section 412(a)(1)(B)(ii) of the Immigration and Nationality Act, as amended, and in ORR's Statement of Goals, Standards, and Priorities. These services include English language training and services specifically related to employment such as employment counseling, job placement, and vocational training. Other allowable services from the remaining 15 percent of funds are those identified in a State's program under title XX of the Social Security Act as well as certain services listed in ORR policy instructions to the States, such as orientation, translation, social adjustment, transportation, and day care.

- Targeted Assistance

In FY 1985 ORR received a final appropriation of $50 million for targeted assistance activities for refugees and entrants. Another $39 million in FY 1984 funds, for which Congress had provided two-year spending authority in the Second Supplemental Appropriations Act of 1984, were made available during FY 1985 as well, making the total amount available in FY 1985 $89 million.

The county targeted assistance program for FY 1985 was not substantially revised from the FY 1984 program. In their applications submitted to ORR, States were required only to update elements of the application already on file for the FY 1984 program for which changes were planned and to reflect those management plans for which new schedules and processes were necessary. However, States which directly administer local plans were again required to submit the full service delivery plan to ORR for review and approval. ORR received applications from 20 States and the District of Columbia on behalf of 42 qualifying county areas under the formula-based targeted assistance program.

The targeted assistance program is designed to get jobs for refugees and entrants who reside in local areas of high need. These areas are defined as counties or contiguous county areas where, because of factors such as unusually large refugee and/or entrant populations, high refugee and/or entrant concentrations in relation to the overall population, and high use of public assistance, there exists a specific need for supplementation of other available service resources for the local refugee and/or entrant population.

The fundamental scope of the county targeted assistance program remains identical to that of FY 1983 and FY 1984 and is reflected in the continuation of many of the proven activities developed in those years, such as job development, employment incentives (i.e., on-site English language training, translation, and worker orientation), on-the-job training, and vocational training.

In addition to the county targeted assistance program, ORR awarded $6 million to Florida for providing health care to eligible entrants and $5 million to the Dade County public school system in Florida in support of education for entrant children. An additional $3 million were used to fund a variety of targeted assistance activities throughout the country for purposes consistent with the intent of Targeted Assistance (See page 56.)

- Unaccompanied Refugee Children

ORR continued its support for programs providing care for refugee children in the U.S. who had been identified in countries of first asylum as unaccompanied minors. Sponsored through two of the national voluntary resettlement agencies -- United States Catholic Conference (USCC) and Lutheran Immigration and Refugee Service (LIRS) -- the children generally are placed in programs operated by local affiliates of those national agencies, although in a few States, most notably California, the children are placed in the public child welfare system. Legal responsibility is established under State law in such a way that they are eligible for basically the same range of child welfare benefits as non-refugee children in the State. Refugee children are placed in foster care, group care, independent living, or residential treatment depending upon their individual needs. Costs incurred on their behalf are reimbursed by ORR until the month after their 18th birthdays or such higher ages as are permitted under the State Plan under title IV-B of the Social Security Act.

Since January 1979, a total of 6,895 children have entered the program, and of these, 865 or 12.5 percent subsequently were reunited with family, and 2,202 or 31.9 percent have been emancipated, having reached the age of majority. Based on reports received from the States, the number in the program as of September 30, 1985 was 3,828 -- an increase of 3.9 percent from the 3,684 in care a year earlier. During FY 1985, 186 children were reunited with family and 832 were emancipated.

During 1985, new programs were opened in Arizona and Texas. In all, unaccompanied children are located in 39 States, the District of Columbia, and Guam. New York has the largest number, 899, followed by California with 415, Illinois with 325, and Minnesota with 310. (See Table 13, Appendix A).

The ORR program also provides support for 94 unaccompanied minor Cuban and Haitian entrants in nine States in a similar manner. During 1985, nine such children were reunited with family and 66 were emancipated, having reached the appropriate age in their State of resettlement.

The arrival of about 50 Amerasian children from Vietnam through the Orderly Departure Program prompted ORR, the national voluntary agencies, and several of their local affiliates specializing in their care to focus on the needs of such children. In general, Amerasians have been clustered in locations where intensive, specialized services can be directed to help them make the difficult transition to American life. ORR also continued to provide technical assistance to the Immigration and Naturalization Service in implementing P.L. 97-359, known as the Amerasian Children's Act, which is administered by INS.

A major activity of ORR during FY 1985 was the formation of an interagency workgroup on the future of the unaccompanied minors program. Participants besides ORR include the Department of State, LIRS, USCC, representatives of two State government refugee programs, and four local provider agencies. Confronted with a potentially declining caseload in future years, the workgroup seeks to develop an ongoing plan for insuring that appropriate care for the children is maintained despite the reduced numbers.

In support of more effective administration of the program, ORR, LIRS, and USCC sponsored a national conference on unaccompanied minors November 13-16, 1984, in Chevy Chase, Maryland, which was attended by more than 300 practitioners, administrators, and State officials. More than 30 professional papers were presented covering a wide variety of subjects related to child care.

ORR increased its monitoring activity in the program in FY 1985 and continued to provide technical assistance to provider agencies, States, and national voluntary agencies. ORR also began computerizing its records of children in care, and during FY 1986 expects to begin generating aggregate data on the English language skills, education, social adjustment, and health of these children. Reports submitted by the States indicated that most children continue to make satisfactory progress as they move toward adulthood.

- Program Monitoring

ORR program monitoring during FY 1985 included the following:

-- Program management guidance: To strengthen ORR oversight of State adherence to ORR's regulations, policies, and directives as well as to ORR's program goals, priorities, and standards for the purpose of assisting refugees to achieve economic self-sufficiency in the shortest time possible.

-- Technical assistance: To improve the quality of State data collection and reporting procedures to achieve completeness and greater consistency of program data relative to State assistance and service outcomes, enabling ORR to conduct effective monitoring and comprehensive performance analyses of State program activities.

-- Program analysis: To chart the progress and outcomes of the State program with in-depth program and data analyses based upon program and expenditure information reported to ORR by the States on a quarterly basis and other demographic data compiled by ORR.

-- Direct field monitoring/casefile and project review: To identify strengths and weaknesses in the States' implementation of Federal policies and regulations for the delivery of cash and medical assistance, social services, and case management, and for the administration of refugee funds.

-- Followup: To assist the States to take corrective action, if necessary, on programmatic aspects of ORR's field monitoring activities.

The above objectives have been achieved through the implementation of State quarterly performance reports, casefile and project reviews, the State Plan amendment process, and followup by ORR when corrective actions were required. Results of ORR program monitoring during FY 1985 are summarized below:

(a) Program management guidance

States with out-of-date plans or having material changes during FY 1985 continue to submit State plan amendments based on the procedures established by ORR to bring State programs into full compliance with Federal regulations. ORR continues to monitor a State's implementation of its plan provisions and funding allocations to assure that the service priorities mandated by Congress are being observed by State agencies.

ORR's revised Statement of Goals, Priorities, and Standards was issued to all States on March 1, 1984, as part of the State plan guidance. In late FY 1985, the Office of Management and Budget (OMB) approved the use of Form ORR-1 which allows ORR to collect information on State estimates of social service allocations and caseload projections. Information provided on this form allows ORR to monitor whether a State's social services funding allocation processes comply with ORR's program goals, priorities, and standards.

The Regional Office issuance system, implemented in late FY 1984, consolidated technical materials issued to the Regions for the purposes of monitoring States and their grantees. This system enables ORR to be more uniform in monitoring the refugee resettlement program from State to State.

(b) Technical Assistance

The Regional Offices of ORR have the day-to-day responsibility to monitor and provide technical assistance to States. In addition, ORR Central Office provides guidance and direction, conducts on-site training, and holds consultations with State officials who are responsible for the collection, preparation, and reporting of State program performance data.

(c) Program Analysis

ORR analyzed information and data submitted by the States in the Quarterly Performance Reports during FY 1985 to chart the progress and outcomes of the State-administered refugee resettlement program over the four quarters of FY 1985. States provide information on employment services (enrollment, job referral, job placement, 90-day job retention), English language training (enrollment vs. completion), vocational/skills training (enrollment vs. completion), and the economic self-sufficiency outcomes of the program.

ORR developed on a pilot basis a management information system which consolidates program, fiscal, and population data available for selected States in each region. All data available to ORR since the beginning of FY 1983 were entered into the system for trend analysis. Key performance indicators such as dependency rate, job retention rate, unit cost of assistance, and medical utilization have been generated from this system. The system, when complete, will provide ORR with a comprehensive analytical tool to improve its monitoring and oversight of State programs.

(d) Project Reviews

In addition to periodic project and casefile reviews conducted by ORR Regional Offices, ORR focused national project monitoring review efforts during FY 1985 on the State of California which has more than one-third of the refugee population in the U.S., approximately one-half of the total refugee cash assistance caseload, and the highest State welfare dependency rate. ORR undertook two major monitoring initiatives in California directed at the Central Intake Units (CIUs) and the targeted assistance program (TAP).

Review of the CIUs

In California, the CIUs are county-based entities which form a network of assessment, referral, and tracking systems to control client flow through the State's Refugee Resettlement Program service network. During April 1985, ORR reviewed 21 CIUs located in 14 California counties to examine the effectiveness of the systems throughout the State. The review assessed the linkages among the CIUs, the refugee service providers (particularly employment service contractors), county welfare departments, and refugee clients to determine how these interrelationships affect employment outcomes.

ORR found that many CIUs were not consistently implementing the "early employment" priority emphasized by the Office of Refugee Resettlement. Most CIUs emphasized the provision of various services to refugees rather than readying refugee clients for employment as soon as possible.

ORR is working with the State and counties to improve CIU performance.

Review of Targeted Assistance Program (TAP)

A comprehensive review of the targeted assistance program began in the third quarter of FY 1985. ORR conducted site visits in all counties receiving targeted assistance funds in California.

The national targeted assistance assessment was initiated in California because 13 of the major targeted assistance sites are in the State and these sites accounted for approximately $25 million of the total FY 1984 funds allocated for the program. California provides a critical test of the effectiveness of targeted assistance since prolonged welfare utilization and high secondary migration are the two major problems in the State and these are the problems associated with high refugee impact which the targeted assistance program is designed to address.

Several major issues identified in the review are noted below.

-- Most counties provide TAP services to refugees with higher skill levels, who are often not on cash assistance, and neglect needier refugees such as the unskilled and the generally harder-to-serve refugees receiving assistance under the program of aid to families with dependent children of unemployed parents (AFDC-UP).

-- County welfare departments infrequently sanction non-cooperative TAP clients.

-- Many CIUs make inappropriate, insufficient, and untimely referrals to TAP service providers which jeopardize the achievement of project goals.

Despite the fact that outcomes from the counties reviewed are below expectations, valuable knowledge has been gained about the operations of the program. As a result, ORR anticipates that managers at all levels of the program will be better able to improve the performance of TAP in FY 1986.

(e) Followup

ORR sent comprehensive reports of the findings from the CIU and TAP reviews to the State of California and to the counties. The reports contained requests for corrective action to address each identified administrative or programmatic issue. ORR Regional and Central Offices are also providing technical assistance to the State and counties. For example, resources from ORR's national ESL technical assistance initiative (see pages 63 and 64 on the Mainstream English Language Training Program) have been given to the CIUs to improve their assessment of refugee language proficiencies. Additionally, ORR is working with the State to develop employment strategies for large families on public assistance whose ability to become self-sufficient depends upon the employment of several wage earners in the household. The State of California and ORR are also collaborating on ways to address the special problems of refugees in California's Central Valley. Joint efforts by the State and ORR to improve monitoring and technical assistance capabilities are the direct result of ORR's FY 1985 on-site monitoring activities.

(f) Audits

Formal audits of several State refugee programs were undertaken by the HHS Inspector General's office. The findings are summarized below. States may appeal amounts finally determined for recovery by ORR.

- California

  A recovery of $242,591 has been recommended for refund to ORR for overclaims of dental costs.

- Florida

  The audit found that: (1) $633,037 in stipends had been paid to entrants who were ineligible for program services under the Cuban/Haitian Entrant Impact Aid Program, including related indirect costs; (2) $327,580 of interest income had been earned on excess Cuban/Haitian Entrant Impact Aid Program funds; and (3) the South Florida Employment and Training Consortium had claimed $76,407 for indirect costs and services not provided by a subcontractor. A total recovery of $1,037,024 was recommended.

- Utah

  A refund of $4,734 was recommended to ORR for payments made to families not eligible to receive assistance under the Refugee Resettlement Program.

- Wisconsin

  A refund of $126,986 was recommended for payments made to refugees who exceeded the 18- or 36-month period of eligibility.

Voluntary Agency Matching Grant Program

Congress, responding to an Administration request, appropriated funds in FY 1979 to provide assistance and services to refugees through a program of matching grants to voluntary resettlement agencies. Under this program, Federal funds of up to $1,000 per refugee have been provided on a dollar-for-dollar matching basis to voluntary agencies which participated in the program.

The matching grant program was devised to provide services to refugees which complement those services provided under the Department of State's initial reception and placement grants, and which provide an alternative to the State-administered programs funded by ORR. In the second quarter of FY 1984, a grant announcement and program guidelines were issued to further define and clarify requirements of the program. These requirements include "essential services" which are: maintenance services (food and housing) to be provided for up to three months following the initial 30 days provided under the terms of the reception and placement grant (during which time the refugee normally would not receive public cash assistance), case management services, and job development and placement services.

Voluntary agencies submitted applications for funding which were reviewed competitively. Five applicants, including two agencies which had not previously participated in the program, were selected by the Director of ORR for FY 1984 funding. These agencies were awarded continuation grants in FY 1985 totalling $4,000,000. The agencies participating in the program, together with the FY 1985 Federal funds awarded to them, are listed below.

AGENCY	FEDERAL GRANT
Church World Service	$ 99,358
Council of Jewish Federations	1,188,476
International Rescue Committee	426,637
Lutheran Immigration and Refugee Service	391,577
United States Catholic Conference	1,893,952
TOTAL	$4,000,000

ORR program staff conducted on-site monitoring reviews of each of the above grantees in FY 1985. ORR found that guidelines had been implemented appropriately, that local agencies were emphasizing the early employment goals of the program, that at least 50 percent of employable refugees in the program were employed within the first four months after arrival, and that few cases of refugees were accessing cash assistance during the first 120 days in the United States. In addition to communicating results of individual program reviews to respective agencies, ORR staff met with national voluntary agencies' staffs to discuss overall findings and recommendations for improving program performance.

In order to assess the effectiveness of its program, one agency new to the matching grant program, the Lutheran Immigration and Refugee Service (LIRS) affiliate in Minneapolis/St. Paul, Minnesota, compared refugees participating in its matching grant program with refugees having similar family composition and ethnicity who had been resettled prior to implementation of the program.

Refugees in both groups were sponsored by churches of comparable size and resources. Although the study consists of a small number of clients (approximately 20 employable adults in each group), findings show that during the first 120 days in the country, 50 percent of matching grant participants were employed full-time versus less than 10 percent of the non-matching grant refugees. LIRS believes that the added employment staff capability and emphasis placed on early employment in the matching grant program are the key contributors to the higher employment results.

Refugee Health

Refugees often have health problems due to the environmental conditions and lack of medical care which exist in their country of origin or are encountered during their flight and wait for resettlement. As in earlier years, these problems were addressed during FY 1985 by activities in the first asylum camps, in refugee processing centers (RPCs), and after arrival in the United States.

Medical and other volunteers continued to treat refugee health problems as well as improve the general health conditions in refugee camps. Public health advisors from the U.S. Public Health Service's Centers for Disease Control (CDC) were stationed in Southeast Asia to monitor the quality of medical screening for U.S.-bound refugees. Another CDC public health advisor has been placed in Europe to monitor the health assessments for U.S.-bound South Asian, Near Eastern, European, and African refugees. At the U.S. ports-of-entry, refugees and their medical records were inspected by PHS Quarantine Officers, who also notified the appropriate State and local health departments of the arrival of these refugees.

Recognizing that the medical problems of refugees, while not constituting a public health hazard, may adversely affect their successful resettlement and employment, ORR provided $6.4 million to State and local health agencies through an interagency agreement with CDC. These funds were awarded through grants by the Public Health Service Regional Offices, and provide for the conduct of health assessments on refugees soon after resettlement in the U.S.

In response to growing concerns about the impact of refugee mental health problems on successful resettlement and employment, ORR funded a new initiative in refugee mental health. ORR provided over $2 million through an interagency agreement with the Office of Refugee Health (ORH) and the National Institute of Mental Health (NIMH) to establish a new grant program to create focal points for refugee mental health within State mental health agencies. The purpose of these State focal points is to increase U.S. capacity to meet refugee mental health needs by mainstreaming mental health services for refugees. Awards were made to 12 States with large refugee concentrations for a total of $1.7 million. A contract was also awarded for $0.3 million to the University of Minnesota to establish a Technical Assistance Center to provide support and assistance to State mental health agencies. (See pages 67-69.)

Additionally, in cooperation with ORH and CDC, ORR funded an expansion of the Health Assessment Grant Program to provide for the Hepatitis B screening of pregnant refugee women who have been in the United States since October 1981. The newborns and close family contacts of these women are screened and vaccinated as appropriate to prevent the development of Hepatitis B carriers. (See page 69.)

Because Southeast Asian refugees currently spend an average of six to seven months in RPC's in Southeast Asia for English language training and cultural orientation programs, refugees with active tuberculosis complete their medical treatment during this period, prior to resettlement in the U.S. (For a more detailed discussion of Public Health Service activities covering refugee health matters, see Appendix B.)

Refugee Education

The Transition Program for Refugee Children, implemented through an interagency agreement between ORR and the Department of Education, provides funding for the special educational needs of refugee children who are enrolled in public and nonprofit private elementary and secondary schools. Under this State-adminstered program, funds are distributed through formula grants which are based on the number of eligible refugee children in the States. State educational agencies are in turn distribute the funds to local educational agencies as formula-based subgrants. Because the needs of recent arrivals are generally more serious and require immediate attention, the critical element in the formula for deciding a State's funding allocation is the number of eligible refugee children who have been in the U.S. less than one year. Significance is also placed on the number of eligible refugee children enrolled in secondary schools rather than on refugee children in elementary schools since older refugee children usually need more language support. During FY 1985, $21.6 million was distributed to States.*

Activities funded under the Transition Program include supplemental educational services directed at instruction to improve English language skills, bilingual education, remedial programs, school counseling and guidance services, in-service training for educational personnel, and training for parents. Under this special educational funding, State administrative costs are restricted to one percent of a State educational agency's funding allocation, and support services costs are restricted to 15 percent of each local educational agency's allocation.

---

* This amount includes $5.0 million obligated in FY 1985 for use in school year 1984-85.

The following funds have been distributed since the Transition Program began in FY 1980:

Fiscal Year	For Use in School Year	Amount
1980	1980-81	$23,168,000
1981	1981-82	$22,268,000*
1982	1982-83	$22,700,000**
1983	1983-84	$16,600,000
1984	1984-85	$16,600,000***
1985	1985-86	$16,600,000

---

* Although funds were appropriated in FY 1981, the actual distribution of this amount for the 1981-1982 school year did not occur until FY 1982 (that is, after September 30, 1981).

** This amount includes $19,700,000 from FY 1982 funding and $3 million from FY 1981 carryover. These funds were distributed prior to September 30, 1982.

*** This amount includes $5.0 million obligated in FY 1985.

National Discretionary Projects

The Office of Refugee Resettlement in FY 1985 funded a number of national projects with social services funds and targeted assistance monies unexpended during FY 1984. Approximately $9.9 million was obligated in support of activities to improve refugee resettlement operations at national, regional, State, and community levels.* The programmatic activities described below address one or more of the following objectives:

1. To reduce the effects of large concentrations of refugees on communities;
2. To establish program standards and performance measures for refugee program services;
3. To strengthen the capability of refugee mutual assistance associations (MAAs);
4. To provide technical assistance to improve the quality of services to refugees;
5. To improve the effectiveness of the refugee program through information dissemination;
6. To leverage mainstream program funds from other agencies by using national discretionary funds as the stimulus.

---

* This total includes approximately $3.0 million available through the targeted assistance program.

- Planned Secondary Resettlement (PSR) Program

The Planned Secondary Resettlement (PSR) Program provides an opportunity for unemployed refugees and their families to relocate from areas of high welfare dependency to communities in the U.S. that offer favorable employment prospects. Secondary resettlement assistance and services are provided to refugees who participate in a planned relocation. Eligibility is limited to refugees who have lived in the U.S. for 18 months or more and who have experienced continuing unemployment during their period of residency.

PSR grants are conducted in two phases: a planning phase to assess and prepare prospective receiving communities and to identify and prepare interested refugees for participation in PSR, and a resettlement phase to implement a planned relocation involving the provision of services to facilitate adjustment and prompt employment.

This grant program was started in FY 1983 with State agencies as the only eligible grantees. The program has since been redesigned to stimulate greater use of the opportunities available under PSR. Eligible grantees now include mutual assistance associations and voluntary agencies, as well as States.

In fiscal year 1985, three PSR grants totaling $129,158 were awarded.

North Carolina Department of Human Resources 325 N. Salisbury Street Raleigh, North Carolina 27611 Resettlement Phase	$ 59,089
Lao Family Community, Inc. 4336 Covington Highway, Suite 107 Decatur, Georgia 30035 Planning Phase	$ 34,271
The Hmong-American Planning and Development Center 3006 Pearson Drive Grand Prairie, Texas 75051 Planning Phase	$ 35,798

- Highland Lao Initiative Continuation Grants

The purpose of Highland Lao Initiative continuation grants is to provide continuing support to Highland Lao projects funded in FY 1983 whose activities have contributed significantly to increased community stability and employment in Highland Lao communities outside the State of California. Particular emphasis has been placed on providing continuing support to Highland Lao MAAs which have performed well during the grant period and where additional funding is needed to ensure a continuation of this performance. Three continuation grants were awarded in FY 1985, totaling $292,036.

Wisconsin Department of Health and Social Services P.O. Box 7851 Madison, Wisconsin 53707	$238,830
North Carolina Department of Human Resources 325 N. Salisbury Street Raleigh, North Carolina 27611	$ 33,206
Tennessee Department of Human Services 111 7th Avenue North Nashville, Tennessee 37203	$ 20,000

- Favorable Alternate Sites Program (FASP)

The Favorable Alternate Sites Program (FASP) is designed to identify and test resettlement sites which are suitable alternatives to communities with unfavorable resettlement conditions. FASP projects encourage rapid self-sufficiency by resettling "free case" refugees (refugees without close relatives in the U.S.) in communities that offer good employment opportunities, available housing, and support services. Grantees are required to track all FASP refugees for a period of one year.

A supplemental award was granted to the Virginia Department of Social Services to complete a FASP program. Virginia was initially awarded a grant in FY 1983 to resettle 420 Khmer refugees in Richmond and the Tidewater area of the State. Due to unforeseen conditions overseas, not all targeted refugees arrived during the designated time period resulting in the need to extend the project to complete the tracking process.

Virginia Department of Social Services
8007 Discovery Drive
Richmond, Virginia 23208 $18,987

- Enhanced Skills Training Grants

The purpose of this program is to provide enhanced skills training, post-training assistance, and job placement to targeted refugees and entrants to increase their chances of obtaining jobs or self-employment at adequate rates of compensation which will result in a decrease of the refugee/entrant family's total dependence upon public assistance. The targeted population served are refugees and entrants who are unemployed, are receiving cash assistance, or are at risk of having to resort to interstate secondary migration in order to secure cash assistance benefits, and who have histories of extended difficulties in entering and/or advancing in the work force due to deficiencies in job skills and English language skills.

One new grant in the amount of $137,500 was awarded in FY 1985.

Minnesota Department of Human Services
Refugee Program Office
444 Lafayette Road
St. Paul, Minnesota 55101 $137,500

Two supplemental grants totaling $23,858 were awarded to enhanced skills training projects initially funded in FY 1984.

Family Farm Development Network
P.O. Box 1899
Little Rock, Arkansas 72203 $ 16,358

Georgia Department of Human Resources
47 Trinity Avenue S.W.
Atlanta, Georgia 30334-1202 $ 7,500

- Enhanced Employment and Training Grant for Hiawatha Valley Hmong Returnees

A grant was provided to the Minnesota Department of Human Services to provide employment and language services to Hmong families who relocated to St. Paul, their original place of residence, after participating in the unsuccessful Hiawatha Valley Farm Project in Homer, Minnesota. The purpose of this grant is to provide on-the-job training, job placement services, and language training as needed to enable these families to obtain employment at sufficient wage levels to avoid a return to public assistance.

Minnesota Department of Human Services
Refugee Program Office
444 Lafayette Road
St. Paul, Minnesota 55101 $ 25,736

- Social and Economic Assistance to Hmong (Highland Lao) Refugees

A grant was provided to the University of California to make available to Highland Lao refugees services provided by the University's Cooperative Extension Service in seven counties: Sacramento, Fresno, Merced, Tulare, Riverside, San Diego, and San Joaquin. Highland Lao bilingual staff will be employed in the various county cooperative extension offices to enable

Highland Lao refugees to utilize the services offered by the Extension Service in the following fields: agriculture, small farms and gardens, consumer education, home economics, nutrition, and 4-H activities.

The Regents of the University of California
Agriculture and Natural Resources
2120 University Avenue
Berkeley, California 94720 $419,891

- Multiple Wage Earner Demonstration Projects

A grant was awarded to the State of California to develop and implement multiple wage earner demonstration projects in the State. The purpose of these projects is to target training and employment services on two or more employable adults per refugee family served in order to increase the number of wage earners in these families as a strategy for reducing welfare dependency. These projects will target public assistance recipients with large families in counties having major refugee populations.

California Department of Social Services
744 P Street
Sacramento, California 98514 $515,097

- Grant to Address the Critical Needs of Refugees in the Central Valley

A grant was awarded to the State of California to support projects which address the critical needs of refugees, particularly Highland Lao refugees, in the Central Valley. The purpose of these projects is to address persistent and unmet needs including social adjustment, health, and education needs, as well as employment needs, in order to improve the long-term resettlement prospects of the refugee population in the Central Valley.

California Department of Social Services
744 P Street
Sacramento, California 95814 $370,051

- San Francisco Case Management Demonstration Project

A supplemental grant was awarded to the State of California to enable the State to continue the San Francisco voluntary agency-based case management demonstration project, originally funded in FY 1984.

California Department of Social Services
744 P Street
Sacramento, California 95814 $250,000

- Small Business Administration Interagency Agreement

Under an interagency agreement with SBA, ORR provided $169,551 for technical assistance to refugee small businesses nationwide through SBA's 7(j) program. SBA has matched $165,218 of this amount. The goal of the program is to assist refugee groups to establish small businesses and to assist existing refugee small businesses to improve management capability.

Awards were made by SBA to the following agencies:

International Refugee Center in Oregon	$40,000
Management Task Force in Colorado	$39,554
Tramco in Massachusetts	$39,557
LTG Associates in California	$40,000
Rhode Island SBA	$40,000
Alexander Grant Company in Texas	$40,000
Asian Inc. in California	$60,000
Palms & Company in Washington State	$35,658

- Mutual Assistance Associations Technical Assistance (MAA-TA) Program

The Northwest Educational Cooperative received a contract to provide technical assistance and training to mutual assistance associations (MAAs). The purpose of the MAA-TA program is to utilize a national contractor to enhance the capacity of MAAs nationwide to manage social services programs, develop their capacity as trainers, and develop and access private sector resources for the provision of social services to refugees/entrants. Through the project, the extensive experience and knowledge of established MAAs and mainstream social services providers will be tapped to assist other MAAs in

the rudiments of grants/contracts management, social service delivery skills, and resource and leadership development. Individuals from established MAAs will be trained as trainers and will subsequently provide training and technical assistance to recently funded and potentially fundable MAAs. This will enable the creation of a resource pool of trainers which can be made available for training of MAAs in subsequent years. Project deliverables include: establishment of a Project Advisory Committee, development and dissemination of three national MAA-TA newsletters, establishment of a toll-free number, development of a "Train the Trainer" package, and implementation of a Peer Internship Program for MAAs. The contractor will provide technical assistance and training to MAAs nationwide and will evaluate these activities.

Northwest Educational Cooperative
MAA-Technical Assistance Consortium Project
500 S. Dwyer Avenue
Arlington Heights, Illinois 60005 $349,500

- Mainstream English Language Training Technical Assistance Project (MELT-TAP)

The Northwest Educational Cooperative received a contract to run the mainstream English language training technical assistance project (MELT-TAP). The purpose of the MELT-TAP is to utilize a national contractor to provide technical assistance and training to State Refugee Coordinators, English language trainers, vocational English language trainers, and employment service providers to utilize effectively, implement, and/or adapt the Competency-Based MELT Resource Package in the provision of language instruction to refugees/entrants. The MELT Resource Package consists of a core curriculum, the Student Performance Levels, and the Basic English Skills Test (BEST). The package was developed and field-tested by seven ORR demonstration projects funded in fiscal years 1983-1984.

The effective utilization of the MELT Resource Package is expected to result in increased accountability of language training programs, more rapid student movement from one instructional level to the next, and a more reliable basis for program monitoring and evaluation.

Northwest Educational Cooperative
500 S. Dwyer Avenue
Arlington Heights, Illinois 60005 $324,145

- Vocational English Language Training (VELT) Resources Project

A supplemental award was provided to Research Management Corporation (RMC) for the purpose of convening a workgroup in Washington, D.C., to evaluate the VELT Resource Package. ORR funded RMC in fiscal year 1984 to develop a VELT Resource Package to address the employability needs of refugees/entrants. The package provides practical approaches for training refugees/entrants to become more competitive, flexible, and adaptable in the U.S. job market. The package includes a glossary of VELT terms, a description of model programs, a bibliography of VELT materials, and a list of resource individuals and agencies.

Research Management Corporation
7115 Leesburg Pike, Suite 327
Falls Church, Virginia 22043 $2,198

- Comprehensive Discretionary Social Services (CDSS)

The Comprehensive Discretionary Social Services (CDSS) initiative was developed in FY 1985 to encourage States to analyze their current social service delivery strategies and to identify and prioritize unmet needs. Through this initiative, ORR provided funds to States, based on a competitive process, to meet critical needs.

Although States could apply for the funds to carry out virtually any refugee social service if fully justified, CDSS placed principal emphasis on these two areas: Employment-related services to underserved populations, and services in newly-established or small refugee communities heretofore lacking such services. A feature of the program was the ability of a State to submit a single application for discretionary funding covering a variety of identified services, rather than individual applications for each activity as was the case in the past.

In all, ORR funded 32 service components in 16 States totaling $3,270,660. The amounts by State are listed below.

Alabama Department of Pensions and Security Division of Special Programs 64 North Union Street Montgomery, Alabama 36130	$224,600
Colorado Department of Social Services Refugee Service Program 190 E. 9th Avenue, Suite 200 Denver, Colorado 80203	$ 39,496
Georgia Department of Human Resources State Refugee Coordinator 47 Trinity Avenue S.W. Atlanta, Georgia 30334-1202	$312,000
Idaho Department of Health and Welfare Refugee Services Programs 450 West State Street, 7th Floor Boise, Idaho 83720	$128,199
Iowa Refugee Service Center 4626 S.W. 9th Street Des Moines, Iowa 50315	$199,008
Kentucky Department of Social Services 275 East Main Street Frankfort, Kentucky 40621	$ 58,850
Michigan Department of Social Services 300 S. Capitol Avenue, P.O. Box 30037 Lansing, Michigan 48909	$219,662

Minnesota Department of Human Services State Coordinator, Refugee Programs 444 Lafayette Road St. Paul, Minnesota 55101	$287,220
Mississippi Department of Public Welfare Social Services Department P.O. Box 352 Jackson, Mississippi 39205	$100,000
Missouri Department of Social Services Refugee Program P.O. Box 88, Broadway Office Building Jefferson City, Missouri 65103	$262,090
New York State Department of Social Services 40 North Pearl Street Albany, New York 12243	$271,506
Ohio Department of Human Services Refugee Resettlement Program 30 East Broad Street, 30th Floor Columbus, Ohio 43232	$162,010
Texas Department of Human Resources Office of Research, Demonstration and Evaluation P.O. Box 2960 Austin, Texas 78769	$185,895
Virginia Department of Social Services State Refugee Coordinator 8007 Discovery Drive Richmond, Virginia 23229-8699	$229,145
Washington Department of Social and Health Services Bureau of Refugee Assistance P.O. Box OB-31B Olympia, Washington 98504	$240,979
Wisconsin Department of Health and Social Services Division of Community Services P.O. Box 7851 Madison, Wisconsin 53707	$350,000

- Refugee Health Professional/Paraprofessional Retraining Project

A supplemental award was granted to the University of Minnesota to complete a demonstration project initially funded in FY 1983. The supplement will support additional English language training to assist a group of refugee students to complete their academic training and preparation for the Licensed

Practical Nurse Examination. A total of 16 licensed practical nurses will graduate from this program and will work for a minimum of one year in health care facilities serving large numbers of refugees.

University of Minnesota
Office of Research Administration
Box 85 Mayo
Minneapolis, Minnesota 55455 $19,429

- National Refugee Mental Health Program

ORR entered into an interagency agreement with Office of Refugee Health, PHS, and through this agency with the National Institute of Mental Health, to implement a national refugee mental health program. This program consists of two major elements: (1) A multi-year cooperative agreement program designed to improve mainstream mental health services available to refugees. Twelve State mental health agencies received awards totalling $1,698,937 to plan and implement coordinated mental health system improvements. Recipient States are expected to make necessary administrative, legislative, financial, and programmatic arrangements to provide culturally sensitive diagnostic, treatment, and prevention services to high-need refugee populations; and (2) the establishment of a national refugee mental health resource development and technical assistance center to provide information and technical assistance to States, mental health agencies, and refugee service providers. An award of $316,000 was made to the University of Minnesota Hospitals for the technical assistance center.

Mental Health Cooperative Agreement Awards

California Department of Mental Health 1600 9th Street, Room 250 Sacramento, California 95814	$208,680
Colorado State Department of Institutions 3520 West Oxford Avenue Denver, Colorado 80236	$108,879
Hawaii Department of Health P.O. Box 3378 Honolulu, Hawaii 96801-9984	$108,593
Illinois Department of Mental Health and Developmental Disability 100 West Randolph Street Chicago, Illinois 60601	$145,700
Massachusetts Department of Mental Health 160 North Washington Street Boston, Massachusetts 02114	$136,147
Minnesota State Department of Human Services Centennial Office Building, 4th Floor St. Paul, Minnesota 55155	$139,255
New York State Office of Mental Health 44 Holland Avenue Albany, New York 12229	$200,000
Rhode Island State Division of Mental Health and Community Support Services 600 New London Avenue Cranston, Rhode Island 02920	$ 84,050
Texas Department of Mental Health and Mental Retardation P.O. Box 12668 Austin, Texas 78711-2668	$168,265
Virginia Department of Mental Health and Mental Retardation P.O. Box 2797 Richmond, Virginia 23214	$167,997

Washington State Department of Social and Health Services Mail Stop OB 42-F Olympia, Washington 98504	$154,717
Wisconsin State Department of Health and Social Services P.O. Box 7851 Madison, Wisconsin 53707	$ 76,654

Mental Health Technical Assistance Center Award

University of Minnesota Hospitals Box 85 University of Minnesota Minneapolis, Minnesota 55455	$316,000

- Refugee Hepatitis B Vaccination Program

A program of Hepatitis B surface antigen screening among pregnant women and unaccompanied minors was instituted in Southeast Asia in September 1983. The newborns of refugee women who test positive are given immunizations of globulin and vaccine and close household contacts of unaccompanied minors who are carriers receive vaccine. This program, however, did not provide for the screening of subsequent pregnancies among the identified carrier refugee populations or for the identification of carriers among refugees who arrived prior to 1983.

In FY 1985, ORR provided $596,000 to the Centers for Disease Control (CDC) through an interagency agreement to expand the program to include an initial effort to screen all refugee women aged 15-35 who have entered the U.S. since October 1981 and who encounter the health care system for prenatal care during the 12 months of the project. Newborns of refugee women who are found to be carriers will receive vaccinations while close household contacts will be screened and vaccinated if necessary.

- Sudden Unexplained Deaths Syndrome (SUDS)

The phenomenon of sudden unexplained nocturnal deaths continues to be an important public health problem among refugees coming to the U.S. from Southeast Asia. In FY 1985, ORR through an interagency agreement provided an additional $86,000 to the CDC to develop a cooperative agreement with the Association of State and Territorial Health Officials to establish a nationwide surveillance system that will actively seek new cases and attempt to identify previous cases that have not been reported to the CDC. The data obtained will be used to monitor trends of the syndrome and to support possible future epidemiologic study of SUDS etiology.

- Interagency Agreement with Department of State (DOS)

Through an interagency agreement between ORR and the Bureau for Refugee Programs (BRP) in the U.S. Department of State, ORR transferred $200,000 to BRP to jointly develop a demonstration with Save Cambodia, Inc., a mutual assistance association located in Northern Virginia, which has proposed to provide enhanced community support and resettlement services to a minimum of 200 refugees in the State of Virginia. Save Cambodia, Inc., will also provide workshops and technical assistance to other service providers throughout the United States.

Save Cambodia, Inc.
4621 Lee Highway, Suite 100
Arlington, Virginia 22207 $200,000

- Interagency Agreement with Department of Education (ED)

Through an interagency agreement between ORR and the U.S. Department of Education, ORR transferred $135,000 to the Refugee Materials Center (RMC) in Kansas City, Missouri. The RMC serves as an ORR repository and reproduction

and distribution point for refugee resettlement program materials. A bibliography of refugee and educational materials has been developed and disseminated nationwide. In addition, a bibliography of non-Southeast Asian refugee materials was developed and disseminated in 1985.

- Refugee Employment Services Program Standards Development Project

The Office of Refugee Resettlement supplemented a cooperative agreement, initiated in FY 1984 with the National Governors' Association, for the purpose of assisting in the development and implementation of performance-driven management systems for Refugee Employment Services programs nationwide. The cooperative agreement encompasses three major activities: (1) the convening of an advisory committee and technical work group comprised of State and local refugee program managers to provide guidance to NGA throughout the project period; (2) the holding of formal consultations with the 49 State Refugee Coordinators to discuss both policy and technical aspects of designing and developing performance standards; and (3) the provision of technical assistance and training to States participating in the pilot phase of the project. During the pilot phase implemented in FY 1985, the 34 States that volunteered to participate in the design phase of the project are testing the design of a standardized Glossary of Terms and Service Definitions for use by employment services providers.

National Governors' Association
444 North Capitol Street, N.W.
Suite 250
Washington, D.C. 20001 $177,992

- Technical Assistance by ORR Regional Offices

Three ORR Regional Offices and the ORR Florida Office received a total of $225,992 to implement technical assistance contracts to improve refugee services within the States in those regions.

Program Evaluation

During the reporting period, the Office of Refugee Resettlement continued its program of evaluation and research in order to: Document the characteristics of the program's implementation at the State and local levels, as well as the effects and outcomes of the program for refugees and for States and local communities and institutions; clarify the policy and operational issues of the program; understand the extent and process of refugees' social and economic adjustment; and assess qualitatively specific program services and special projects.

Descriptions of evaluation contracts awarded in FY 1985 follow:

- A Study of the Economic and Social Adjustment of Non-Southeast Asian Refugees in the United States, contracted for $264,404 to Research Management Corporation of Falls Church, Virginia. The purpose of this study is to conduct a community-based, qualitative assessment of the economic and social adjustment status of several non-Southeast Asian refugee communities and to describe their general resettlement experience, the extent to which this differs from or parallels that of Southeast Asian refugees, and the extent to which the program is effectively serving different populations. Because the study will not include a survey of individuals, statistical data similar to what ORR has collected on the Southeast Asian refugee population through the Southeast Asian Refugee Self-Sufficiency Study and through the annual telephone survey will not be available. No survey is involved. Instead the study will provide an interpretative framework for a description of non-Southeast Asian communities and identify the implications of the findings for policy and program implementation.

- Assessment of the MAA Incentive Grant Program, contracted to Lewin and Associates, Inc. of Washington, D.C.; Refugee Policy Group of Washington, D.C.; Berkeley Planning Associates of Berkeley, CA; and American Institutes for Research of Palo Alto, CA, for $99,827. This is part of a "task order" contract. The purpose is to assess the role and effect of funds which have been provided for mutual assistance associations (MAAs) by ORR during the past four years. The objectives of this task are (1) to determine the extent to which the objectives of the funding in support of MAAs have been achieved; (2) to examine the variations in how funds were used and the effects such funding has had on MAAs as participants in the refugee resettlement program; and (3) to study the effect of the provision of these funds on the structure and role of MAAs as community organizations.

- Evaluation of ORR's Discretionary Grant Support for Enhanced Skills Training and Multiple Wage Earners, contracted to Lewin and Associates, Inc., with Refugee Policy Group, Berkeley Planning Associates, and American Institutes for Research. This is a "task order" contract. The task, awarded in FY 1985 for $99,648, is an assessment of the outcomes of ORR's national discretionary grants for two projects funded in FY 1984: (1) Enhanced Skills Training, which provides for skills training, job placement, and post-training assistance to hard-to-place refugees and entrants; and (2) Multiple Wage Earners, which provides social services to underserved refugees and entrants, such as hard-to-place men, women, and youth in large (three or

more members) households, in order to expand the number of wage earners in these households thereby reducing their need for public assistance. The task is (a) to assess the success of specific projects funded in each of the States which received grants; (b) to identify features of successful implementation which could be replicated; and (c) to make recommendations on the appropriateness and effectiveness of these program strategies for the hard-to-place refugee and entrant populations.

The following evaluation study, contracted in FY 1984, remains in progress:

- Evaluation of the Refugee Targeted Assistance Grants Program, contracted to Research Management Corporation for $299,683. This evaluation is being conducted in two phases. The final report from Phase I was completed in FY 1985. In this phase outcome data from programs funded with targeted assistance grants were tabulated and site visits were made to a sample of 28 projects in 13 counties. The focus of the study was (1) to determine the outcomes of the targeted assistance program on refugee self-sufficiency in terms of job placements and job retention and in terms of decreased public assistance use; and (2) to identify programmatic features and other variables which are related to different program outcomes. The report identifies a broad range of propositions based on the relationships documented between program characteristics and outcomes, including features such as planning, staffing, client background, and service characteristics.

The evaluation findings which relate outcomes to program factors and other characteristics are shown below. In all of the analyses which led to the findings, placement outcomes were used as the criteria in placing projects into high, medium, and low outcome categories. The placement criteria included a combination of actual placement rate, percent of program completed at that point, placement earnings, projected market stability of the placements, and relation of placements to the program services.

The major findings are clustered into related themes and considered as propositions for still further testing as follows:

A. Nature of Services

1. The ease and regularity of client access to a broad array of services, either inside or outside the targeted assistance projects (TAPs), is associated with higher outcomes.

2. TAPs which work together in providing cross-agency services or in making appropriate referrals across their networks are associated with higher outcomes.

3. On-the-job training and employment service programs have substantially higher outcomes than do vocational training programs.

4. TAPs which have a staff member whose primary and explicit responsibility is job development have higher outcomes than those which do not.

A-1. Supportive Feature

5. Regular, structured forums for inter-TAP staff communication on substantial matters are associated with higher outcome projects.

B. Planning Features

6. The closer the "fit" (of program duration, resources, and targeted skill levels) of services to particular refugee client background and ability characteristics, the higher the outcomes.

7. Private business/industry involvement through Private Industry Councils or Chamber of Commerce representatives in the planning process is itself not related to outcomes.

8. Refugee involvement in the planning process was almost always present, allowing insufficient variation for a proposition to be formulated.

9. Formal market analyses were so infrequently part of the planning process that insufficient variation existed for a proposition.

C. Staff

C-1. Staff Ethnicity

10. The ethnicity of the TAP coordinator/director is, in itself, not associated with project outcomes.

11. The ethnicity of the job developer is, in itself, not associated with project outcomes.

12. Because program teachers are almost always non-refugee Americans, there is too little variation to formulate a proposition about project outcomes and the ethnic composition of teachers.

13. Almost all staffs had a combination of American and native ethnic members, providing insufficient variation for a proposition about the relationship of ethnic configurations on the staff as a whole to placement outcomes.

C-2. Staff Training and Experience

14. The training and experience of job developers is not related to project outcomes.

15. Having teachers with previous classroom experience is associated with higher project outcomes.

D. Specific Program Activities

16. More extensive followup activity with employers -- such as job site followup contacts, frequent followups, helping solve problems at the site -- is associated with higher outcomes.

17. The extent and formalism of employability development plans are not associated with project outcomes.

18. Projects which utilize curriculum and instructional materials either developed specifically for their projects or at least for refugee populations are associated with higher outcomes.

E. Client Background

19. The employability potential of clients -- in terms of English ability, education level, work experience, or age -- is not related to project outcomes.

20. Projects with larger numbers of AFDC clients with larger families are associated with lower outcomes.

F. Mutual Assistance Associations (MAAs)

21. TAPs housed in MAAs, in general, have lower outcomes than those in non-MAA agencies.

22. The years of experience an MAA has in providing services similar to their TAP services is associated with higher outcomes. This relationship does not hold true for non-MAA TAPs.

23. For MAAs, the ability to carry out administrative and reporting requirements of TAP is associated with higher outcomes.

24. For both MAAs and non-MAAs, the adequacy of human and physical resources is associated with higher outcomes, and this association is even more pronounced for MAAs than for non-MAAs.

25. Whether or not the MAAs are part of a host agency is not associated with outcomes.

G. County Characteristics

26. County unemployment rate is not related to the placement outcomes of TAPs within the county.

Refugee Client Perspectives on Targeted Assistance

Native language discussions with 444 refugee clients of TAPs were also conducted. This revealed that obtaining a job is a primary concern and that many refugees have high expectations, desiring "good" jobs which either pay well, are satisfying, or both. Others are satisfied to take any job as a temporary measure. And a fair proportion of refugees are satisfied to take any job on a permanent basis. A plurality of those who do not have jobs

view their poor English ability and their lack of work experience or skill training as their major barriers to employment. Over two-thirds of the clients expressed satisfaction that the programs met their expectations. For those who were not satisfied with the TAPs, however, the major reason was simply that they did not yet have a job, and they had expected to obtain one as a result of the program.

Several of the major study findings corroborated information from other studies such as the lack of correlation between the county unemployment rate and placements for refugees, the lack of correlation between the employability potential of individuals (English level, experience) and placement, the positive relation between experienced teachers and outcomes, the importance of job developers, and the positive relation between outcomes and access to services and cooperation among service providers.

Phase II of the evaluation, while continuing to track, collate, and analyze the outcome data from all the projects funded, will concentrate on examining in greater detail those programs which are attempting to serve the more difficult-to-serve clients who are caught in, or are in danger of remaining in, a state of long-term dependence. The evaluation will describe how programs are serving this population and with what results in order to inform decisions about how to approach this difficult resettlement issue.

The following evaluation activities were completed in FY 1985:

- Assessment of Program Alternatives: Case Management, a task order under a contact to Lewin and Associates, Inc.; Refugee Policy Group; Berkeley Planning Associates; and American Institutes for Research, for $95,000.

  The objectives of this study were to (1) describe and analyze the various designs and strategies which are employed in current case management approaches; (2) identify potential measures for assessing the outcomes and cost effectiveness of case management models; and (3) develop recommendations on the need for, types of, and alternatives to, case management systems. Project methodology included literature review, intensive interviews with a wide range of public and private officials and with experts on service system management and evaluation, and field investigation in seven States.

  The final report, entitled Unrealized Potential: Case Management in the U.S. Refugee Program, provides a comprehensive and critical appraisal of case management activity. Included are specific observations and recommendations describing (1) a causal model of case management effectiveness (demonstrating that case management can potentially make a difference in outcomes for refugees, but only within limitations imposed by a

series of "intervening variables"); (2) useful functions of case management (summarizing the successful systems observed in the field, and stressing the importance of functions and institutional relationships rather than the general concept of case management); (3) the unfulfilled potential of case management (addressing several weaknesses in existing systems, most of which can and should be remedied); (4) constraints on the effectiveness of case management (showing how some of the shortcomings result as much from systemic constraints in the resettlement system as from programmatic weaknesses); (5) factors contributing to the effectiveness of case management (outlining the components of case management that can make a difference in the success of refugee resettlement); and (6) recommendations for a series of actions that would help case management reach its full potential.

- Study of Refugee Utilization of Public Medical Assistance, contracted for $245,141 to SysteMetrics, Inc., of Santa Barbara, CA, in FY 1983. The major purpose of the study was to provide initial assessment of the patterns in refugee utilization of medical services (including types of service, frequency of service, costs, and conditions for which service was sought), and to compare those patterns with those of the general Medicaid population. Three States -- California, New York, and Tennessee -- were involved in the study. Most of the study data were for 1981 and most data came from an extensive multi-State,

multi-year Medicaid research data set developed by HHS's Health Care Financing Administration (HCFA). Results of the study showed significant differences in health care utilization among refugees eligible for medical assistance in the three States. Tennessee refugees generally had considerably lower utilization rates than refugees in California and New York, and California refugees were somewhat more likely than New York refugees to utilize medical services. For example, the ambulatory care user rate for AFDC child refugees was 89 percent in California vs. 75 percent in New York and only 53 percent in Tennessee.

Available data on diagnoses were analyzed to better understand the major health conditions or problems for which refugees sought medical services in 1981. Diagnosis data were not available for Tennessee in 1981, and they were available in New York for only inpatient hospital, not ambulatory, claims. Generally, the conditions for which refugees were hospitalized in California and New York in 1981 were substantially different. However, these differences seem consistent with the differences in the demographic composition of the refugee population in each State. In general, the refugees in

California tend to be younger that the refugees in New York. The most frequently occurring general diagnostic category for California refugees using inpatient hospital care involved normal childbirth and complications of pregnancy (26 percent of all hospital claims). In New York, the most frequently occurring diagnostic category for hospital care was diseases of the circulatory system, involving 22 percent of all hospital claims. Coronary atherosclerosis and congestive heart failure are specific disease problems falling into this general diagnostic category.

Study findings indicated that refugees utilized fewer Medicaid services and cost less than their cohorts in the general Medicaid population. The table below presents key data comparing time-eligible AFDC refugees and AFDC enrollees in the general Medicaid population in California, New York, and Tennessee. Study data did not include information on the health status of refugees. Therefore, it is impossible to know with certainty whether refugees had fewer health care needs.

Table

Key Data Comparing Time-Eligible AFDC Refugees and AFDC Enrollees in General Medicaid Population in California, New York, and Tennessee, 1981*

	CA		NY		TN	
	Ref.	Gen.	Ref.	Gen.	Ref.	Gen.
	AFDC Child					
Service Utilization						
% Inpatient Hospital Users	3%	7%	3%	10%	7%	10
% Ambulatory Care Users	89%	84%	75%	87%	53%	74%
Inpatient Hospital Days/User	6	7	13	9	6	7
Ambulatory Care Visits/Users	6	6	6	7	5	5
Per Capita Expenditures						
Inpatient Hospital	$117	$241	$114	$249	$101	$126
Ambulatory Care	324	272	233	267	128	182
Long-term Care	0	6	0	11	0	10
Total	$442	$519	$347	$527	$230	$318
	AFDC Adult					
Service Utilization						
% Inpatient Hospital Users	13%	17%	11%	22%	9%	23%
% Ambulatory Care Users	93%	89%	82%	90%	52%	82%
Inpatient Hospital Days/User	7	8	14	8	15	9
Ambulatory Care Visits/User	9	14	10	14	7	7
Per Capita Expenditures						
Inpatient Hospital	$456	$696	$476	$510	$305	$369
Ambulatory Care	631	628	441	541	227	380
Long-Term Care	1	2	0	17	0	0
Total	$1,089	$1,325	$917	$1,067	$532	$749

*Calculated using person-years of Medicaid enrollment and claims data. Expenditure figures may not add to totals due to rounding.

The study findings also show that it can be misleading to think of an "average" refugee receiving medical assistance. In each of the States, a small group of refugees was responsible for most of the medical care utilization and costs. About 10 percent of refugees accounted for 67 to 70 percent of all refugee medical assistance costs in 1981 in each of the study States. In California, for example, the per capita cost for this high-cost group was $4,763 in 1981, compared to $832 for all California refugees. The high-cost refugee group had some consistent characteristics across each of the States: Aged and disabled refugees were always a higher proportion of the high-cost group than they were of the overall refugee population. Across all three States, hospital costs accounted for most of the extraordinary expenses of the high-cost group. For the general Medicaid population, a similar pattern occurred in 1981 for the three study States. This pattern also exists in private health insurance populations.

Data and Data System Development

Maintenance and development of ORR's computerized data system on refugees continued during FY 1985. Information on refugees arriving from all areas of the world is received from several sources and compiled by ORR staff. Records were on file by the end of FY 1985 for approximately 890,000 out of more than one million refugees who have entered the U.S. since 1975. This data system is the source of most of the tabulations presented in Appendix A.

Since November 1982, ORR's Monthly Data Report has covered refugees of all nationalities. This report continues to be distributed to State and local officials by the State Refugee Coordinators, while ORR distributes the report directly to Federal officials and to national offices of voluntary agencies. The monthly report provides information on estimated cumulative State populations of Southeast Asian refugees who have arrived since 1975; States of destination of new refugee arrivals; country of birth, citizenship, age, and sex of newly arriving refugees; and the numbers of new refugee arrivals sponsored by each voluntary resettlement agency. Also, a special set of summary tabulations is produced monthly for each State and mailed to the State Refugee Coordinators for their use. In addition to the same categories of information produced for the national-level report, the State reports include a tabulation of the counties in which refugees are being placed. These reports provide a statistical profile of each State's refugees that can be used in many ways by State and local officials in the administration of the refugee program.

At the time of application to INS for permanent resident alien status, refugees provide information under section 412(a)(8) of the Immigration and Nationality Act. This collection of information is designed to furnish an update on the progress made by refugees during the

one-year waiting period between their arrival in the U.S. and their application for adjustment of status. The data collection instrument focuses on the refugees' migration within the U.S., their current household composition, education and language training before and after arrival, employment history, English language ability, and assistance received. ORR links the new information with the arrival record, creating a longitudinal data file. Work continued during FY 1985 to develop this data file. Findings pertaining to the refugees who adjusted their status during FY 1985 are reported in the "Adjustment of Status" section, pages 117 and 118.

In FY 1985, ORR continued an interagency agreement with the Internal Revenue Service for the tabulation of summary data on incomes earned and Federal taxes paid by refugees who arrived from Southeast Asia between 1975 and 1979. Findings covering the 1982-1983 tax years are presented in the "Economic Adjustment" section, pages 113 through 116. This data series will be continued in future years.

In FY 1985, ORR developed an interagency agreement with the U.S. Bureau of the Census for some special data tabulations on Cambodians, Laotians, and Vietnamese as well as other Asian groups enumerated in the 1980 Census. These tabulations will provide a baseline for assessing the progress of these groups in future years for both pre-1980 and post-1980 arrivals. The Census Bureau plans to publish a special report containing the findings.

KEY FEDERAL ACTIVITIES

Congressional Consultations on Refugee Admissions

Consultations with the Congress on refugee admissions took place in September 1985 as required by the Refugee Act of 1980. After considering Congressional views, President Reagan signed a Presidential Declaration in October 1985, setting a world-wide refugee admissions ceiling for the U.S. at 67,000 for FY 1986. This includes subceilings of 45,500 refugees from East Asia; 9,500 from the Soviet Union and Eastern Europe; 6,000 from the Near East/South Asia; 3,000 from Africa; and 3,000 from Latin America/Caribbean. In addition, the President designated that an additional 5,000 refugee admissions numbers shall be made available for the adjustment to permanent residence status of aliens who have been granted asylum in the United States, since this is justified by humanitarian concern or is otherwise in the national interest.

Reauthorization of the Refugee Act of 1980, as Amended

During FY 1985, the House passed legislation to reauthorize the Refugee Act of 1980 as amended by the Refugee Assistance Amendments of 1982. The Senate, however, did not complete action on the legislation by the close of FY 1985. Funds for the refugee program were appropriated under the Continuing Resolution for FY 1986.

III. REFUGEES IN THE UNITED STATES

POPULATION PROFILE

This section characterizes the refugees in the United States, focusing primarily on those who have entered since 1975. Information is presented on their nationality, age, sex, and geographic distribution. All tables referenced by number appear in Appendix A.

Nationality, Age, and Sex

Southeast Asians continue to be the largest category among recent refugee arrivals, although the number arriving in the United States declined slightly in FY 1985 compared with FY 1984. By the end of the year, approximately 761,000 were in the country. At that time, less than 7 percent had been in the U.S. for under one year, and only 19 percent had been in the country for three years or less. About 39 percent of the Southeast Asians arrived in the U.S. in the FY 1980-1981 period.

Vietnamese remain the majority group among the refugees from Southeast Asia, although the ethnic composition of the entering population has become more diverse over time. In 1975 and most of the subsequent five years, about 90 percent of the arriving Southeast Asian refugees were Vietnamese. Their share of the whole has declined gradually, especially since persons from Cambodia and Laos began to arrive in larger numbers in 1980. No complete enumeration of any refugee population has been carried out since January 1981, the last annual Alien Registration undertaken by the Immigration and Naturalization Service (INS). At that time, 72.3 percent of the Southeast Asians who registered were from Vietnam, 21.3 percent were from Laos, and 6.4 percent were from Cambodia. By the end of FY 1985, the Vietnamese made up 64 percent of the total, while 19 percent were from Laos, and about 17 percent were

from Cambodia. The increasing proportion of arrivals from Cambodia in FY 1985 continued to raise their proportion in the resident population. About 38 percent of the refugees from Laos are from the highlands of that nation and are culturally distinct from the lowland Lao; this percentage remained stable during FY 1985.

The age-sex composition of the Southeast Asian population currently in the U.S. can be described by updating records created at the time of arrival in the U.S. About 55 percent of these refugees are males; 45 percent are females. The population remains young compared with the total U.S. population because the gradual aging of the population that arrived beginning in 1975 is partially offset by the very young age structure of the newer arrivals. At the close of FY 1985, the median age of the resident population was 24.6, without a significant age difference between men and women. Approximately 4 percent of the refugees were preschoolers in late 1985; but this figure does not include children born in the U.S. to refugee families, and the actual proportion of young children in Southeast Asian families in the U.S. is known to be considerably larger. The school age population (6-17) of refugee children is about 28 percent of the total, and an additional 19 percent are young adults aged 18-24. A total of 55 percent of the population are adults in the principal working ages (18-44). About 2.8 percent, or roughly 21,000 people, are aged 65 or older.

While the Southeast Asians predominate among refugee arrivals since 1975, the Cubans remain the largest of the refugee groups admitted since World War II. Most of them entered in the 1960's and are well established in the United States. Many have become citizens. Since

1975, fewer than 40,000 Cuban refugees have arrived, which is less than 5 percent of all the Cuban refugees in the country.* Information on the age-sex composition of this refugee population is not available.

Approximately 104,000 Soviet refugees arrived in the United States between 1975 and 1985; the peak years were 1979 and 1980. Only Jews and Armenians have been permitted to emigrate by the Soviet authorities, ostensibly for reunification with their relatives in Western nations. Men and women are about equally represented in the Soviet refugee population. This is the oldest of the refugee groups: On the average Soviet refugees are approximately 40 years of age, and at least 15 percent are in their sixties or older.

Many other refugee groups of much smaller size have arrived in the United States since the enactment of the Refugee Act of 1980. Polish refugees admitted under the Refugee Act number 22,000, with the largest numbers arriving in 1980 and 1981. More than 20,000 Romanian refugees have entered since April 1, 1980, along with more than 5,000 refugees from Czechoslovakia and lesser numbers from the other Eastern European nations. By the end of FY 1985, the refugee populations from Afghanistan and Ethiopia were both in excess of 15,000. Nearly 8,000 Iranians and more than 6,000 Iraqis have entered the United States in refugee status. Exact figures on the numbers of persons granted refugee status since April 1, 1980, are presented in Table 7.

---

* This discussion does not include the 125,000 Cubans designated as "entrants" who arrived during the 1980 boatlift.

Geographic Location and Movement

Southeast Asian refugees have settled in every State and several territories of the United States. Large residential concentrations can be found in a number of West Coast cities and in Texas, as well as in several East Coast and Midwestern cities. Migration to California continued to affect refugee population distribution during FY 1985, but at the same time several States in other areas of the U.S. experienced significant growth due to both secondary migration and initial placements of refugees.

Because the INS Alien Registration of January 1981 was the most recent relatively complete enumeration of the resident refugee population, it was the starting point for the current estimate of their geographic distribution. (These 1981 data appeared in the ORR Report to the Congress for FY 1982.) The baseline figures as of January 1981 were increased by the known resettlements of new refugees between January 1981 and September 1985, and the resulting totals were adjusted for secondary migration, using new data presented below. The estimates of the current geographic distribution of the Southeast Asian refugee population derived in this manner are presented in Table 9.

At the close of FY 1985, the 14 States with the largest estimated populations of Southeast Asian refugees were:

State	Number	Percent
California	303,100	39.8%
Texas	57,200	7.5
Washington	34,300	4.5
New York	28,600	3.8
Pennsylvania	25,400	3.3
Illinois	25,300	3.3
Minnesota	24,100	3.2
Massachusetts	22,500	3.0
Virginia	20,700	2.7
Oregon	17,400	2.3
Louisiana	14,100	1.8
Florida	12,700	1.7
Colorado	10,500	1.4
Michigan	10,400	1.4
TOTAL	606,300	79.7%
Other	154,600	20.3%
TOTAL	760,900	100.0%

Of these 14 States, the top 13 were also the top 13 States in terms of Southeast Asian population one year previously, at the close of FY 1984. Michigan regained 14th place, replacing Wisconsin. California, Texas, and Washington have held the top three positions since 1980. Only one change took place in the rank order of these 13 States during FY 1985: Massachusetts replaced Virginia in eighth place, due both to a large number of initial resettlements and to substantial secondary migration. After the top three States, the next six all have between 20,000 and 30,000 refugees. The proportion of Southeast Asian refugees living in California is now estimated at 39.8 percent, a small decline from the estimated 40.1 percent of one year earlier. California has continued to grow significantly through secondary migration, since it again in FY 1985 received a lower share of initial placements than its

share of the total population, but the pace of migration to California seems to have slowed somewhat. Texas and New York, as well as Massachusetts, are estimated to have increased their share of the refugee population by small fractions, growing through secondary migration and new arrivals. Pennsylvania, Washington, Virginia, and Louisiana grew more slowly than would have been expected, due to out-migration partially offsetting new arrivals, and their share of the estimated refugee population dropped accordingly; the changes were on the order of one-tenth of a percentage point. The refugee populations of most States grew slightly or remained relatively stable during FY 1985.

A number of explanations for secondary migration by refugees have been suggested: Employment opportunities, the pull of an established ethnic community, more generous welfare benefits, better training opportunities, reunification with relatives, or a congenial climate.

The adjustment of State population estimates for secondary migration through September 30, 1985, was accomplished through the use of the Refugee State-of-Origin Report. In the Refugee Assistance Amendments of 1982, the Congress added specific language to the Refugee Act, directing ORR to compile and maintain data on the secondary migration of refugees within the United States. ORR developed the Refugee State-of-Origin Report and the current method of estimating secondary migration in 1983 in response to this directive.

The method of estimating secondary migration is based on the first three digits of social security numbers, which are assigned geographically in blocks by State. Almost all arriving refugees apply for social security numbers immediately upon arrival in the United States, with the assistance of their sponsors. Therefore, the first

three digits of a refugee's social security number are a good indicator of his/her initial State of residence in the U.S. (The current system replaced an earlier program in which blocks of social security numbers were assigned to Southeast Asian refugees during processing before they arrived in the U.S. The block of numbers reserved for Guam was used in that program, which ended in late 1979.) If a refugee currently residing in California has a social security number assigned in Nevada, for example, the method treats that person as having moved from initial resettlement in Nevada to current residence in California.

States participating in the refugee program reported to ORR a summary tabulation of the first three digits of the social security numbers of the refugees currently receiving assistance or services in their programs as of June 30, 1985. The report will continue to be submitted annually. Most States chose to report tabulations of refugees participating in their cash and medical assistance programs, in which the social security numbers are already part of the refugee's record. Ten States were able to add information on persons receiving only social services and not covered by cash/medical reporting systems. The reports received covered approximately 58 percent of the refugee population of less than three years' residence in the U.S.

Compilation of the tabulations submitted by all reporting States results in a 53x53 State (and territory) matrix, which contains information on migration from each State to every other State. In effect, State A's report shows how many people have migrated in from other States, as well as how many people who were initially placed in State A are currently there. The reports from every other State, when combined, show how many people have left State A. The fact that the reports are based on current assistance or service populations means, of course, that coverage does not extend to all refugees who have entered

since 1975. However, the bias of this method is toward refugees who have entered in the past three years, the portion of the refugee population of greatest concern to ORR. Available information also indicates that much of the secondary migration of refugees takes place during their first few years of residence in the U.S., and that the refugee population becomes relatively stabilized in its geographic distribution after an initial adjustment period. The matrix of all possible pairs of in- and out-migration between States can be summarized into total in- and out-migration figures reported for each State, and these findings are presented in Table 10.

The Refugee State-of-Origin Reports summarized in Table 10 contained information on a total of 117,031 refugees, 58 percent of the refugee population whose residence in the U.S. was less than three years as of the reporting date. Of these refugees, 77 percent were still living in the State in which they were resettled initially. The reported interstate migrants numbered 27,158. Of this migration, 53.5 percent, representing 14,533 people, was into California from other States. No other State received in-migration approaching the scale of California's. However, California's dominance of refugees' secondary migration was somewhat reduced from the findings of earlier years. Texas was the second favored destination, attracting 2,227 people or 8.2 percent of the total reported migration. New York State, Massachusetts, and Maryland each attracted more than 1,000 in-migrants. Almost every State experienced both gains and losses through secondary migration. On balance, however, only six States (Alabama, Arkansas, California, Maryland, Massachusetts, and Wisconsin) gained net population through secondary migration. The States losing the most people through out-migration were Texas, California, New York, Illinois, Washington, and the District of Columbia; but since they were among the States with the

largest numbers of resettlements during the past few years, they contained the largest number of potential out-migrants. Texas experienced the most out-migration of any State, losing 3,697 people, and was the source of 13.6 percent of the reported out-migration. Examination of the detailed State-by-State matrix showed two major migration patterns: A movement into California from all other parts of the U.S., and a substantial amount of population exchange between contiguous or geographically close States. The first pattern is consistent with the historical pattern of migration by the refugees from Southeast Asia, and the second is predictable from general theories of migration.*

---

* Explanatory Note: The reported interstate migration figures shown in Table 10 were used to calculate rates of in-migration and out-migration for each State. The base population was taken to be the total resettlements in each State during the FY 1983, 1984, and 1985 period, since almost all of the reported migration pertains to this population. State A's in-migration rate was calculated by dividing its reported in-migrants by the total number of placements in all States except State A during the three-year period, while its out-migration rate was calculated by dividing the total out-migrants from State A by the total number of placements in State A during the three-year period. The migration rates calculated in this manner were then applied to the appropriate base populations, in order to calculate the revised population estimates.

In order to correct for reporting problems in several States and as a check against the accuracy of the estimates derived as explained above, ORR compared them with the most recent alternative available data on the distribution of the refugee population -- namely, the U.S. Department of Education's refugee child count of March 1985. That enumeration of refugee children was converted into a percentage distribution by State. This was compared with the percentage distribution calculated from the tentative ORR State refugee population estimates. Where the Education (ED) percentage distribution differed from the ORR percentage distribution by more than one-tenth of one percent (0.1 percent), this was interpreted as

an indication of secondary migration requiring an adjustment in the ORR population estimate. The adjustment was made by calculating the mean of the two percentage distributions and taking that figure as the revised State share of the total. (Example: ORR percentage 4.13 percent; ED percentage 4.37 percent; mean 4.25 percent, which becomes the revised ORR estimate. However, the revisions were held to no closer than 0.1 percent to the ED percentage. If the ORR percentage was 4.13 percent and the ED percentage was 4.30 percent, the revision was 4.20 percent.) The adjusted percentage was then applied to the total refugee population, yielding a revised State population estimate. The population estimates for 22 States were adjusted in this way. Finally, small adjustments in the estimated refugee populations of several States were made based on information about recent migration flows documented by local or State officials that would not have been reflected in the existing data bases. The method used does not consider deaths or emigration, which are statistically rare among this population, or births of U.S. citizen children to refugee families.

ECONOMIC ADJUSTMENT

Overview

The Refugee Act of 1980 and the Refugee Assistance Amendments of 1982 both stress the achievement of economic self-sufficiency by refugees soon after their arrival in the United States. The achievement of economic self-sufficiency involves a balance among three elements: The employment potential of the refugees, including their skills, education, English language competence, health, and desire for work; the needs that they as individuals and members of families have for financial resources, whether for food, housing, or child-rearing; and the economic environment in which they settle, including the availability of jobs, housing, and other harder-to-measure resources.

The economic adjustment of refugees to the United States has historically been a successful and generally rapid process. Naturally, a variety of factors can influence the speed and extent of refugees' striving toward economic self-sufficiency. Refugees often experience significant difficulties in reaching the United States and may arrive with problems, such as personal health conditions, that require attention before the refugee can find work. Some refugees, for reasons of age or family responsibilities, cannot reasonably be expected to find work. The general state of the American economy also influences on this process. When jobs are not readily available, refugees -- even more than the general American population -- may be unable to find employment quickly even if they are relatively skilled and actively seek work. Household size and composition are also important, influencing the degree to which minimum wage jobs meet the requirements of families that can include several dependent children as well as dependent adults.

While the general pattern of refugee economic adjustment appears positive, a number of aspects, including both the characteristics of arriving refugees and changes in the American economy during the last few years, suggest that the adjustment process has been more complex and uneven than had previously been expected.

Current Employment Status of Southeast Asian Refugees

In 1985, ORR completed its 14th survey of a national sample of Southeast Asian refugees, with data collected by Opportunity Systems, Inc. The sample included Southeast Asian refugees arriving from May 1980 through April 1985 and is the most recent and comprehensive data available on the economic adjustment of these refugees. Unlike previous annual surveys, the 1985 survey and planned future surveys include only those refugees who have arrived in the U.S. during a five-year period ending five months before the time of interviewing. In addition, ORR has converted the annual survey to a longitudinal survey, beginning with the 1984 interviews: Each year those refugees who have been in the U.S. five years or less and who were sampled in 1983 or subsequently are again included in the sample. Refugees who arrived since the previous year's survey are sampled and added to the total survey population each year. Thus, the survey continuously tracks the progress of a randomly sampled group of refugees over their initial five years in this country. This not only permits comparison of refugees arriving in different years, but also allows assessment of the relative influence of experiential and environmental factors on refugee progress toward self sufficiency.*

---

* A technical description of the survey can be found on pages 109 and 110, following the text of this section.

As a result of this change in the annual survey sampling design, the 1985 survey results appear in some cases inconsistent with trends established over previous years. This is because the sample no longer contains refugees who arrived in the U.S. prior to May 1980, although some sampled refugees are members of households which contain refugees who arrived earlier. Figures in this report which present current year and previous year survey results -- for example, labor force participation and unemployment rates -- also show the influence of removing the early arrivals from the sample. The remaining parts of this section deal with the findings of this survey, conducted in September and October 1985, which included 1,056 refugee households.

Results of the survey indicate a labor force participation rate of 44 percent for those in the sample aged 16 years and older as compared with 65 percent for the U.S. population as a whole. Of those in the labor force -- that is, those working or seeking work -- approximately 83 percent were employed as compared with 93 percent for the U.S. population. Overall refugee labor force participation was thus somewhat lower than for the general United States population, and the unemployment rate was higher.

These comparisons with the United States population are affected by the inclusion of numerous Southeast Asian refugees who have been in the country for only a short time and the exclusion from the sample of refugees who arrived before May 1980. When employment status is considered separately by year of entry, the results indicate the relative success of earlier arrivals and the relative difficulties faced by more recent arrivals. Refugees arriving in 1985 had a labor force

participation rate of 28 percent and an unemployment rate of 50 percent; those who had arrived in 1984 had a labor force participation rate of 42 percent and an unemployment rate of 36 percent. However, refugees who had arrived in 1980 have participated in the labor force at a stable rate of about 56 percent over the past three years and have an unemployment rate of about 18 percent this year.

A comparison of data from ORR's 1985 and three previous annual surveys illustrates refugee labor force participation rate trends over time. Thirty percent of 1984 arrivals were in the labor force in October 1984, but this figure rose to 42 percent in the October 1985 survey. Generally, annual cohorts have a labor force participation rate in the 20-30 percent range during their initial year and this figure rises to the 40-55 percent range in subsequent years. For the total Southeast Asian refugee population, labor force participation has remained virtually the same over the past few years -- 56 percent in 1982 and 55 percent in 1983 and 1984, but dropping 10 points to 44 percent in 1985, largely due to the survey changes mentioned above.

The data on unemployment rates indicate the progress of refugees in finding and retaining jobs. In October 1982, Southeast Asian refugees had an overall unemployment rate of 24 percent; by the October 1983 survey this figure had dropped to 18 percent, and the October 1984 survey showed a further drop in refugee unemployment to 15 percent. The 1985 survey, even excluding the 1975-1979 arrivals who were taken into account

in previous samples, produced an unemployment rate of 17 percent. Economic adjustment over time is observable when examined by year of entry. For 1983 arrivals, unemployment decreased from 55 percent in 1983 to 36 percent in 1984 and to 17 percent in 1985; for 1984 arrivals, it decreased from 41 percent in 1984 to 36 percent in 1985.

Current Employment Status of Southeast Asian Refugees

Year of Entry	Labor Force Participation (Percent)				Unemployment (Percent)				1985 Response Rate*
	In 1982	In 1983	In 1984	In 1985	In 1982	In 1983	In 1984	In 1985	
1985	--	--	--	28	--	--	--	50	82
1984	--	--	30	42	--	--	41	36	82
1983	--	21	42	41	--	55	36	17	78
1982	25	41	45	45	62	30	12	16	59
1981	42	46	51	46	41	17	16	12	61
1980	51	55	54	56	32	21	12	18	62
Total Sample**	56	55	55	44	24	18	15	17	66
U.S. rates***	64	64	65	65	10	8	7	7	--

* Proportion of original sample of 1,589 successfully located and interviewed, by year of entry. The total number interviewed, 1,056, was 66 percent of the original sample. See Technical Note, page 109.

** In 1982-1984 this sample included refugees who arrived since 1975. In 1985 this sample included only refugees who arrived from 1980-1985.

*** October unadjusted figures from the Bureau of Labor Statistics, Department of Labor.

The kinds of jobs that refugees find in the United States are often different in type and socio-economic status from those they held in their country of origin. For example, 39 percent of the employed adults sampled had held white collar jobs in their country of origin; 16 percent hold similar jobs in the United States. Conversely, far more Southeast Asian refugees hold blue collar or service jobs in the U.S. than they did in their countries of origin. The survey data indicate, for example, a tripling of those in service occupations and a quadrupling of those in semi-skilled blue collar occupations.

Current and Previous Occupational Status

Occupation	In Country of Origin	In U.S.
Professional/Managerial	10.2%	2.6%
Sales/Clerical	28.5%	13.8%
(TOTAL WHITE COLLAR)	(38.7%)	(16.4%)
Skilled	13.1%	19.9%
Semi-skilled	6.1%	27.8%
Laborers	1.3%	13.6%
(TOTAL BLUE COLLAR)	(20.5%)	(61.3%)
Service workers	5.8%	21.2%
Farmers and fishers	35.0%	1.1%

Factors Affecting Employment Status

The ability of Southeast Asian refugees to seek and find employment in the United States is influenced by many factors. Some of these involve individual decisions about whether to seek work. As in previous surveys, respondents who were not in the labor force were asked why they were not seeking work. The reasons they gave varied by age and sex, but focused on the demands of family life, health problems, and decisions to gain training and education preparatory to entering the job market.

For those under the age of 25, the pursuit of education was the overriding concern. For those between the ages of 25 and 44, family needs also became a major concern, and for those over the age of 44, health problems predominated as a reason for not seeking work. These factors have continued to be seen as more important, relative to other factors, as reasons for not seeking work for these age groups.

Reasons for Not Seeking Employment*

	Percent Citing:				
Age Group	Limited English	Education	Family Needs	Health	Other
16-24	6.1%	83.1%	3.9%	1.7%	5.2%
25-34	11.6%	33.9%	35.2%	5.0%	14.3%
35-44	18.3%	24.6%	35.2%	7.7%	14.2%
Over 44	17.2%	9.2%	8.7%	43.5%	21.4%

* The total of those not seeking work for the reasons cited above equals 100 percent for each age group when added across.

One background characteristic that influences refugee involvement in the labor force is English language competence. As has been found in previous surveys, English proficiency affects labor force participation, unemployment rates, and earnings. For those refugees in the sample who were fluent in English, the labor force participation rate was similar to that for the overall United States population. Refugees who spoke no English, however, had a labor force participation rate of only 15 percent and an unemployment rate of 41 percent.

Effects of English Language Proficiency

Ability to Speak and Understand English	Labor Force Participation	Unemployment	Average Weekly Wages*
Not at all	14.6%	41.4%	$187.49
A little	41.6%	19.0%	$200.74
Well	53.3%	13.0%	$218.67
Fluently	62.3%	20.2%	$243.39

* Of surveyed refugees 16 years of age and above who were employed.

Achieving Economic Self-sufficiency

The achievement of economic self-sufficiency hinges on the mixture of refugee skills, refugee needs, job opportunities, and the resources available in the communities in which refugees resettle. The occupational and educational skills that refugees bring with them to the United States influence their prospects for self-sufficiency. Data from the 1985 survey indicate two basic points about the characteristics of Southeast Asian refugees at the time of their arrival: First, there is little difference in educational level between 1980 and later arrivals, averaging about five to six years for each cohort. Second, there appear to have been more refugees with no English language competence at arrival in the earlier years and increasing proportions with some English since then. The percent of 1985 arrivals with no English speaking ability at all was only 40 percent, virtually the same level as that indicated by the 1975 cohort in last year's survey. Recent increases in English language skill among newer arrivals at time of entry may reflect the provision of ESL training in refugee processing centers overseas.

Background Characteristics at Time of Arrival by Year of Entry

for Refugees 16 Years of Age or Over

Year of Entry	Average Years of Education	Percent Speaking No English	Percent Speaking English Well or Fluently
1985	4.9	40.1%	4.9%
1984	5.2	41.5%	5.1%
1983	5.7	45.9%	5.6%
1982	6.0	48.3%	5.4%
1981	6.2	57.1%	4.3%
1980	6.0	65.1%	4.9%

Note: These figures refer to characteristics of incoming refugees at time of arrival in the United States and should not be confused with the current characteristics of these refugees. All figures are based on responses of refugees 16 years and older at the time of the 1985 survey.

Based on the survey findings, a series of aggregate characteristics of refugees were computed separately for differing lengths of residence in the U.S. (These figures are detailed in the table on page 111.) The figures tend to show the same general trends over time as in previous surveys of increasing labor force participation, decreasing unemployment, and increasing weekly income. However, while weekly income of employed

persons shows a consistent increase for each time period, labor force participation is lower for the 31-60 month cohorts than for some more recently arrived cohorts, and unemployment is higher for the 25-60 month cohorts than for the more recent cohorts. These patterns differ from those found in earlier surveys.

Another pattern that differs is the percent living in households receiving cash assistance: Previous surveys have shown much higher percentages among refugees who have been in the U.S. less than 12 months, with greater reductions over time. The present survey shows lower initial receipt of cash assistance and a less consistent downward trend over time. One factor, of course, with respect to the longer term residents has been the exclusion from the 1985 survey of the over-60-month cohorts.

The reasons for the different patterns found in the 1985 survey are not immediately evident. Since part of the survey sample now includes a longitudinal panel who will be interviewed for several years, further analysis and comparison with 1986 findings may help to shed light on the differences that have been observed.

Working toward economic self-sufficiency is one part of a refugee's overall process of adjustment to the United States. But the achievement of economic self-sufficiency is complicated. An examination of the differences between refugee households that are receiving cash assistance and those not receiving cash assistance highlights some of the difficulties. Two factors deserve attention: First, cash assistance receipient households are notably larger than those not receiving assistance. The average size of recipient households in the 1985 survey was 5.7 individuals, compared to 3.8 individuals in households not receiving any public assistance. Second, recipient households have, on average, fewer wage earners. Households not receiving public assistance have an average of 2.4 wage earners as opposed to an average of 1.6 for households receiving such assistance. These figures illustrate the importance of multiple wage earners within a refugee household in generating sufficient income to be economically self-supporting.

Overall, findings from ORR's 1985 survey indicate, as in previous years, that refugees face significant problems on arrival in the United States, but that over time refugees increasingly seek and find jobs, and move toward economic self-sufficiency in their new country. This most recent survey continues to show the importance of English language competence to refugee economic progress and the frequency with which refugees seek English language training.

Technical Note: The ORR Annual Survey, with interviews held between September 13 and November 2, 1985, was the 14th in a series conducted since 1975. It was designed to be representative of Southeast Asians who arrived as refugees between May 1, 1980, and April 30, 1985, the cutoff date for inclusion in the sample. The sampling frame used was the ORR Master Data File for persons arriving from May 1980 through April 1985. A simple random sample was drawn. Initial contact was made by a letter in English and the refugee's native language, introducing the survey. If

the person sampled was a child, an adult living in the same household was interviewed. Interviews were conducted by telephone in the refugee's native language by the staff of ORR's contractor, Opportunity Systems, Inc. The questionnaire and procedures used have been essentially the same since the 1981 survey, except that this year the sample was limited to refugees who arrived over the most recent five years.

The 1985 sample included 1,589 persons, of whom 1,184 were first selected in 1983, 200 in 1984, and 205 in 1985. A total of 1,056 interviews were completed, or 66 percent of the full sample.

Of the 779 refugees sampled in 1983 or 1984 and interviewed in 1984, 712 (91 percent) were interviewed again in 1985. In addition, 175 refugees from the 1983-1984 samples who were not interviewed in 1984 were located and interviewed in 1985. Of the 205 refugees first sampled in 1985, 169 (82 percent) were interviewed.

Patterns in the Adjustment of Southeast Asian Refugees Age 16 and Over

Length of Residence in Months

	0-6	7-12	13-18	19-24	25-30	31-36	37-60
Labor force participation	24.7%	38.5%	40.6%	41.9%	45.5%	42.9%	41.6%
Unemployment	42.5%	24.4%	13.3%	12.2%	15.1%	18.7%	16.4%
Weekly income of employed persons	$161.72	$170.18	$171.47	$185.15	$191.30	$208.56	$243.09
Percent in English training	38.3%	25.8%	23.7%	17.1%	19.7%	15.2%	34.8%
Percent in other training or schooling	29.0%	31.5%	27.4%	31.6%	35.6%	34.1%	19.6%
Percent speaking English well or fluently	28.2%	33.8%	37.4%	42.7%	46.5%	43.8%	34.2%
Percent speaking no English	14.6%	13.3%	13.2%	13.7%	7.8%	10.0%	13.6%
Percent in households receiving cash assistance*	61.4%	49.2%	54.5%	62.8%	56.3%	51.4%	50.3%

* This item includes refugees of all ages.

Characteristics of Households Containing Cash Assistance and Households Containing No Cash Assistance Recipients

	Households With Recipients	Households With No Recipients
Average household size	5.7	3.8
Average number of wage-earners per household	1.6	2.4
Percent of household members:		
Under the age of 6	26.4	31.6
Under the age of 16	50.0	46.3
Percent of households with at least one fluent English speaker	2.4	5.0
Percent of sampled households	56.6	43.4

Incomes of Southeast Asian Refugees

Through an interagency agreement with the Internal Revenue Service (IRS), ORR is obtaining yearly summary data on the incomes received and taxes paid by Southeast Asian refugees who arrived in the United States from 1975 through late 1979.* Tabulation of aggregated data on this group of refugees by IRS is possible because they were issued social security numbers in blocks through a special program in effect during that time. Data have been tabulated for tax years 1980 through 1983, and ORR expects to continue this data series in future years.

Some information is presented in a way that differentiates the 1975 arrival cohort from the cohort that arrived during 1976-1979. The distinction is of interest because the characteristics of the two cohorts differ substantially. The 1975 cohort numbered about 130,000 people, of whom 125,000 were Vietnamese. The 1976-1979 cohort is ethnically more heterogeneous, with about 60,000 Vietnamese, 49,000 Lao (of whom a significant proportion were Hmong), and 9,000 Cambodians. Of these 118,000 persons, 81,000 arrived in 1979, so on average this group was almost four years behind the 1975 cohort.

"Household" Income and Tax Liability

The first data are compiled from forms in the 1040 series.** They

---

* Tax information is maintained in confidence by the IRS; ORR receives only aggregate data.

** The IRS has advised ORR that the data compiled from the 1040 series in FY 1984 covering tax years 1980-1982 contained errors. The records were selected in a way that overstated the number of refugee households in the lowest income category. Therefore, median incomes were higher than previously reported. The IRS has revised the 1982 tabulations, which are summarized here. Data presented this year do not constitute a valid time series with data presented last year.

pertain to tax filing units, which are roughly equivalent to households but smaller on average, since household members may file separate returns.

Between 1982 and 1983, total income received by this group of refugees increased. In the aggregate, these refugees had more than one billion dollars in income annually:

Incomes Received (in Millions) by Southeast Asian Refugees, 1982-1983*

Tax Year	All Cohorts	1975 Arrivals	1976-79 Arrivals
1982	$1,031	$824	$207
1983	$1,127	$890	$237

From 1982 to 1983, the adjusted gross incomes of tax filing units increased. The 1976-1979 cohort continued to earn about $5,000 less on average than the 1975 cohort, but its income improved more rapidly from a lower base. The median income of the 1975 cohort was within $1,000 of that of all U.S. tax filing units.

Median Adjusted Gross Income of Tax Filing Units, Southeast Asian Refugees, 1982-1983*

Tax Year	All Cohorts	1975 Arrivals	1976-79 Arrivals	Ratio, 75/76-79	All U.S. Tax Units**
1982	$11,941	$13,962	$8,709	1.60	$14-15,000
1983	$12,637	$14,533	$9,562	1.52	$15-16,000

* Refugees who arrived from 1975 through late 1979.

** The IRS provides this comparative data as a range.

The proportion of tax returns filed showing incomes high enough to result in a tax liability increased, and the disparity between the earlier and later cohorts narrowed. The Southeast Asian refugees who arrived between 1975 and 1979, who comprise about 29 percent of all refugees admitted between 1975 and 1983, were paying nearly $100 million yearly in Federal income taxes.

Percent of Refugee Tax Returns Showing Tax Liability

Tax Year	All Cohorts	1975 Arrivals	1976-79 Arrivals	Total Tax Liability (millions)
1982	76.4%	78.8%	70.4%	$97.8
1983	77.1%	78.7%	73.4%	$99.2

These tax filing unit data show that, despite an increase over this time period, median refugee incomes remained below those of other residents. However, the upward trend provides a basis for optimism about future incomes. Refugees as taxpayers are making a substantial contribution to the U.S. economy.

Individual Incomes and Sources

Data on individual incomes are based on forms in the W-2 series. They tend to overstate numbers of persons covered, since some people work for more than one employer during a year. For the same reason, earnings per person tend to be understated.

During the 1980-1983 period, aggregate income earned by these Southeast Asian refugees from wages increased steadily. Income from pensions and interest income increased quite rapidly, while income from dividends fluctuated around an upward trend:

Income (in 1000's) From:

Tax Year	Wages	Pensions	Dividends	Interest
1980	$ 766,816	$ 895	$ 167	$ 7,328
1981	992,369	1,171	629	12,188
1982	1,010,881	1,677	1,135	18,620
1983	1,112,319	3,578	894	23,368

The incomes of individuals, as reflected on their W-2 forms, improved:

Percent of High and Low W-2 Forms, Refugee Wage Earners

Tax Year	Percent of W-2's under $5,000	Percent of W-2's over $25,000
1980	41.0%	2.4%
1981	36.8	4.7
1982	37.4	5.7
1983	36.3	7.6

Insured unemployment rose from 1980 to 1982, showing the negative effect of the 1982 economic slowdown on the refugee population, but also indicating that an increasing number of refugees had been working in positions covered by unemployment compensation. In 1983, fewer refugees received unemployment compensation than in 1982, reflecting improving economic conditions. As a whole, the data from both tax filing units and individuals show broader participation by refugees over time in the U.S. economy.

REFUGEE ADJUSTMENT OF STATUS AND CITIZENSHIP

Adjustment of Status

Most refugees in the United States become eligible to adjust their immigration status to that of permanent resident alien after a waiting period of one year in the country. This provision, section 209 of the Immigration and Nationality Act as amended by the Refugee Act of 1980, applies to refugees of all nationalities. During FY 1985, 71,820 refugees adjusted their immigration status under this provision.

In addition, laws predating the Refugee Act provide for other groups of refugees (who entered the U.S. prior to enactment of the Refugee Act) to become permament resident aliens after waiting periods of various lengths. In FY 1985, only 166 Southeast Asians adjusted their status under legislation pertaining specifically to them. This figure represents a 96 percent drop from the 4,298 who adjusted status under the same provision in FY 1984. In all, 229,676 Southeast Asians have become permanent resident aliens through this route since FY 1978, the first year that legislation was in effect. This represents about 69 percent of the Southeast Asian refugees who entered before the Refugee Act of 1980 was enacted. The number of Cubans adjusting status under the Cuban Refugee Adjustment Act of 1966 was 14,288 in FY 1985. This figure includes both refugees and entrants, who were permitted to adjust status under this Act beginning in 1985. Refugees from other nations are able to become permanent resident aliens after a two-year waiting period under P.L. 95-412 (legislation amending sections 201(a), 202(c), and 203(a) of the Immigration and Nationality Act and for other purposes), which took effect October 5, 1978. Data from the Immigration and Naturalization Service indicate that 3,766 persons adjusted status under that law during FY 1985. (All figures cited in this section are tentative, as reported by INS. Official final figures have not been published.)

The Refugee Act also provides for the adjustment of status of a maximum of 5,000 aliens who have been granted political asylum and who have resided in the U.S. for at least one year after that. Tentative data for FY 1985 indicate that the maximum of 5,000 political asylees were granted permanent resident alien status during the year. This represents the second consecutive year in which the maximum number was reached.

Citizenship

When refugees admitted under the Refugee Act of 1980 become permanent resident aliens, their official date of admission to the United States is established as the date on which they first arrived in the U.S. as refugees. After a waiting period of at least five years from that date, applications for naturalization are accepted from permanent resident aliens, provided that they have resided continuously in the U.S. and have met certain other requirements. The number of former refugees who have actually received citizenship lags behind the number who have become eligible at any time, since a substantial amount of time is necessary to complete the process.

Data are not compiled on the number of naturalizations of former refugees as a distinct category of permanent resident aliens. However, since almost all permanent resident aliens from Cambodia, Laos, and Vietnam arrived as refugees, a calculation of their naturalization rate can be made. The 1975 cohort of refugees first became eligible in 1980. From 1980 through 1983, the most recent year for which data are available, approximately 35,000 former Southeast Asian refugees became U.S. citizens. This represents about 20 percent of those eligible for naturalization by the close of FY 1983.

IV. REFUGEE RESETTLEMENT IN PERSPECTIVE

In this section, the Director of the Office of Refugee Resettlement (ORR) discusses his plans to improve the refugee program.*

Refugee Admissions Levels

A principal responsibility of the Office of Refugee Resettlement (ORR) is to assist refugees in becoming self-sufficient at the earliest date possible following their arrival to this country. States are reimbursed for the costs incurred in providing cash and medical assistance to refugees who have been here three years or less. Under a separate grant, States are awarded funds to support a broad range of social services critical to a refugee's adjustment in a new homeland and to help a refugee develop the basic skills and knowledge necessary to provide for the economic security of the individual or family.

ORR does not anticipate a problem in providing for the needs of those refugees admitted at the ceiling of 67,000, set by the Administration for the coming fiscal year 1986, or of those refugees who have been in this country three years or less. ORR's budget request is also sufficient to enable services to be provided to refugees who, for various reasons, require additional help in order to become employed and to overcome the difficulties of adjustment.

---

* Updated from testimony presented to the Senate and House Judiciary Committee by Phillip N. Hawkes, Director of ORR, as part of the Congressional Consultations on proposed refugee admissions for FY 1986.

The following sections provide a brief assessment of the refugee resettlement program by way of discussing current welfare dependency rates, the accomplishments or interim results of ongoing program efforts, and the highlights of new initiatives.

Welfare Dependency Rates

At the end of fiscal year 1985, 55.5 percent of the nation's time-eligible refugee/entrant population were receiving cash assistance. An estimated 53.5 percent of the cash assistance caseload is in the State of California. The fact that California alone accounts for 40 percent of the nation's Southeast Asian refugee population may explain the high national rate of refugee cash assistance receipt.

The AFDC program contains certain disincentives to refugee employment. For example, refugee families are usually larger than non-refugee families on public assistance and they often live together in extended family households. The total income from the cash assistance payments often exceeds the income that could be earned in entry-level, low-skilled employment. Individuals on AFDC are not required to give up their benefits to accept jobs if these jobs pay less than the family's total AFDC grant. Furthermore, job training programs available to AFDC recipients are not designed to overcome the cultural and language barriers or to meet the special employment training needs which most refugees have. Another reason for California's high welfare dependency rate is the fact that the State has an AFDC grant level 65 percent higher than the national average. These disincentives are being addressed by the State of California through the recent implementation of a major demonstration project which is described later.

Fiscal year 1985 will be viewed in retrospect as a year of significant innovation in the refugee program, and substantial progress has been made in the implementation of new initiatives.

On-Going Program Efforts

- State Social Service Program Requirements

As part of the State-administered program, ORR provides funding to States for the purpose of making available to refugees a broad range of social services critical to their adjustment and ability to become self-sufficient. In FY 1984, ORR upgraded from a recommendation to an administrative requirement that 85 percent of such funds are to be used by States to support priority social services, specifically English language training and employment services. For fiscal year 1985, approximately $61.6 million was provided to States in the form of social service grants.

- Consolidated Discretionary Program

It has been ORR practice in past years to fund several program and/or demonstration initiatives aimed at aiding refugees in becoming self-sufficient. Based on the recommendations of a number of States, we issued a single program announcement this year that simplified the

process by which States would apply for funds. The "Comprehensive Discretionary Social Services" (CDSS) announcement, as it is formally referred to, encourages States to develop initiatives on behalf of refugees who are difficult to serve or who have special needs not previously addressed in the State's refugee social service delivery system. Emphasis is placed on direct, short-term services which foster employment. A total of 16 States were funded under this announcement with approximately $3.3 million in social service funds.

- California Targeted Assistance Program/CIU Review

During fiscal years 1983 and 1984, nearly $120 million in targeted assistance funds were awarded to counties or local areas with high concentrations of refugees. The purpose of the funds is to assist these areas in addressing the needs of difficult-to-place refugees whose inability to secure employment and achieve self-sufficiency cannot be overcome without such special services.

Due to the large number of refugees in California, $48.2 million -- or about 40 percent of the funds -- have been divided among 13 targeted assistance sites in that State. Beginning in June 1985, ORR undertook a major review of the California targeted assistance program by conducting on-site reviews of the 13 county-based programs in order to provide current information on the performance of targeted assistance projects. The results of this review are being used as the basis for program recommendations to enable the State and counties to utilize their targeted assistance funds more effectively.

ORR also undertook a review in FY 1985 of Central Intake Units (CIUs) in major California counties. CIUs are the county-based entities in California which handle the employability assessments and referrals of refugees to appropriate services. As a result of the review, and with

the cooperation of the State, early employment of refugees has been formally identified as the basic goal of the State's refugee program. ORR and California State officials have jointly visited counties to assure more vigorous implementation of the self-sufficiency objectives of the program. We are gratified by the cooperation among all levels of government in collaboratively working to improve program performance in the State.

New Initiatives

The major challenges confronting this Office in the administration of the refugee resettlement program have been, and continue to be: (1) to increase refugee self-sufficiency; (2) to increase the number of refugees who are able to obtain permanent employment in lieu of public assistance; and (3) to ensure that the critical health and social needs of the refugees are responsively addressed. Until recently, the prospects for making significant headway in reducing welfare dependency seemed distant.

- Alternative Refugee Resettlement Demonstration Projects

The Wilson/Fish Amendment to the Immigration and Nationality Act, contained in the FY 1985 Continuing Appropriations Resolution, is the vehicle enabling us to develop alternative projects which promote early employment of refugees. It provides the States, voluntary resettlement agencies, and others with the opportunity to develop innovative approaches for the provision of cash and medical assistance, social services, and case management.

ORR awarded grants to the States of California and Oregon for demonstration projects designed to decrease refugee reliance on welfare and to promote earlier economic self-sufficiency.

The purpose of the California Refugee Demonstration Project (RDP), implemented on July 1, 1985, is to test whether removal of cash assistance barriers to employment will result in greater employment of refugees and reduced utilization of cash assistance. Under the RDP refugee cases which were on AFDC and in which the principal wage earner had been in the United States for 24 months or less (as of July 1) were converted from AFDC to the RDP program. Newly applying refugee cases in which the principal wage earner has been in the U.S. for 30 months or less at the point of application (and who would otherwise be eligible for AFDC) are also being aided under the RDP. Refugees may work full time and receive supplemental cash assistance and medical care if their earnings are less than the welfare benefit levels. In addition, RDP participants are mandatorily referred to refugee-specific employment programs and/or other appropriate training as part of an approved employability plan. The ability to implement this three-year demonstration project expeditiously was made possible by the Wilson/Fish Amendment.

The Oregon Refugee Early Employment Project (REEP), which began September 16, 1985, integrates the delivery of cash assistance with case management, social service, and employment service functions within the private, not-for-profit sector in an effort to increase refugee

employment and reduce reliance on cash assistance by refugees. Encompassing a tri-county area surrounding Portland, where 85 percent of all refugees in Oregon initially settle, REEP aims to reduce the aggregate 18-month dependency rate for these clients from 80 percent to an estimated 50 percent.

The three-year project serves needy refugees who do not meet the State's AFDC or SSI categorical requirements (e.g., members of two-parent families, couples without children, and single individuals) during their initial 18 months in the United States. The target population includes both new arrivals and secondary migrants. Refugees who normally are eligible for assistance under AFDC continue to be eligible for that program and will not participate in REEP.

Finally, ORR has conditionally approved a preapplication from the State of Massachusetts for a Wilson/Fish demonstration project intended to reduce the high welfare dependency level in that State. We are also working actively with the national voluntary refugee resettlement agencies to encourage their involvement in cash assistance alternatives.

In FY 1986 we hope to encourage more States and interested organizations to submit proposals under the authority of the Wilson/Fish amendment.

- Refugee Mental Health Initiative

Over the last year, increasing attention has been focused on the mental health problems experienced by refugees. In response to this demonstrated need, the Office of Refugee Resettlement entered into an interagency agreement with the National Institute of Mental Health of the Public Health Service for the purpose of implementing a national refugee mental health strategy during the course of the next three years.

The overall intent of this strategy is threefold: (1) to increase the capacity of State mental health agencies to serve the mental health care needs of refugees; (2) to provide technical assistance and disseminate information to State mental health agencies and State refugee agencies; and (3) to increase the number of refugee mental health professionals.

- Refugee Self-Help Initiatives

ORR has long recognized mutual assistance associations (MAAs) as valuable resources in refugee communities. This support dates back to the enactment of the Refugee Act of 1980. Since that time, the Administration has allocated nearly $11 million for initiatives which strengthen the MAAs' role in the resettlement of new refugees. Strengthening MAAs continues to be a high priority of this Office.

As part of this effort, we awarded a national contract for technical assistance and training to MAAs in late FY 1985. The goals of this project are to strengthen the capability of MAAs in: (1) managing social services programs; (2) developing their capacity as trainers; and (3) developing and accessing private sector resources for the provision of social services to refugees as well as to Cuban/Haitian entrants.

- Federal Program Administration

In order to enable ORR to concentrate attention on the States which account for the majority of refugee program costs, we plan to streamline the grants and reporting requirements for those States which have especially low refugee dependency rates or which account for a relatively small portion of ORR costs. With a reduction in the paperwork requirements for those States, ORR will be in a better position to focus its limited staff resources on areas which have the greatest needs and costs.

This country's commitment to refugees has been more than demonstrated over the course of the past ten years. By the end of FY 1985 we had resettled over one million refugees, the majority of whom are from Southeast Asia. If the United States is to continue accepting a share of the world's refugees, those of us involved in domestic resettlement must continually remember that the extent to which we are able to provide responsive and cost-effective services and the extent to which our efforts result in the successful resettlement of refugees are important factors taken into account in determining annual refugee admissions.

APPENDIX A

TABLES

TABLE 1

Southeast Asian Refugee Arrivals in the United States: 1975 through September 30, 1985

Resettled under Special Parole Program (1975)	129,792
Resettled under Humanitarian Parole Program (1975)	602
Resettled under Special Lao Program (1976)	3,466
Resettled under Expanded Parole Program (1976)	11,000
Resettled under "Boat Cases" Program as of August 1, 1977	1,883
Resettled under Indochinese Parole Programs:	
August 1, 1977--September 30, 1977	680
October 1, 1977--September 30, 1978	20,397
October 1, 1978--September 30, 1979	80,678
October 1, 1979--September 30, 1980	166,727
Resettled under Refugee Act of 1980:	
October 1, 1980--September 30, 1981	132,454
October 1, 1981--September 30, 1982	72,155
October 1, 1982--September 30, 1983	39,167
October 1, 1983--September 30, 1984	52,000
October 1, 1984--September 30, 1985	49,853
TOTAL	760,854

Prior to the passage of the Refugee Act of 1980, most Southeast Asian refugees entered the United States as "parolees" (refugees) under a series of parole authorizations granted by the Attorney General under the Immigration and Nationality Act. These parole authorizations are usually identified by the terms used in this table.

TABLE 2

Refugee Arrivals in the United States by Month:
FY 1985

Month	Number of Arrivals		
	Southeast Asians	All Others	Total
October	3,821	1,073	4,894
November	4,270	1,717	5,987
December	4,097	1,337	5,434
January	3,493	1,157	4,650
February	3,531	1,387	4,918
March	4,860	1,992	6,852
April	3,332	1,274	4,606
May	5,157	1,688	6,845
June	4,178	1,584	5,762
July	3,321	1,305	4,626
August	4,087	1,401	5,488
September	5,706	2,007	7,713
TOTAL	49,853	17,922	67,775

FY 1985: October 1, 1984--September 30, 1985.

TABLE 3

Southeast Asian Refugee Arrivals by State of Initial Resettlement: FY 1985

State	Country of Citizenship			
	Cambodia	Laos	Vietnam	Total
Alabama	45	33	128	206
Alaska	0	0	24	24
Arizona	79	16	776	871
Arkansas	6	46	62	114
California	5,110	1,657	9,340	16,107
Colorado	124	68	347	539
Connecticut	393	76	139	608
Delaware	0	0	7	7
District of Columbia	55	14	131	200
Florida	302	83	719	1,104
Georgia	514	110	419	1,043
Hawaii	28	57	217	302
Idaho	100	25	86	211
Illinois	871	229	676	1,776
Indiana	75	23	144	242
Iowa	184	169	210	563
Kansas	156	78	569	803
Kentucky	146	0	208	354
Louisiana	137	50	538	725
Maine	189	10	15	214
Maryland	215	30	301	546
Massachusetts	1,612	77	831	2,520
Michigan	32	71	259	362
Minnesota	752	322	406	1,480
Mississippi	3	2	123	128
Missouri	240	73	316	629
Montana	0	16	15	31
Nebraska	36	5	33	74
Nevada	12	18	133	163
New Hampshire	114	8	21	143
New Jersey	108	17	382	507
New Mexico	142	28	101	271
New York	884	76	1,225	2,185
North Carolina	294	55	236	540
North Dakota	56	10	26	92

Country of Citizenship

State	Cambodia	Laos	Vietnam	Total
Ohio	497	104	177	778
Oklahoma	133	69	304	506
Oregon	209	104	454	767
Pennsylvania	869	82	793	1,744
Rhode Island	347	103	42	492
South Carolina	18	5	38	61
South Dakota	4	6	26	36
Tennessee	329	124	138	591
Texas	1,369	387	2,463	4,219
Utah	597	30	188	815
Vermont	39	0	0	39
Virginia	501	69	641	1,211
Washington	1,291	297	855	2,443
West Virginia	4	11	7	22
Wisconsin	61	284	75	420
Wyoming	0	6	0	6
Guam	0	0	19	19
Other	0	0	0	0
TOTAL	19,237	5,233	25,383	49,853

TABLE 4

Eastern European[a/] and Soviet Refugee Arrivals by State of Initial Resettlement: FY 1985

State	Country of Citizenship					
	Czechoslovakia	Hungary	Poland	Romania	USSR	Total
Alabama	1	2	3	0	5	11
Alaska	0	0	3	1	1	5
Arizona	7	1	33	85	0	126
Arkansas	0	1	34	0	0	35
California	265	98	380	1,374	151	2,268
Colorado	8	0	11	14	0	33
Connecticut	17	35	93	103	6	254
Delaware	0	0	4	1	0	5
District of Columbia	0	1	21	13	2	37
Florida	17	51	90	123	13	294
Georgia	2	24	8	34	2	70
Hawaii	0	2	0	0	0	2
Idaho	168	9	92	40	0	309
Illinois	26	6	291	559	34	916
Indiana	8	3	21	21	4	57
Iowa	2	6	18	6	0	32
Kansas	0	0	3	0	0	3
Kentucky	0	0	0	19	0	19
Louisiana	4	0	11	17	0	32
Maine	0	0	27	5	0	32
Maryland	29	19	60	54	13	175
Massachusetts	55	4	49	21	81	210
Michigan	7	4	202	242	15	470
Minnesota	10	8	27	41	5	91
Mississippi	3	2	0	6	0	11
Missouri	23	19	40	70	2	154
Montana	0	0	0	1	0	1
Nebraska	0	0	15	0	0	15
Nevada	4	3	7	5	4	23
New Hampshire	6	0	4	0	0	10
New Jersey	11	12	174	71	17	285
New Mexico	3	0	0	0	0	3
New York	73	73	621	824	259	1,850
North Carolina	6	10	20	28	0	64
North Dakota	36	7	8	40	0	91

State	Country of Citizenship					Total
	Czechoslovakia	Hungary	Poland	Romania	USSR	
Ohio	20	25	29	109	2	185
Oklahoma	0	0	25	20	0	45
Oregon	0	1	7	117	3	128
Pennsylvania	13	9	157	72	24	275
Rhode Island	0	7	1	3	3	14
South Carolina	0	0	1	0	0	1
South Dakota	5	14	8	32	0	59
Tennessee	1	2	11	17	1	32
Texas	38	11	135	162	8	354
Utah	40	0	4	12	1	57
Vermont	0	0	1	6	0	7
Virginia	12	14	11	27	0	64
Washington	27	30	64	80	6	207
West Virginia	1	6	3	4	0	14
Wisconsin	5	1	11	4	2	23
Wyoming	0	0	0	0	0	0
Guam	0	0	0	0	0	0
Other	0	0	0	0	0	0
TOTAL	953	520	2,838	4,483	664	9,458

a/ Small numbers arriving from Albania, Bulgaria, and Yugoslavia are not reported in this table.

TABLE 5

Ethiopian and Near Eastern Refugee Arrivals by State of Initial Resettlement: FY 1985

	Country of Citizenship				
	Ethiopia	Afghanistan	Iran	Iraq	Total
[illegible]	3	6	4	0	13
[illegible]	0	6	7	0	13
[illegible]a	120	14	23	0	157
[illegible]sas	0	0	4	1	5
[illegible]ornia	317	882	1,832	73	3,104
[illegible]rado	17	21	24	0	62
[illegible]ecticut	3	11	23	0	37
[illegible]ware	2	0	1	0	3
[illegible]trict of Columbia	82	22	31	0	135
[illegible]ida	32	9	80	1	122
[illegible]rgia	68	55	48	0	171
[illegible]waii	1	2	0	0	3
[illegible]aho	0	0	3	0	3
[illegible]inois	100	35	65	43	243
[illegible]diana	4	9	9	0	22
Iowa	0	0	4	0	4
Kansas	0	4	18	0	22
Kentucky	1	0	7	0	8
Louisiana	6	0	13	0	19
Maine	0	19	21	0	40
Maryland	98	67	137	0	302
Massachusetts	30	13	54	3	100
Michigan	56	9	50	97	212
Minnesota	77	28	29	0	134
Mississippi	1	0	0	0	1
Missouri	73	11	7	0	91
Montana	0	0	1	0	1
Nebraska	3	32	3	0	38
Nevada	21	5	58	3	87
New Hampshire	0	10	5	0	15
New Jersey	34	59	43	0	136
New Mexico	3	4	9	0	16
New York	134	404	295	0	833
North Carolina	10	9	7	0	26
North Dakota	11	0	9	0	20

Country of Citizenship

State	Ethiopia	Afghanistan	Iran	Iraq	Total
Ohio	30	5	28	1	64
Oklahoma	0	7	41	5	53
Oregon	26	23	22	0	71
Pennsylvania	50	30	48	2	130
Rhode Island	5	0	0	0	5
South Carolina	4	5	9	0	18
South Dakota	27	1	0	0	28
Tennessee	4	22	17	2	45
Texas	185	73	214	7	479
Utah	0	1	18	0	19
Vermont	0	0	0	0	0
Virginia	18	234	59	1	312
Washington	81	36	47	0	164
West Virginia	0	6	1	0	7
Wisconsin	4	19	5	0	28
Wyoming	0	1	0	0	1
Guam	0	0	0	0	0
Other	0	0	0	0	0
TOTAL	1,741	2,209	3,433	239	7,622

TABLE 6

Total Refugee Arrivals by State of Initial Resettlement:
FY 1985

State	Total Arrivals	Percent
Alabama	236	0.3%
Alaska	42	a/
Arizona	1,196	1.8
Arkansas	154	0.2
California	21,549	31.8
Colorado	648	1.0
Connecticut	914	1.3
Delaware	15	a/
District of Columbia	398	0.6
Florida	1,794	2.6
Georgia	1,298	1.9
Hawaii	308	0.5
Idaho	526	0.8
Illinois	2,966	4.4
Indiana	321	0.5
Iowa	599	0.9
Kansas	828	1.2
Kentucky	381	0.6
Louisiana	776	1.1
Maine	286	0.4
Maryland	1,033	1.5
Massachusetts	2,838	4.2
Michigan	1,052	1.6
Minnesota	1,724	2.5
Mississippi	140	0.2
Missouri	952	1.4
Montana	33	a/
Nebraska	127	0.2
Nevada	276	0.4
New Hampshire	171	0.3
New Jersey	946	1.4
New Mexico	290	0.4
New York	4,974	7.3
North Carolina	637	0.9
North Dakota	203	0.3

State	Total Arrivals	Percent
Ohio	1,027	1.5
Oklahoma	604	0.9
Oregon	966	1.4
Pennsylvania	2,169	3.2
Rhode Island	512	0.8
South Carolina	80	0.1
South Dakota	144	0.2
Tennessee	668	1.0
Texas	5,069	7.5
Utah	899	1.3
Vermont	46	a/
Virginia	1,588	2.3
Washington	2,830	4.2
West Virginia	43	a/
Wisconsin	473	0.7
Wyoming	7	a/
Guam	19	a/
Other	0	a/
TOTAL	67,775	100.0%

a/ Less than 0.1 percent.

Applications for Refugee Status Granted by INS:
FY 1980 - FY 1985[a/]

Country of Chargeability	FY 1980	FY 1981	FY 1982	FY 1983	FY 1984	FY 1985	Total
Afghanistan	668	4,456	3,425	2,896	2,268	2,234	15,947
Albania	10	28	14	69	48	48	217
Angola	0	175	111	10	84	60	440
Bulgaria	62	116	140	136	140	136	730
Cambodia	9,295	38,194	6,246	22,399	21,444	11,380	108,958
China	732	324	8	29	30	20	1,143
Cuba	1,784	1,208	580	710	57	1,865	6,204
Cyprus	20	16	0	0	0	0	36
Czechoslovakia	502	1,251	811	1,297	859	984	5,704
Egypt	51	65	0	0	4	0	120
El Salvador	0	0	0	0	96	0	96
Ethiopia	939	3,513	4,019	2,592	2,536	1,771	15,370
Greece	178	243	0	0	0	0	421
Hong Kong	171	827	189	90	137	101	1,515
Hungary	189	441	410	656	548	534	2,778
India	0	3	0	0	7	0	10
Iran	184	358	0	947	2,969	3,496	7,954
Iraq	861	1,220	2,025	1,588	157	259	6,110
Laos	32,769	19,777	3,616	5,627	8,189	4,305	74,283
Lebanon	239	203	0	0	0	0	442
Lesotho	0	0	0	0	12	10	22
Libya	5	4	0	0	0	5	14
Macau	18	52	3	2	5	1	81
Malawi	0	9	9	1	14	6	39
Mozambique	0	17	6	11	27	9	70
Namibia	0	28	15	3	21	12	79
Nicaragua	0	0	0	0	3	3	6
Pakistan	1	0	0	0	9	0	10
Philippines	0	4	23	42	17	10	96
Poland	387	1,995	6,599	5,820	4,288	3,001	22,090
Romania	1,549	3,077	2,982	3,991	4,301	4,650	20,550
South Africa	0	13	11	14	12	31	81
Sudan	2	13	17	0	0	0	32
Syria	309	378	40	4	5	4	740
Taiwan	0	0	0	0	0	12	12
Turkey	309	411	0	0	0	1	721
USSR	8,136	11,151	2,820	1,407	721	639	24,874
Uganda	0	1	0	0	2	8	11
Vietnam	30,072	65,537	27,396	23,287	28,875	23,799	198,966
Yugoslavia	11	30	2	6	12	6	67
Zaire	0	14	10	11	34	31	100
Zimbabwe	0	0	0	0	0	5	5
All Others	127	139	0	0	1	0	267
TOTAL	89,580	155,291	61,527	73,645	77,932	59,436	517,411

[a/] Approvals under P.L. 96-212, section 207, which took effect April 1, 1980. Numbers approved during a year will differ slightly from the numbers actually entering during that year.

Source: Immigration and Naturalization Service, unpublished tabulations. Changes from last year result from corrections by INS in the FY 1980 and 1981 data series.

TABLE 8

Asylum Applications (Cases) Approved by INS
FY 1980 - FY 1985[a/]

Country of Nationality	FY 1980	FY 1981	FY 1982	FY 1983	FY 1984	FY 1985	Total
Afghanistan	208	201	303	232	186	57	1,187
Angola	0	0	0	0	4	0	4
Argentina	19	1	0	9	1	0	30
Bangladesh	0	0	0	2	0	0	2
Brazil	0	0	0	0	0	1	1
Bulgaria	6	4	4	4	14	5	37
Burma	0	0	0	0	0	1	1
Burundi	1	1	0	0	0	0	2
Cambodia	4	0	1	0	4	3	12
Chile	4	6	0	3	0	6	19
China	6	13	8	9	15	44	95
Colombia	0	0	0	0	5	0	5
Costa Rica	0	0	0	0	0	1	1
Cuba	72	7	1	11	16	61	168
Czechoslovakia	23	7	13	26	36	34	139
Dominican Republic	0	0	0	0	0	1	1
Ecuador	0	0	0	0	1	1	2
Egypt	1	0	1	38	1	0	41
El Salvador[b/]	0	2	69	172	328	74	645
Ethiopia	154	173	249	213	305	187	1,281
France	0	0	0	0	1	0	1
Germany (East)	0	2	0	0	8	6	16
Ghana	0	1	0	14	15	8	38
Guatemala	0	0	0	0	3	5	8
Guinea	0	0	0	0	0	1	1
Guyana	0	1	4	0	1	3	9
Haiti	2	5	7	13	23	4	54
Honduras	0	0	0	1	4	2	7
Hungary	39	21	25	34	62	46	227
India	0	0	0	0	0	1	1
Indonesia	0	0	0	0	2	0	2
Iran	14	120	2,610	5,145	5,017	2,779	15,685
Iraq	43	37	21	15	38	41	195
Israel	0	0	0	0	1	0	1
Italy	0	0	0	1	0	0	1
Japan	0	0	0	0	0	1	1
Jordan	0	0	1	1	1	1	4
Kenya	2	0	0	0	0	0	2
Korea	0	0	0	0	0	1	1
Laos	5	2	1	0	4	1	13
Lebanon	4	9	7	7	16	13	56
Liberia	0	0	0	0	5	2	7
Libya	3	40	23	19	11	54	150
Malawi	1	0	2	1	0	1	5
Mexico	1	0	0	0	0	1	2

Country of Nationality	FY 1980	FY 1981	FY 1982	FY 1983	FY 1984	FY 1985	Total
Namibia	0	0	0	0	3	0	3
Nicaragua	3	297	336	279	1,018	408	2,341
Pakistan	1	0	3	12	7	10	33
Peru	1	0	0	0	1	0	2
Philippines	19	6	4	11	36	29	105
Poland	243	90	102	728	721	451	2,335
Rhodesia	4	0	0	0	0	0	4
Romania	65	30	69	63	158	101	486
Seychelles	0	0	0	0	6	2	8
Sierra Leone	0	0	0	0	2	0	2
Singapore	0	0	0	0	1	0	1
Somalia	0	0	0	0	34	22	56
South Africa	25	5	7	12	7	5	61
Syria	0	0	9	43	21	30	103
Taiwan	0	0	0	0	1	1	2
Thailand	0	0	0	0	2	1	3
Turkey	0	0	3	1	3	1	8
USSR	15	10	14	36	45	26	146
Uganda	36	4	15	14	49	15	133
Vietnam	16	10	14	16	19	13	88
Yemen (Aden)	0	0	0	0	0	1	1
Yemen (Sanaa)	0	0	0	0	0	6	6
Yugoslavia	8	2	2	11	12	8	43
Zaire	1	1	0	1	4	2	9
Zimbabwe	0	0	0	1	0	1	2
All Others	55	67	68	109	0	5	304
Total Cases	1,104	1,175	3,996	7,307	8,278	4,585	26,445
Total Persons	c/	c/	4,731	8,333	11,627	6,514	

a/ Approvals under P.L. 96-212, section 208.
b/ Prior to March 1, 1981, approvals for EL Salvador are shown under "All Others."
c/ Not available.

Source: Immigration and Naturalization Service, unpublished tabulations. Changes from last year result from corrections by INS in the FY 1980-FY 1983 data series.

TABLE 9

Estimated Southeast Asian Refugee Population by State:
September 30, 1984 and September 30, 1985[a/]

State	9/30/84	9/30/85	9/30/85 Percent
Alabama	2,600	3,000	0.4%
Alaska	200	200	c/
Arizona	4,300	5,000	0.7
Arkansas	2,300	2,500	0.3
California	285,100	303,100	39.8
Colorado	10,700	10,500	1.4
Connecticut	6,600	7,000	0.9
Delaware	300	200	c/
District of Columbia	1,400	1,600	0.2
Florida	11,500	12,700	1.7
Georgia	8,300	9,700	1.3
Hawaii	6,200	6,600	0.9
Idaho	1,300	1,600	0.2
Illinois	23,400	25,300	3.3
Indiana	3,800	3,900	0.5
Iowa	8,300	8,800	1.2
Kansas	9,400	10,000	1.3
Kentucky	2,000	2,200	0.3
Louisiana	13,500	14,100	1.8
Maine	1,600	1,700	0.2
Maryland	8,500	9,300	1.2
Massachusetts	19,300	22,500	3.0
Michigan	10,000	10,400	1.4
Minnesota	22,600	24,100	3.2
Mississippi	1,700	1,800	0.2
Missouri	6,200	6,900	0.9
Montana	800	800	0.1
Nebraska	1,900	2,000	0.3
Nevada	1,900	2,000	0.3
New Hampshire	700	800	0.1
New Jersey	6,300	6,800	0.9
New Mexico	1,800	2,000	0.3
New York	24,800	28,600	3.8
North Carolina	5,000	5,200	0.7
North Dakota	800	900	0.1
Ohio	9,600	10,300	1.4
Oklahoma	8,200	8,600	1.1
Oregon	17,200	17,400	2.3

State	9/30/84	9/30/85	9/30/85 Percent
Pennsylvania	23,900	25,400	3.3
Rhode Island	5,100	5,800	0.8
South Carolina	2,100	2,100	0.3
South Dakota	900	1,000	0.1
Tennessee	4,500	4,900	0.6
Texas	51,300	57,200	7.5
Utah	7,800	7,900	1.0
Vermont	600	600	c/
Virginia	21,000	20,700	2.7
Washington	32,600	34,300	4.5
West Virginia	400	400	c/
Wisconsin	10,300	10,000	1.3
Wyoming	200	200	c/
Guam	200	300	c/
Other Territories	b/	b/	c/
TOTAL	711,000	760,900	100.0%

a/ The September 1984 estimates were constructed by taking the January 1981 INS alien registration, adjusting it for underregistration, adding persons who arrived from January 1981 through September 1984, and adjusting the totals so derived for secondary migration. The September 1985 estimates were constructed similarly by using the known distribution of the population in January 1981, adding arrivals from January 1981 through September 1985, and adjusting those totals for secondary migration. Estimates of secondary migration rates were developed from data submitted by the States. Figures are rounded to the nearest hundred and may not add to totals due to rounding. No adjustments have been made for births and deaths among the refugee population. Percentages are calculated from unrounded data.

b/ Less than 50.

c/ Less than 0.1 percent.

TABLE 10

Secondary Migration Data Compiled from the Refugee State-of-Origin Report: June 30, 1985[a/]

State	Non-Movers	Out-Migrants	In-Migrants	Net Migration
Alabama d/	c/	189	633	444
Alaska b/	0	170	0	-170
Arizona d/	1,991	731	243	-488
Arkansas d/	664	164	533	369
California	42,973	1,799	14,533	12,734
Colorado d/	1,097	372	329	-43
Connecticut	430	274	136	-138
Delaware	4	27	0	-27
District of Columbia	39	1,009	24	-985
Florida	800	743	103	-640
Georgia d/	1,091	617	294	-323
Hawaii	601	176	41	-135
Idaho	171	173	12	-161
Illinois	2,411	1,388	300	-1,088
Indiana	234	268	0	-268
Iowa	647	325	103	-222
Kansas	703	502	198	-304
Kentucky	256	359	9	-350
Louisiana d/	443	708	358	-350
Maine	340	120	24	-96
Maryland d/	1,296	484	1,023	539
Massachusetts	4,542	427	1,270	843
Michigan	979	481	75	-406
Minnesota	2,789	665	419	-246
Mississippi	59	184	37	-147
Missouri	523	536	86	-450
Montana	26	42	0	-42
Nebraska	90	225	20	-205
Nevada	131	256	25	-231
New Hampshire	83	56	2	-54
New Jersey	776	360	142	-218
New Mexico	185	423	26	-397
New York	3,894	1,398	1,376	-22
North Carolina	149	503	27	-476
North Dakota	210	180	11	-169
Ohio	1,145	623	109	-514
Oklahoma d/	199	579	100	-479
Oregon	1,867	843	273	-570

S U M M A R Y

REFUGEE ARRIVALS IN THE UNITED STATES

Report Date : October 28, 1985

AREA	FY-75	FY-76	FY-77	FY-78	FY-79	FY-80	FY-81	FY-82	FY-83	FY-84	YTD FY-85	FY-86	TOTAL	REMARKS
AFRICA	-	-	-	-	-	955	2,119	3,326	2,648	2,747	1,953		13,748	
ASIA	135,000	15,000	7,000	20,574	76,521	163,799	131,139	73,522	39,408	51,960	49,970		763,893	
EASTERN EUROPE	1,947	1,756	1,755	2,245	3,393	5,025	6,704	10,780	12,083	10,285	9,350		65,323	
SOVIET UNION	6,211	7,450	8,191	10,688	24,449	28,444	13,444	2,756	1,409	715	640		104,298	
LATIN AMERICA	3,000	3,000	3,000	3,000	7,000	6,662	2,017	602	668	160	138		29,247	
NEAR EAST	-	-	-	-	-	2,231	3,829	6,369	5,465	5,246	5,994		29,134	
TOTAL	146,158	27,206	19,946	36,507	111,363	207,116	159,252	97,355	61,681	71,113	68,045		1,005,742	

1907Z

Sources: ASIA: Reporting telegrams from SEA posts.
AFRICA, EUROPE, LATIN AMERICA & NEAR EAST: RMA Geneva.

IMMIGRATION AND NATURALIZATION SERVICE

Department of Justice

The Immigration and Naturalization Service (INS) is responsible for the final determination of an alien's eligibility for processing as a refugee under the United States refugee program and for the final determination of refugee status under United States law. INS is also responsible for the authorization of waivers of grounds of excludability that pertain to refugees. Additionally, INS is responsible for the approval of affidavits of relationship filed on behalf of aliens abroad seeking admission to the United States as refugees. INS is responsible for the inspection and admission of persons arriving in refugee status at United States ports-of-entry and for the approval of the refugee's subsequent adjustment of status.

While performance of these responsibilities involves virtually all INS district offices, INS responsibilities in the United States refugee program are primarily discharged by the overseas offices organized into three districts. These are: (1) Bangkok District, with geographic responsibility for the East Asia region; (2) Rome District, with responsibility for the Soviet Union/Eastern Europe, Near East/South Asia and Africa regions; and (3) Mexico City, with responsibility for the Latin America and Caribbean region.

The INS overseas offices maintain direct and continuous liaison with representatives and officials of the Intergovernmental Committee for Migration, United Nations High Commissioner for Refugees, United States governmental agencies, foreign governments, and all voluntary agencies with offices or representation abroad.

In fiscal year 1985, immigration officers assigned to INS overseas offices conducted over 80,000 refugee determination interviews, and approved for admission 59,436 persons of 34 different nationalities. The overall approval rate for the United States refugee program applicants was 75 percent.

Significant progress was achieved during fiscal year 1985 on a number of program improvement initiatives begun in fiscal year 1983: Pre-assignment training opportunities were broadened for personnel selected for multi-year assignments in overseas posts. Conditions of service for overseas personnel were improved. Greater program management authority was vested in the overseas offices. Greater use was made of routine administrative services provided by United States embassies and consulates abroad. Central Office review of refugee program operations in overseas offices was increased and broadened. Programs were initiated by the Central Office to provide more current substantive information on country conditions in refugee-generating countries to overseas offices. Revisions to the 1983 INS Worldwide Guidelines for Overseas Refugee Processing were drafted and readied for release to the overseas offices. Planning work was completed on several projects concerned with improving the quality of refugee data collection, processing, and data sharing functions, and with standardizing refugee processing procedures in the overseas districts. During fiscal year 1985, liaison and interchange with other governmental and private agencies involved in the United States refugee program was significantly broadened both domestically and at overseas posts.

OFFICE OF BILINGUAL EDUCATION AND MINORITY LANGUAGES AFFAIRS

Department of Education

The Refugee Act of 1980 (P.L. 96-212) authorizes the Director of the Office of Refugee Resettlement (ORR) within the U.S. Department of Health and Human Services (HHS) to provide services or make agreements with other agencies to provide services to refugees. Section 412(d)(1) of the Act addresses the educational needs of refugee children: "The Director is authorized to make grants, and enter into contracts, for payments for projects to provide special educational services (including English language training) to refugee children in elementary and secondary schools where a demonstrated need has been shown."

The responsibility for providing an educational program for elementary and secondary refugee students rests with the Department of Education (ED) through an interagency agreement with ORR/HHS. This agreement provides the operating mechanism through which funds are made available for distribution under the Transition Program for Refugee Children.

During the school year 1985-1986, $16.6 million was made available to States to provide educational services to refugee children.* These funds served 82,174 refugee children nationwide.

---

* An additional $5.0 million was obligated in FY 1985 for school year 1984-85.

TRANSITION PROGRAM FOR REFUGEE CHILDREN

School Year 1985-1986

State	Refugee Children	Amount of Award
Alabama	240	$ 51,080
Alaska		Not Eligible
Arizona	594	120,670
Arkansas	246	49,890
California	23,548	4,675,630*
Colorado	582	119,550
Connecticut	1,276	273,110
Delaware	142	29,480
District of Columbia	204	32,180
Florida	5,499	1,081,440
Georgia	995	215,790
Hawaii	252	55,840
Idaho	293	63,470
Illinois	3,823	775,090
Indiana	207	40,480
Iowa	994	184,860
Kansas	1,377	211,260
Kentucky	358	74,910
Louisiana	1,408	255,630
Maine	373	83,860
Maryland	1,009	200,690
Massachusetts	4,738	1,061,310
Michigan	1,493	289,430
Minnesota	2,124	443,500
Mississippi		Did not apply
Missouri	677	141,020
Montana	35	7,110
Nebraska	268	50,820
Nevada	228	45,330
New Hampshire	158	31,950
New Jersey	1,249	265,880
New Mexico		Did not apply
New York	2,714	550,950
North Carolina	805	156,510
North Dakota	134	37,240
Ohio	2,030	444,950
Oklahoma	906	173,270
Oregon	1,178	236,140
Pennsylvania	2,947	576,750
Rhode Island	1,934	388,750
South Carolina	240	52,310
South Dakota	91	17,090

* Does not include $4,977,272 which was authorized in FY 1984 and obligated in FY 1985 for school year 1984-85.

State	Refugee Children	Amount of Award
Tennessee	908	198,080
Texas	6,041	1,208,080
Utah	705	146,900
Vermont	95	16,760
Virginia	3,175	615,700
Washington	2,969	661,300
West Virginia		Did not apply
Wisconsin	912	187,080
Wyoming		Did not apply
TOTAL	82,174	$16,599,120

Transition Program for Refugee Children
FY 1985

	Indochinese Children	Other Refugee Children	Total
Elementary	27,656	10,102	37,758
Secondary	34,606	9,810	44,416
	62,262	19,912	82,174

U.S. PUBLIC HEALTH SERVICE

Department of Health and Human Services

As the Public Health Service (PHS) is charged with ensuring that aliens entering the United States do not pose a threat to the public health of the U.S. populace, its activities related to refugee health included the monitoring, at U.S. ports-of-entry, of the health screening of refugees, the notification of the appropriate State and local health departments of those new arrivals requiring followup care, provision of domestic health assessments, and appropriate treatment.

The Office of Refugee Health (ORH) in the Office of the Assistant Secretary for Health continued to coordinate the activities of those PHS agencies involved with the refugee health program. In matters related to domestic health activities, ORH worked closely with the HHS Office of Refugee Resettlement (ORR), where it maintained a liaison office. ORH also worked closely with the Bureau for Refugee Programs in the Department of State, with the Immigration and Naturalization Service in the Department of Justice, and with the U.S. Refugee Coordinator's Office on activities related to health screening and health conditions at the refugee camps overseas.

ORH undertook several special initiatives during FY 1985 including efforts to strengthen the monitoring of overseas screening for refugees arriving from Europe, the Near East, Africa, and South Asia. A public health advisor was stationed in Germany to assess and improve the quality of medical screening and documentation for East European and African refugees. In cooperation with ORR and the National Institute of Mental

Health, ORH implemented a new strategy for meeting the mental health needs of refugees resettled in the United States. ORH continued to assist the UNHCR with technical assistance and consultation in the expansion of medical and dental services at the Philippine Refugee Processing Center in Bataan.

Furthermore, ORH negotiated an agreement whereby ORR provided $596,000 for expanded hepatitis B screening in the U.S. of pregnant refugees and immunization of newborns and susceptible close family contacts of those women with carrier status. ORH also negotiated the transfer of $86,000 from ORR to CDC for expanded surveillance on Sudden Unexplained Death Syndrome, the leading cause of death in hitherto healthy males from Southeast Asia.

ORH continued to coordinate the refugee activities of the PHS agencies including the Centers for Disease Control (CDC), the Health Resources and Service Administration (HRSA) and the Alcohol, Drug Abuse, and Mental Health Administration (ADAMHA). The activities of these agencies are discussed below:

CENTERS FOR DISEASE CONTROL

During FY 1985, the Centers for Disease Control (CDC) continued its legislated responsibility of evaluating and sustaining the quality of the medical screening examinations provided to refugees seeking to resettle in the United States. The program included inspection of refugees and their medical records at U.S. ports-of-entry and the continuation of the health data collection and dissemination system.

CDC continued to station two public health advisors in Bangkok, Thailand, to operate a regional program to monitor and evaluate the medical screening examinations provided to refugees in Southeast Asia. Additionally, a public health advisor was stationed in Frankfurt, Germany, to perform similar duties related to refugees coming to the United States from Europe, Africa, the Near East, and South Asia.

During FY 1985, CDC quarantine officers at the U.S. ports-of-entry inspected all of the arriving refugees (approximately 50,000 from Southeast Asia and 18,500 from other areas of the world). As part of the stateside followup, CDC collected and disseminated copies of refugee health and immunization documentation to State and local health departments. Minicomputers and printers at U.S. ports-of-entry were used to compile refugee health data and to print more than 2,500 different State and local health department address labels. These labels were used to address refugee medical documentation packets to health departments and to instruct refugees to report to the appropriate health department.

Quarantine officers paid particular attention to refugees with active or suspected active (Class A) tuberculosis and notified the appropriate local health departments by telephone within 24 hours of the refugees' arrival in the United States.

A computerized disease surveillance data base of demographic and arrival data on refugees was continued in FY 1985. In addition to documentation of excludable conditions, data collected include the number of Indochinese completing tuberculosis chemotherapy before departure for the United States, those who receive tuberculin skin tests and are started on tuberculosis preventive therapy, those who are screened for

hepatitis B surface antigenicity, those who receive hepatitis B vaccine, and those who are placed on prophylaxis for Hansen's disease. Data were also collected on refugees arriving from the Philippine Refugee Processing Center to assess the adequacy of special health initiatives being implemented in that facility.

The CDC data base on refugee arrivals was also used by ORR as the primary source of arrival and destination statistics. CDC has computerized the medical screening and immunization records of the 494,612 Southeast Asian refugees entering this country since October 1979. Beginning in October 1982, medical screening results were also computerized for non-Indochinese refugees, and records on about 50,000 of these refugees are now in the CDC data base.

In FY 1985, a short-course chemotherapy (SCC) regimen for tuberculosis was continued in Southeast Asia for U.S.-bound Indochinese refugees. During the first six months of FY 1985, approximately 250 Indochinese completed SCC before arrival, resulting in less than one-quarter of one percent of Indochinese arriving with active tuperculosis, down from two to four percent of arrivals in previous years. Procedures implemented in FY 1984 to test Indochinese refugees for tuberculous infection and to implement isoniazid preventive therapy were continued through FY 1985. The workload experienced by local health departments in the United States in providing tuberculosis treatment and followup services to Indochinese refugees declined as a result of these disease control measures.

The overseas hepatitis B surface antigen screening program for pregnant females and unaccompanied minors also continued. Approximately 1,470 women and children were tested in the first two quarters of FY 1985, with 15 percent identified as positive. CDC continued to notify State and local health departments and refugee sponsors of those refugees with positive tests. Midway through the year steps were taken to modify the vaccination procedures of infants born to mothers identified as hepatitis B surface antigen carriers. In addition to the initial dose of hepatitis B immune globulin (HBIG) administered at birth, a concurrent dose of hepatitis B vaccine (HBV) was recommended, with additional doses recommended at one and six months of age if the child remained in the camp for that period of time. Refugees are not held in Southeast Asia for completion of the vaccines; therefore, some infants are required to complete the vaccination series after arrival in the United States.

Also during FY 1985, the hepatitis B surface antigen testing began to be performed by laboratories in Southeast Asia rather than at CDC, Atlanta. The change in testing reduced the turnaround time and minimized the number of refugees who leave for resettlement to the United States with unknown test results. The changes described above were carried out in conjunction with CDC hepatitis consultants who made site visits to processing centers in Southeast Asia.

In the United States, hepatitis B vaccine continues to be offered by health care providers to foster family members who are close household contacts of unaccompanied minors identified as being hepatitis B surface antigen (HBsAG) carriers. During FY 1985, the hepatitis B screening and vaccination program was supplemented by the addition of $596,000 in grant

funds to State and local health departments to provide hepatitis screening for pregnant refugee women who arrived in the United States after October 1, 1981. Infants born to mothers who have been identifed as being HBsAG carriers are given the HBIG and HBV in accordance with Immunization Practices Advisory Committee recommendations. In addition, household contacts of carriers are screened and, if susceptible, given the HBV vaccine.

In FY 1985, CDC completed a two-phased assessment of the health education needs of Indochinese refugees and of the instructional methodology used in overseas refugee processing centers in Thailand and the Philippines.

Phase I of the health education project was conducted with a panel of 15 consultants who identified six refugee health problems which may be amenable to change by health education. These health conditions are tuberculosis, intestinal problems, injuries due to "unfamiliar things," undernutrition, unwanted pregnancy, and dental caries. Phase II of the project was conducted in the refugee processing centers to identify the extent to which these six health problems were addressed through health education activities in the Refugee Processing Centers. The results of the assessment were presented to the Department of State so that modifications to health education methodology could be made, if necessary, in the processing centers.

CDC completed the "Sentinel Project" in August 1985. Under this project, nutritional, parasitic, and dental data on refugees coming to the United States from the Philippine Refugee Processing Center, where the health care services have been expanded due to Government of Japan contributions at the Center, were collected from eight sites in the U.S.

A total of 6,577 refugees were assessed under this program. Of those assessed, 16 percent were found to have hookworm, 10 percent were anemic, and 5 percent were referred for early dental treatment. Further analysis of the data is continuing.

CDC designed and implemented a project to evaluate the high rate of "boosting" of tuberculin sensitivity among Southeast Asian refugees. "Boosting" occurs when, following an initial negative (induration reaction less than 10 mm) Mantoux test, a second test, given as soon as one week later, elicits markedly increased reaction (increase of six or more mm to greater than 10 mm). This phenomenon has occurred in 20 to 40 percent of the Indochinese refugees tested in the United States.

The study was conducted at the Philippine Refugee Processing Center, Bataan, and involved the testing of approximately 2,500 refugee volunteers. All refugees were tested initially with tuberculin, tested again after one week if they had a negative reaction to the first test, and again after three months if there was no "boosting" at the second test. Data from the study show that 36 percent were positive at the first test, and of the negatives, 24 percent "boosted" at the second test. Preliminary results from the third test, which was administered to 1,056 refugees three months after the first test, show that 10 percent of these participants "boosted." The answer to the main question posed by the study (i.e., whether refugees who "boost" are as likely to have real tuberculosis infection as persons who react significantly to the customary single test) is currently being determined in a detailed analysis of the data.

CDC also continued surveillance on Sudden Unexplained Death Syndrome (SUDS) among Indochinese refugees in the United States. During FY 1985, ORR provided funds to ORH for CDC to expand and augment surveillance activities for SUDS.

CDC continued to publish reports on refugee health problems in its Morbidity and Mortality Weekly Report (MMWR) as a means of rapidly providing useful information to health care providers in the United States. Since 1975, 88 articles concerning refugee health conditions have been published in the MMWR.

CDC continued to review the medical screening examinations given to refugees in Vietnam who were bound for the United States under the Orderly Departure Program.

Domestic Health Assessments

Health assessment services again were provided to newly arrived refugees in FY 1985. The followup of Class A and Class B conditions identified through overseas screening continued to be a top priority for State and local health departments. Through a renewed interagency agreement with ORR, CDC again administered the Health Program for Refugees. The goals of the program remained: (1) to address unmet public health needs associated with refugees; and (2) to identify health problems which might impair effective resettlement, employability, and self-sufficiency and to refer such refugees for appropriate diagnosis and treatment. During FY 1985, continued emphasis was given to identify refugees eligible for preventive treatment of tuberculous infection.

In FY 1985, grants were awarded to 41 States; the District of Columbia; the City of Philadelphia; Maricopa County, Arizona; Missoula County, Montana; and the Barren River district Health Department, Kentucky. The nine States which did not participate in FY 1985 were Alaska, Arizona, Delaware, Kentucky, Mississippi, Montana, Nebraska, West Virginia, and Wyoming. Awards were based on the number of newly-arrived refugees, the relative burden created by secondary migration, plans for providing intensified tuberculosis preventive therapy and outreach services, program performance, and the justified need for grant support. The 10 most impacted States, which resettled 69.2 percent of all arriving refugees in FY 1985 received 65.9 percent of the $6.4 million in grant funds awarded. During FY 1984, five CDC public health advisors were assigned to work in selected impacted areas to augment tuberculosis preventive therapy outreach activities. Stationed in Florida, Texas, California, Los Angeles, and New York City, they continued to serve those areas in FY 1985.

In FY 1985, CDC personnel made 74 site visits to project areas and provided technical assistance, consultation, and program support to health assessment personnel there.

Approximately 76 percent of the grantees voluntarily share usable data that is helpful in assessing the status of the health assessment program. An estimated 85 percent of all arriving refugees are receiving health assessments. Of the refugees who arrive in specific parts of States in which grant funds permit the development of a coordinated program, approximately 89 percent of the refugees are contacted, and 85 percent of them receive health assessments. Among those refugees who

receive health assessments, approximately 60 percent have one or more medical or dental health conditions identified that require treatment and/or referral for specialized diagnosis and care. Limited data and site review observations indicate that nearly 100 percent of refugee children seen receive required immunizations against the vaccine-preventable childhood diseases.

The identification of secondary migrants continues to be a major problem. Grantee data show that approximately 30 percent of all health assessents performed are for secondary migrants.

CDC encouraged the development of refugee health registries to permit effective tracking and reporting on the health assessments of all new refugee arrivals in those project areas which had not yet implemented procedures to systematically identify secondary migrants. CDC continued to encourage all grantees to develop networks to identify out-migrating refugees and procedures for communicating with other States on the movement of refugees who were under care for various conditions, especially those of public health concern. Significant progress was made in that endeavor, and information flowed routinely as refugees out-migrated, instead of only in response to specific requests from receiving localities. Through computerized records on refugee arrivals, CDC provided project areas with information about secondary migrants whose initial resettlement areas were in question. This enabled the areas with those secondary migrants to identify promptly the probable location of prior health records, and to request test results and to document previous treatment records.

HEALTH RESOURCES AND SERVICE ADMINISTRATION

Hansen's Disease Activities

Refugees diagnosed in Southeast Asia as having Hansen's Disease were referred to the Regional Hansen's Disease Center at Seton Memorial Hospital in Daly City, California. Patients and close family members were examined by the PHS leprologist at the Regional Center to establish base line information for referral to refugee sponsors and the physicians who provide case management on a continuous basis.

The Regional Hansen's Disease Center in the San Francisco area is one of 12 sponsored by the Division of National Hansen's Disease Medical Programs, Bureau of Health Care and Assistance, to assure the delivery of high quality medical care and adequate diagnosis and followup of patients suspected of having Hansen's Disease. These Centers are located in metropolitan areas where there are large numbers of Hansen's Disease patients: Honolulu, Seattle, San Francisco, Los Angeles, San Diego, Phoenix, Brownsville, Miami, Chicago, Boston, New York, and San Juan.

During fiscal year 1985, 14 new refugees were admitted to the Gillis W. Long Hansen's Disease Center in Carville, Louisiana, because of complications in their treatment. In addition, seven refugees were readmitted for care, and there are currently 25 such patients carried on the census of the center. Lepromatous leprosy generally requires life-long medication to ensure that the patient remains non-infectious and does not develop deformities or blindness from complications of the disease.

Community Health Centers

The Community Health Center and Migrant Health Center programs in the Bureau of Health Care Delivery and Assistance do not collect or maintain specific data on health services provided to refugees. Many of the Centers do, however, provide primary health care services to refugees in their catchment areas. Some Centers employed translators and used bilingual signs and notices to assist in health care delivery. Some examples of program activities are detailed below:

- The Central Seattle Community Health Centers Consortium, a multi-clinic organization in Seattle, Washington, had several unique programs, including a translation service. The Indochinese Language Bank provided five full-time translators who spoke a total of 10 Indochinese languages and serviced Community Health Centers and other health care providers through the Seattle area. The consortium also utilized the skills of foreign-trained health professionals from Southeast Asian countries, some of whom were licensed physician assistants and particularly sensitive to the special needs of the refugee and low-income Asian populations.
- The Model Cities Health Center in St. Paul, Minnesota, provided primary health care services to approximately 300 Laotian refugees resettled in its service area.
- The Broadlawns Primary Care Center in Des Moines, Iowa, in addition to providing primary health care services to the Hmong community, offered nutrition and health education programs.

ALCOHOL, DRUG ABUSE, AND MENTAL HEALTH ADMINISTRATION

During fiscal year 1985, the National Institute of Mental Health (NIMH) in the Alcohol, Drug Abuse, and Mental Health Administration participated in several refugee activities.

NIMH, in conjunction with ORR and ORH, had previously participated in conceptualizing and planning an initiative for mental health service delivery to refugees in recognition of the critical need to prevent mental illness, to promote the delivery of appropriate and accessible mental health care, and to improve the existing system's capacity to treat refugees with severe mental and emotional disability.

Between fiscal years 1976 and 1980, ORR provided funds totaling $5 million for mental health service demonstration projects. With passage of the 1980 Refugee Act, funding for such services became the responsibility of State agencies, which proved to be a load beyond most States' capabilities.

Noting the shortcomings in the mental health care system available to refugees, ORR held regional consultations and established a joint ORR/ORH/NIMH workgroup in FY 1984 to examine the issue. The workgroup's recommendations resulted in the development of the Refugee Assistance Program - Mental Health (RAP-MH) during FY 1985. This program is directed at developing the capabilities of State mental health agencies to assure availability of appropriate mental health care for refugees with severely disabling mental problems, thus promoting refugee self-sufficiency.

During FY 1985, the NIMH, in consultation with ORR, developed the guidelines for such a program and held regional pre-application briefings for interested State representatives. Of the 13 State applications

received, 12 were considered to be technically acceptable and were approved. These 12 States (California, Colorado, Hawaii, Illinois, Massachusetts, Minnesota, New York, Rhode Island, Texas, Virginia, Washington, and Wisconsin) contain nearly three-quarters (72 percent) of the refugees who have entered the U.S. since 1975. Cooperative agreements were negotiated with the 12 states, and ORR provided funds to the ORH for a total of $1.7 million for the 12 projects' first year of activity under NIMH monitoring and guidance.

To assure these projects maximal success in improving the delivery of appropriate mental health care to refugees, a Technical Assistance Center (TAC) was established. Designed to provide support, coordination, and information transfer among the 12 RAP-MH projects, the Technical Assistance Center is charged with developing a comprehensive program in conjunction with each project. Other TAC responsibilities will include the development of a unique technical information resource on cross-cultural definition and treatment of mental illness, the expansion of the number and accessibility of individuals trained in refugee mental health care, and the identification of areas in greatest need of research or service resources. The successful bidder of the nine applicants was the University of Minnesota, which was awarded approximately $300,000 in FY 1985.

As a followup to a series of mental health regional workshops, NIMH has published "Southeast Asian Mental Health: A Focus on Treatment, Training, Services, Prevention, Research, and the Federal Perspective." This source book synthesizes the proceedings of the workshops and also includes current publications in the mental health field.

APPENDIX C

RESETTLEMENT AGENCY REPORTS

(The following reports by the Voluntary and State Resettlement Agencies have been prepared by the individual agencies themselves and express judgements or opinions of the individual agency reporting.)

VOLUNTARY RESETTLEMENT AGENCIES (VOLAGS)

Mr. Wells Klein
Executive Director
American Council for Nationalities Service
95 Madison Avenue
New York, N.Y. 10016
(212) 532-5858

Dr. Jan Papanek
President
American Fund for Czechoslovak Refugees, Inc.
1776 Broadway, Suite 2105
New York, N.Y. 10019
(212) 265-1919

Mr. Douglas Powers
Deputy Director
Buddhist Council for Refugee
Rescue and Resettlement
Gold Mountain Monastery
1731 15th Street
San Francisco, CA 94103
(415) 621-5202

Mr. Dale de Haan
Director
Immigration and Refugee Program
Church World Service
475 Riverside Drive, Room 666
New York, N.Y. 10115-0050
(212) 870-2257

Mr. Karl D. Zukerman
Executive Vice President
HIAS, Inc.
200 Park Avenue South
New York, N.Y. 10003
(212) 674-6800

Ms. Helen Huff
Director
Idaho International Institute
2444 Penitentiary Road
Boise, Idaho 83702
(208) 342-4723

Mr. Robert DeVecchi
Executive Director
International Rescue Committee
386 Park Avenue South
New York, N.Y. 10016
(212) 679-0010

Mr. Marvin Weidner
Executive Director
Iowa Refugee Service Center
4626 S.W. 9th Street
Des Moines, Iowa 50315
(515) 281-3119

Rev. Donald H. Larsen
Director
Lutheran Immigration and Refugee Service
360 Park Avenue South
New York, N.Y. 10010
(212) 532-6350

Mr. Janusz Krzyzanowski
Executive Vice President
Polish American Immigration
and Relief Committee, Inc.
17 Irving Place
New York, N.Y. 10003
(212) 254-2240

Rev. Samir Habiby
Executive Director
The Presiding Bishop's Fund for
World Relief (The Episcopal Church)
815 Second Avenue
New York, N.Y. 10013
(212) 867-8400

Mr. Leon Marion
Executive Director
Tolstoy Foundation, Inc.
200 Park Avenue South
16th Floor
New York, N.Y. 10003
(212) 677-7770

Rev. Nicholas DiMarzio
Director
Migration and Refugee Services
United States Catholic Conference
1312 Massachusetts Ave., N.W.
Washington, D.C. 20005
(202) 659-6630

Mr. Donald Bjork
Associate Executive Director
World Relief Refugee Services
P.O. Box WRC
Nyack, N.Y. 10960
(914) 268-4135

AMERICAN COUNCIL FOR NATIONALITIES SERVICE (ACNS)

The American Council for Nationalities Service (ACNS) is a national non-sectarian organization which has been concerned with issues affecting immigrants, refugees, the foreign born and their descendents for sixty years. ACNS is the national office for a network of 33 member agencies and affiliates across the country. All members of the ACNS network provide services to refugees in their local communities. Twenty-eight are active in direct resettlement of refugees from overseas. In addition to initial resettlement, member agencies provide ongoing services including casework and counseling, legal immigration, educational services and a range of community awareness activities.

Since 1975, the ACNS network has directly assisted over 65,000 refugees from Southeast Asia, Eastern Europe, the Near East, Africa, Afghanistan, and Cuba to become productive members of American society. In addition to serving refugees directly resettled by ACNS, member agencies provide extensive social services, employment assistance, language training, and immigration services to large numbers of refugees sponsored by other agencies.

Resettlement Program

During fiscal year 1985 ACNS and its member agencies resettled the following numbers of refugees:

Afghan	189
African	275
European	47
Hmong	246
Cambodian	2,636
Laotian	317
Latin American	4
Vietnamese	1,970
	5,684

The National Office of ACNS provides a variety of refugee-related resources to member agencies and affiliates. Program development and monitoring, centralized information development and distribution, aasistance with management allocations and processing of refugees are just a few of these services.

ACNS member agencies serve as sponsors for all refugees they resettle. Although relatives of interested groups may act as co-sponsors, member agencies are responsible for insuring that pre-arrival arrangements are completed and that the refugee or refugee family is met at the airport. In addition, agencies secure housing, provide furniture, food, clothing, and financial support for a minimum of 30 days. All refugees are referred for medical screening as soon as possible after arrival.

Utilizing a case management approach, ACNS assigns each refugee to a case manager. The case manager works with the refugee on an ongoing basis to assess needs and to develop and implement a resettlement plan. If the case manager does not speak the refugee's language, interpreter services, either from agency staff or volunteers, are available. Although supportive services, such as ESL and counseling may be required, the focus of all planning is on the acquisition of employment for all employable refugees as quickly as possible.

Employment Services

Employment services are viewed as critical during the resettlement process. Most ACNS agencies employ staff specifically for job counseling and placement. In these agencies, a job counselor discusses types of work available, job placement policies, the value of work over public assistance, job upgrading, etc. The counselor helps the refugee to put together a realistic plan for employment, orients the refugee to American work systems, and works with the refugee to find an appropriate position. The staff attempts to plan individually with and for each employable new arrival, to closely monitor progress towards achievement of agreed-upon objectives, and to focus on the goal of early lasting employment.

Related Activities

ACNS sees its commitment to refugees and immigrants as broader than sponsorship and resettlement. The ACNS public information program is unique in the scope of its interests, target populations, and activities. Since 1923, ACNS has published the weekly newsletter Interpreter Releases, considered the preeminent publication in the field of immigration and nationality law. Since December 1981, ACNS has published Refugee Reports, a national bi-weekly resettlement newsletter. Refugee Reports is widely distributed and meets the information needs of public officials, private agency personnel, and community groups serving refugees in the United States.

The United States Committee for Refugees (USCR), the public information program of ACNS, informs the American public, policy-makers and practitioners of refugee problems around the world and stresses the vested interest this country has in responding to and supporting principles regarding refugee well-being.

USCR publishes the World Refugee Survey, an annual compilation of articles and statistics on refugee problems, and also issues special reports on specific refugee problems with recommendations for their resolution. Recent issue papers include a report on the current situation of the Cambodians in Thailand and a thought provoking analysis of human rights in Uganda.

Volunteerism is an important aspect of the ACNS programs. Volunteers provide thousands of hours of service each year to member agencies. Among other contributions, volunteers are active on governing

boards, teach English, provide group instruction, solicit and collect donated goods, organize and run cultural events, and participate in community relations programs.

As community-based organizations, all member agencies involved in the refugee program are active in local and State refugee networks, often providing the focus for cooperation and coordination. In many places agencies have developed joint service projects with other service providers and Mutual Assistance Associations in order to maximize resources and coordination.

AMERICAN FUND FOR CZECHOSLOVAK REFUGEES, INC.

The American Fund for Czechoslovak Refugees, Inc. (AFCR) was organized in May 1948 in New York City after the communist coup d'etat in Czechoslovakia with the support of the Soviet Union, when tens of thousands of Czechoslovaks, many of whom had survived Nazi concentration camps, fled and were granted asylum in Germany, Austria, Italy, France, and other Western European countries. With the understanding and support of the governments of the countries of first asylum, the allied occupation military commanders, UNRRA, International Refugee Organization, and later United Nations High Commissioner for Refugees, 12 AFCR offices were established in Western Europe. Cooperating groups were created in Canada, Australia, New Zealand, South Africa, and South America. These endeavors resulted in the integration of many thousands of individuals in Western Europe and in the resettlement of many more in the United States and other countries of the free world.

In 1973 the AFCR was asked to assist also in the resettlement of Indians expelled from Uganda by the Idi Amin dictatorship.

In 1975 the AFCR was present and active in Camp Pendleton, California, and in Indiantown Gap, Pennsylvania, helping resettle the first waves of Indochinese refugees.

Since its founding, the AFCR has served over 120,000 refugees from Eastern Europe and 18,017 Vietnamese, Laotian, and Cambodian refugees since the beginning of the U.S Indochinese refugee program in 1975.

In FY 1985 the following refugees were resettled:

Vietnamese	400
Cambodians	908
Laotians	124
Czechoslovaks	504
Poles	9
Bulgarians	10
Romanians	9
Hungarians	12
Russians	1
TOTAL	1,977

The AFCR national office is located at 1776 Broadway, Suite 2105, New York, New York 10019. The regional offices, which are direct extensions of the parent agency, are located in New York City, Boston, Salt Lake City, and San Francisco. Each regional office is organized in a standardized manner; it maintains a regional director and the appropriate number of supportive staff in order to ensure the fulfillment of the regional responsibilities and comprehensive delivery of quality core services.

Each regional office is multi-ethnic in scope. The Indochinese and East European programs have been established at all sites and will be fully functioning throughout FY 1985. The Indochinese program carries out the resettlement of the entire range of all Indochinese ethnic groups and the East European programs concentrate mainly on Czechoslovak, Polish, and other East European refugees.

In addition to regional offices, the AFCR maintains three small resettlement operations: Chicago, Illinois; Bowling Green, Kentucky; and Minneapolis, Minnesota.

In Chicago, "Nghia Sinh International, Inc.", (approximately 50 volunteers) are involved in resettlement of exclusively Vietnamese refugees. 81 persons were resettled in FY 1985; the expected caseload in FY 1986 will be about the same.

In Bowling Green, the "Western Kentucky Refugee Mutual Assistance, Inc.", in cooperation with various local churches and private sponsors, has assisted the AFCR in resettling predominantly Cambodian and Lao family reunification cases. In FY 1985, 78 persons were resettled; the expected caseload in FY 1986 will be approximately the same.

In Minneapolis, the AFCR has an agreement with the YMCA of Metropolitan Minneapolis, "Hiawatha Branch". The YWCA resettled 121 persons (Lao, Khmer, Vietnamese) and plans to resettle approximately the same number in FY 1986.

One of the more significant developments in the activities of the AFCR was the agreement in February 1984 with the International Institute of Idaho ("Idaho Voluntary Agency"), approved by the State of Idaho, to resettle a substantial number of East European refugees in that State. One hundred seventy-four East European and 54 Indochinese refugees have been resettled in Idaho in the FY 1985. This operation will continue in FY 1986.

The AFCR generally restricts the resettlement of refugees to those localities in which it has established regional offices or affiliated operations. Therefore, in keeping with this policy, refugees are resettled in New York City and vicinity, Massachusetts, California, Utah, Idaho, Illinois, Kentucky, and Minnesota. Out of the total of 545 East European refugees, 120 who are properly assured by individual sponsors have been resettled in the following States: Arizona, Colorado, Connecticut, Florida, Illinois, Michigan, Minnesota, Missouri, Nevada, New Jersey, New Mexico, North Dakota, Ohio, Oregon, Pennsylvania, Texas, Virginia, and Washington. East European refugees are generally provided with excellent services by their sponsors. Also ethnic Czechoslovak organizations serve in the orientation process and acclimatization of new arrivals.

Besides the network in the United States, the AFCR maintains its European headquarters in Munich, West Germany, with regional offices in Vienna, Austria; Paris, France; and Rome, Italy. With the exception of Rome, all European offices register and process East European refugees for admission to several Western countries, mainly the United States, Canada, Australia, and New Zealand. East European refugees, predominantly Czechoslovaks, are resettled in those countries with the help of local ethnic Czechoslovak organizations. During FY 1985 the AFCR European offices helped 224 refugees emigrate to Canada, 111 to Australia, and 5 to other Western countries. 311 refugees were assisted in the process of local integration in the European countries of first asylum.

The AFCR resettlement program primarily utilizes the casework model in the provision of resettlement services. The AFCR's regional offices have in the past and will in the future provide, as required in the Cooperative Agreement with the Department of State, the necessary pre-arrival, reception, counseling, and referral services to their refugee clients. AFCR considers itself to be the ultimate sponsor of its refugee regardless of any other sponsorship arrangement.

Self-sufficiency is stressed at the outset of the resettlement process. AFCR functions with the belief that placement of refugees in employment immediately, or as soon as possible after arrival, while simultaneously encouraging development of skills required for subsequent advancement, is the most positive approach to resettlement and the achievement of self-sufficiency for the refugee. AFCR emphasizes the importance of English language training essential to both development of skills, etc., as well as to achieve self-sufficiency as quickly as possible.

BUDDHIST COUNCIL FOR REFUGEE RESCUE AND RESETTLEMENT

The Buddhist Council for Refugee Rescue and Resettlement is an organization of Buddhist congregations and Mutual Assistance Associations that have come together to assist refugees in their efforts to become integrated and productive members of American society. Among the Buddhist organizations which are affiliated with the Buddhist Council, the oldest and most active have been involved in various aspects of assisting refugees and immigrants for many years. The member organizations share the ethnic, cultural, and religious background of the vast majority of the Indochinese refugees resettling in the United States and often function as the social and cultural centers for ethnic clusters where the great majority of Asian immigrants dwell.

While the Buddhist Council has resettled a few non-Asian refugees, the major emphasis of its resettlement efforts is the Indochinese refugee. Since this group of refugees, which has dominated the United States refugee flow since 1975, has needs and characteristics somewhat different than those served through the traditional European-oriented program, the Buddhist Council has developed a unique approach to resettlement. A majority of the refugees resettled through the Buddhist Council are initially resettled at a residential training site for a four-month training program which includes intensive ESL, employment services including vocational training, acculturation, medical screening and treatment, and final placement and resettlement at a site where self-sufficiency is most likely to occur.

This program makes it possible to deliver a wide range of initial services without overlapping, duplication, or the waste of repeated and various referrals. It also makes it possible to generate an individually-tailored and realistic resettlement plan, based on direct contact and consultation with the refugee, with optimum chances for success in self-sufficiency, thereby reducing the possibility of secondary migration.

This initial training program, the Indochinese Refugee Training Program (IRTP), provides the Buddhist Council an opportunity to do the following:

1) Develop a clear profile of the refugee family in regards to their employment skills and close personal contacts, family or otherwise, in the United States and set up a final resettlement opportunity upon graduation from the IRTP that will be stable and offer the greatest possibilities for productive adjustment to United States society.

2. Resolve most medical problems and treat those that require followup.

3. Provide employment training for employable adults. Presently this includes training by professional and certified staff in janitorial work, landscape and garden maintenance, greenhouse and nursery skills, and other entry-level marketable skills. This program trains people for employment opportunities that are realistically available for recently arrived refugees.

4. Provide drivers' training that not only trains refugees in driving skills, but helps them through the licensing process. Most refugees in the drivers' training now leave the program with a driver's license. This removes one of the major impediments to employment.
5. Provide intensive ESL for all refugees, up to six hours a day. This aspect of the program is particularly important in giving the refugee an opportunity to remove the serious language barrier that makes rapid advancement in the work world difficult.
6. Provide a full day of school for all school age children and day care for all pre-school children. This not only educates the children in the traditional school curriculum but further prepares the students for future classroom settings. The child-care for the pre-school children has the benefit of allowing the mothers to attend educational and training classes.
7. Instill the traditional American values concerning work and civic responsibility.
8. Deliver services in a coordinated and intensive fashion that are easily evaluated as to their per capita costs for the whole range of services necessary in the initial stages of resettlement.

The final resettlement after completion of the program involves a further three months of oversight. The refugee is sent on to the final resettlement site in accordance with the plan developed at the IRTP with the cooperation of the staff at the resettlement site. The refugee is

housed, clothed, fed, etc., with the aid of Buddhist Council per capita funds and subcontracted staff or volunteer workers, depending on the mode of resettlement, and the employment plan developed at the IRTP is put into effect.

The Buddhist Council has developed subcontractors at certain sites where a majority of its cases are resettled; these include: Houston, Texas; Kansas City, Missouri; Oklahoma City, Oklahoma; and Pomona, California. At other sites where fewer refugees are resettled the Buddhist Council maintains a congregational approach. Congregations at such sites as Dallas, Texas; Charlotte, North Carolina; Providence, Rhode Island; Phoenix, Arizona, etc., sponsor one case at a time and work with that case until self-sufficiency is achieved.

In FY 1985 the following refugees were resettled:

Cambodians	439
Laotians	69
Vietnamese	213
TOTAL	721

CHURCH WORLD SERVICE

Church World Service is the relief, development and refugee service arm of the National Council of the Churches of Christ in the U.S.A., an ecumenical community of 31 Protestant and Orthodox Christian communions. In fiscal year 1985, the Church World Service Immigration and Refugee Program resettled 5,817 refugees from around the world through its participating denominations.

The CWS Immigration and Refugee Program philosophy of refugee service is based on the Christian religious commitment to aid the uprooted, the hungry and the homeless. Ultimately, the goal is to help refugees become self-sufficient members of their adoptive communities. This commitment manifests itself in the strong constituency for refugee concerns within the church community throughout the nation. This strong constituency both provides an atmosphere of acceptance for refugees in churches across the land and contributes time, materials, and funds to help refugees meet their needs until they become self-supporting. As our study, Making It on Their Own: From Refugee Sponsorship to Self-Sufficiency (December, 1983) demonstrated, CWS congregations contributed an estimated $133 million in cash, goods and services to resettle refugees during the period FY 1980 through the first half of FY 1983. That survey also noted that, over time, most refugees are finding jobs, that refugee use of public assistance is significantly lower than commonly believed, and that, over time, most refugees are achieving self-sufficiency.

Church World Service assists the work of the Protestant church community around the nation working through 1) national denominational leadership, 2) Ecumenical Refugee Resettlement and Sponsorship Services (ERRSS) offices connected to local ecumenical church councils, and 3) local congregations.

The national denominations find church sponsors, and provide counseling, financial assistance, and monitoring throughout the sponsorship. The national resettlement officers of these denominations form the Immigration and Refugee Program Committee which makes policy and oversees the total program.

Many of our sponsors are assisted by Ecumenical Refugee Resettlement and Sponsorship Services (ERRSS) projects, which are located in areas of major CWS resettlement activity. These projects help find sponsors, provide information and advocacy for refugees, provide documented case management, and conduct a variety of post-arrival services such as English-as-a-Second Language training, job development, referral, and counseling services. Twenty-one such offices were provided funding through CWS in FY 1985.

CWS made a number of significant steps forward in our work on behalf of refugees in FY 1985.

- Our new "ORACS" computer system went "on line." This system has vastly improved our ability to serve refugees efficiently. What before was a lengthy process of keeping records and moving files by hand is now simplified through the use of computers.

- Our loan repayment department achieved again the highest collection rate among U.S. resettlement agencies. The $1,700,000 collected illustrates the financial self-sufficiency of refugees who have become able to make payments on their own loans, thus providing money for other refugees to come to the U.S.

- During 1985, CWS participated with the Office of Refugee Resettlement in the Chicago Demonstration Project, the Refugee Early Employment Program in Portland, Oregon, the San Francisco Demonstration Project and the Matching Grant program at two sites, all with positive contributions towards improving refugee resettlement in the U.S.

- The Church World Service Immigration and Refugee Program's weekly newsletter, Monday, entered its fourth year of publication. The newsletter seeks to keep the network of offices related to CWS informed and up-to-date on refugee issues. It includes news from Washington, new resources, features, and other items.

- We published "Finding a Helping Hand: Low-cost Staffing Resources for Refugee service Agencies", a directory of volunteer service programs and other resources.

- Events celebrating refugees, thanking church sponsors and attracting considerable news media coverage were held around the country, in cities including Houston, Texas; Knoxville, Tennessee; Los Angeles and Oakland, California; and Portland, Oregon.

- The Church World Service Immigration and Refugee Program, the Canadian Inter-Church Committee for Refugees, and LIRS convened a "Canada-U.S. Church Consultation on Safe Haven" which brought together 55 church leaders to find ways of providing better protection for refugees in the Americas.

In addition to the work of the Immigration and Refugee Program here in the United States, other offices of Church World Service work with addressing refugee needs in camps overseas such as Afghans in Pakistan and helping colleague churches around the world work to address the root causes which force refugees to flee.

Church World Service looks forward to continuing its service to refugees in the future in the unique partnership of private and public services of the U.S. Refugee Resettlement Program.

HIAS

HIAS, the Hebrew Immigrant Aid Society, is the refugee and migration agency of the organized Jewish community in the United States.

Our philosophy of resettlement is an outgrowth of over one hundred years of experience in the field of refugee resettlement. In developing this philosophy, we have had the advantage of being able to work in close conjunction with a nationwide network of professionalized Jewish community social service agencies. This network provides us with expert and professionally-derived information and feedback on the progress of each refugee resettlement. Furthermore, it enables us to provide comprehensive case management services under the supervision of trained social workers who are familiar with local resources so as to ensure a smooth transition for newcomers as they enter their new communities.

Our structure and system are particularly suited to the migration and absorption of Jewish refugees. Nonetheless, as experienced resettlement professionals, HIAS has taken part over the years in almost every major refugee migration to this country, regardless of ethnic background.

In resettling both Jewish and non-Jewish clients HIAS uses the facilities provided by Jewish Federations and their direct-service agencies, such as Jewish Family Services, Jewish Vocational Services and Jewish Community Centers in almost every city across the country. In New York, we use the services of the New York Association for New Americans, a beneficiary of the United Jewish Appeal. In national resettlement efforts, we work closely with the Council of Jewish Federations, the coordinating and planning body for Jewish Federations in the United States and Canada. In our resettlement programs, wherever possible, the

refugee becomes the responsibility of the organized Jewish community and is serviced by a team of qualified, trained professionals who have as their major priority the successful resettlement of refugees.

This program emphasizing professionalized coordinated professional case management does not fail to utilize resources such as the refugee's stateside family and volunteers. Wherever needed, the stateside family is given guidance and direction by a professional in the field of refugee resettlement. Similarly, volunteers are trained and supervised by a professional.

In a very small percentage of our cases, the stateside relative, often a newcomer to the United States, is capable of assuming the major financial responsibility for the resettlement of his or her incoming family. Even in those cases, however, we feel that a professional agency must be on hand to alleviate any breakdown in resettlement plans.

HIAS monitors the progress of resettlement programs in individual communities very carefully, and conducts nationwide meetings on resettlement issues. HIAS field representatives also travel to resettlement sites to assess local needs and to ensure a consistently high level of service appropriate to local conditions. Thus, flexibility and diversity of services are maintained from community to community. Although clients are placed by our New York office in a community of resettlement primarily on the basis of relative reunion, work potential and job markets are also taken into account. Consequently, the types of programs developed in individual communities can vary. The differences

in programming can involve not only the type and extent of English language training, but also must consider the income potential of clients, their ability to develop self-help groups, housing requirements, size of families, and many other issues.

While certain areas have readily available job placements, other areas have high rates of unemployment, but must nevertheless be utilized for resettlement because of the exigencies of relative reunion. Quite clearly, the period of maintenance and types of services offered in these varying areas differ. Because we meet with both policy makers and practitioners from across the country on a frequent and regular basis, we feel that independence and flexibility in programming is not only possible, but necessary and beneficial to the resettlement process. Since certain communities have developed into centers for certain ethnic groups, those communities must make unique provisions for the social and cultural needs of those groups.

The nature of our programs allows not only for diversification of programming from community to community, it also allows for the efficient utilization of experience and new information concerning refugee resettlement. Our local affiliates can benefit from the long-time experience of the central HIAS office and can also draw upon the experience and expertise of other communities and agencies in developing refugee programming. Moreover, a professional staff has the advantage of dedication, training, and disciplined concern for refugees.

Quite clearly, effective refugee resettlement requires a group of people trained in differing areas of expertise; people with abilities in vocational assessment and job finding, English language training, family counseling, legal issues, etc. All of these areas, however, must be

coordinated and brought together into a coherent program. Unless there is a central policy-making body in each community, there is a very great danger that various groups or agencies providing different specialized services may actually find themselves working at cross purposes, viewing each part of the program as an end in itself, instead of as part of a total resettlement program. Therefore, while a great deal of independence must be given to an individual community, a highly coordinated effort must be developed within the community itself.

Community-wide coordination is also needed in order to utilize available resettlement funds in the optimal manner. All communities bring substantial outlays of private funds and human resorces to their resettlement programs. In addition, some of our affiliates choose to participate in the ORR Matching Grant Program and reception and placement grants are made available to local agencies through he HIAS national office.

While we have stressed that there is flexibility and diversity from community to community in the types of services offered to the refugees, there are certain general guidelines upon which we and all our affiliates agree, and general agreement on the basic attitude towards resettlement. Both our placement policies and resettlement programs in general are structured around two essential elements: Reunion with relatives whenever advisable, and dignified and appropriate employment as soon as possible. These principles can be translated basically into the twin goals of emotional adjustment and financial integration.

By emphasizing relative reunion and the earliest possible appropriate job placement, we try to build upon the refugee's sense of independence and avoid fostering reliance on private and public institutions. Relative reunion helps this situation by shifting lines of the interdependency from a client-agency or client-government relationship, to a family relationship, which is, of course, to the client's advantage.

In terms of earliest possible appropriate job placement, we find that the vast majority of refugees have been out of work for at least a year by the time they arrive in the United States. Changes in culture, economic system, and separation from everything they know as familiar can cause feelings of insecurity. Therefore, we find that even if the job found initially is below the level indicated by the client's qualifications, early job placement is important not only for financial but for therapeutic reasons. Once the client has become socially and economically productive, he can improve his English after work, and can gradually upgrade his level of employment.

Since 1975, the total number of HIAS assisted refugee arrivals to the U.S is as follows:

FY 1975	7,958
FY 1976	7,322
FY 1977	6,732
FY 1978	10,647
FY 1979	28,626
FY 1980	29,533
FY 1981	13,115
FY 1982	3,650
FY 1983	2,568
FY 1984	2,407
FY 1985	2,393

In the following table, refugees resettled in the U.S. by HIAS during FY 1985 are listed by country or region of origin:

USSR	494
Eastern Europe	102
Afghanistan	38
Ethiopia	47
Southeast Asia	1,218
Iran	488
Cuba	2
Syria	4
TOTAL	2,393

IDAHO VOLUNTARY RESETTLEMENT AGENCY

The Idaho Voluntary Resettlement Agency was developed at the recommendation of the Governor's Task Force on Refugee Resettlement 1979. After surveying sponsors and refugees who resettled in Idaho between 1975 and 1979 and after talking with other State Refugee Coordinators, the Governor's Task Force concluded that there was a need for the local presence of a voluntary agency to promote and support quality resettlement in Idaho. The Idaho Voluntary Resettlement Agency contracted with the U.S. Department of State in January 1980 to respond to this need. In February of 1983 the Idaho Voluntary Resettlement Agency, at the Governor's recommendation, became a private, non-profit organization and is now housed in the Idaho International Institute.

During fiscal year 1985, the Idaho International Institute sponsored 141 direct placements to Idaho.

Fiscal Year 1985

Number of Refugees Resettled in Idaho

Ethnic Group	Number of Refugees
Indochinese	141

Favorable sites for resettlement within Idaho are identified by the voluntary agencies representatives through community meetings and through data provided through the State Coordinator's Office. Factors considered when identifying favorable sites include: The local unemployment rate; the impact on and availability of public and private resources to provide support services; community attitude (measured by volunteer response, media coverage, elected officials' positions on resettlement, and incidents of racial tension), population ratio of refugee to non-refugee, welfare dependency rate of local refugees; secondary migration; and the existence of an ethnic group as a support base.

Representatives of the Idaho International Institute recruit, train, and provide support and coordination to the over 100 volunteers who annually assist in providing resettlement core services. Volunteers act as sponsors, host families, friend families or as aides in providing core services. Thus volunteers can participate in resettlement efforts to various degrees, depending on their resources, talents, and time commitment. Sponsorship may be a group, family, or individual effort. Sponsorship recruitment is aimed at non-traditional groups such as fraternal organizations, civic clubs, educational institutions and youth groups as well as the more traditional religious congregations.

Close cooperation and coordination between the Idaho International Institute and the Health and Welfare Department's Refugee Resettlement Program accrue to the enrichment of both and the enhancement of the shared goal of refugee self-sufficiency.

INTERNATIONAL RESCUE COMMITTEE, INC.

In 1984, the International Rescue Committee began its second half-century of service to the cause of refugees. Since its inception in 1933, the IRC has been exclusively dedicated to assisting people in flight, victims of oppression. As in the 1930s, when the IRC's energies were focused on the victims of Nazi persecution, so today IRC is directly involved in every major refugee crisis.

The response of the IRC to refugee emergencies is a two-fold one. A major effort is made domestically to help in the resettlement of refugees who have been accepted for admission to the United States. The second major effort lies in the provision of direct assistance to meet urgent needs of refugees abroad in flight or in temporary asylum in a neighboring country.

The IRC carries out its domestic resettlement responsibilities from its New York headquarters and a network of 14 regional resettlement offices around the United States. IRC also maintains offices in Europe to assist refugees in applying for admission to the United States. In addition, the IRC is responsible for the functioning of the Joint Voluntary Agency office in Thailand which, under contract to the Department of State, carries out the interviewing, documenting and processing of Indochinese refugees in Thailand destined for the United States.

Overseas refugee assistance programs are of an emergency nature, in response to the most urgent and critical needs of each particular situation. Most often, these programs have an educational or a health thrust to them, with a particular stress on preventive medicine, public health, sanitation, and health education. At present, the IRC has medical and relief programs of this nature in Thailand, Pakistan, Sudan, Lebanon, Costa Rica, Honduras, and El Salvador.

Goals and Mission

The IRC's overiding goal and mission is to assist, by whatever means are most effective, refugees in need. Such assistance can be of a direct and immediate nature, especially through those programs overseas in areas where refugees are in flight. It can as well be in assisting refugees towards permanent solutions, in particular resettlement in a third country. The objective conditions that pertain in countries of first asylum are critical in determining what the most appropriate response may be.

The goal of IRC's resettlement program is to bring about the integration of the refugee into the mainstream of American society as rapidly and effectively as possible. The tools to accomplish this end are basically the provision of adequate housing, furnishings and clothing, employment opportunities, access to educational services, language training, and counseling.

IRC continues to maintain that refugee resettlement is most successful when the refugee is enabled to achieve self-sufficiency through employment as quickly as possible. True self-reliance can only be achieved when the refugee is able to earn his or her own living through having a job. This is the only viable way that refugees can once again gain control over their lives and participate to the best of their ability in their new society.

IRC Resettlement Activities

The IRC domestic refugee resettlement activities are carried out through a network of 14 regional offices. They are staffed by professional case workers, and supported by volunteers from the local community.

The number of refugees and the ethnic groups each office resettles are determined by an on-going consultation process between each office and national headquarters. A yearly meeting of all resettlement office directors is held at New York headquarters usually at the beginning of each fiscal year. Daily contact, however, is maintained between offices and accommodations made in numbers and ethnic groups, based on new or unexpected refugee developments.

Caseworkers are expected to provide direct financial assistance to refugees on the basis of the specific needs of each case, within overall financial guidelines established by headquarters. The entire amount of the reception and placement grant plus privately raised funds are available to the regional office for its caseload.

The IRC acts as the primary sponsor for each refugee it resettles. As such, it assumes responsibility for pre-arrival services, reception at the airport, provision of housing, household furnishings, food and clothing, as well as direct financial help. Each refugee, as necessary, is provided with health screening, orientation to the community, and job counseling. In this connection, IRC provides for appropriate translation services, transportation, uniforms and tools for specific jobs and, where necessary, medical costs.

Newly arriving refugees are counselled on the desirability of early employment. Each office has job placement workers on staff and has developed contacts through the years with local employers. Federal or State funded job placement programs are utilized on a regular basis as well. IRC continues to be the fiscal agent for such federally-funded programs in New York and San Diego.

Each IRC regional office participates in local refugee forums, as well as advisory committees. Coordination is maintained also with the other resettlemnet agencies, the National Governors' Association, the U.S. Conference of Mayors, The National Association of Counties, and other refugee-related groups.

In addition to its New York headquarters, the IRC regional resettlement offices are located in Boston, Massachusetts; Washington, D.C.; Atlanta, Georgia; Houston and Dallas, Texas; San Diego, Orange County, Los Angeles, San Francisco and San Jose in California; and Seattle, Washington. Offices primarily assisting Cuban refugees are maintained in Union City, New Jersey; and Miami, Florida. The average number of permanent staff in each resettlement office is five to six.

During FY 1984, the International Rescue Committee resettled the following number of refugees:

Vietnamese	2,750
Cambodians	2,272
Laotians	795
Romanians	374
Poles	356
Czechoslovaks	90
Soviets	38
Other Eastern Europeans	103
Iranians	538
Iraqis	6
Afghans	246
Ethiopians	243
Other Africans	8
Cubans	31
Total:	7,850

IOWA REFUGEE SERVICE CENTER

The State of Iowa's participation in the U.S. refugee program began in 1975 when Former Iowa Governor Robert D. Ray created the Governor's Task Force for Indochinese Resettlement. Although the name was later changed to Iowa Refugee Service Center (IRSC), Iowa's program has continued to concentrate on the resettlement of Southeast Asians. Iowa Governor Terry E. Branstad has upheld the strong support of the refugee program and under his leadership IRSC's employment-oriented approach to refugee service has been further strengthened.

8,700 Refugees in Iowa

IRSC has resettled about half of the 8,700 refugees living in Iowa. The other refugees have been resettled by other resettlement agencies represented in the State.

Organization

IRSC is a resettlement agency for refugees, serves as the "single State agency" for U.S. Department of Health and Human Services (HHS) funds and is the major refugee service provider in Iowa. During FY 1984, Iowa Governor Branstad appointed Marvin Weidner as the Executive Director of IRSC and designated the Center as an independent state agency. Mr. Weidner also serves as Iowa's Refugee State Coordinator.

Employment-Oriented Services

IRSC operates an employment-oriented refugee program utilizing a sophisticated case management system that emphasizes job development. In FY 1985, IRSC made a total of 976 job placements for refugees, for an average of 81 placements per month. The cash assistance role is used as the primary document in job development and placement activities with those listed therein being given a high priority in our efforts.

Case management activities continue to receive emphasis with a uniform, structured and monitored system ensuring accountability and timely, coordinated employment services. The National Governor's Association (NGA) Employability Standards project has been integrated into our employment and case management systems with several of our forms being merged with the NGA-mandated employment intake record.

Several meetings with the Des Moines Work Incentive Program (WIN) office have resulted in a preliminary agreement for IRSC staff to act as WIN staff in addressing the needs of post-36 month AFDC and AFDC-UP refugee cases. We hope to be able to assist the Des Moines WIN office staff in providing additional services to their clients by holding orientation, assessment, Job Search Assistance classes, etc., in the refugee's own language. IRSC will also act as a job development and job placement agent for these cases.

Coordination

The Iowa Joint Voluntary Agencies (IJVA), convened by IRSC, continue to meet on a monthly basis. All volags have agreed to provide IRSC with a quarterly Future Resettlement Plans report; each agency's information will then be shared with the other agencies resettling refugees in the state.

Welfare Usage Low

Iowa has, throughout the years, maintained a very low welfare usage rate among its refugees. In September 1985, only 8.7 percent of the 8,700 refugees in Iowa were receiving cash or medical assisstance. (Iowa does not have a general assistance program.) Of the 8.7 percent figure,

181 people or 2.1 percent were unaccompanied refugee minors, 297 people or 3.2 percent were on Refugee Cash Assistance, 220 people or 2.4 percent were on Aid to Families with Dependent Children and 86 people or 1.0 percent were on various medical programs.

IRSC Fiscal Year 1985 Ethnic Resettlement Totals

Afghan	0
Cambodian	78
Hmong	0
Lao	35
Tai Dam	52
Vietnamese	49
Total for FY 1985	214

IRSC Resettlement Total by Fiscal Year

FY 1975-77	1,211
FY 1978	166
FY 1979	535
FY 1980	1,399
FY 1981	581
FY 1982	155
FY 1983	42
FY 1984	267
FY 1985	214
Total Resettlement	4,570

LUTHERAN IMMIGRATION AND REFUGEE SERVICE

Lutherans have been active since the 18th century in helping refugees and immigrants adjust to life in the United States; and the work of Lutheran Immigration and Refugee Service today carries on that tradition. In the LIRS view, resettlement requires a strong moral commitment which systematically encourage refugee self-sufficiency and provides valuable contacts for employment. Since 1975, the Lutheran network has effectively resettled more than 80,000 refugees.

LIRS, a department of the Division of Mission and Ministry of the Lutheran Council in the USA, works on behalf of five church bodies representing 95%, or more than 8 million of all the Lutherans in the United States. Its strength lies in congregational and group sponsorships that provide both material and emotional support to the newcomers. Self-sufficient refugee relatives and cooperating agencies are also accepted as sponsors when congregational or group sponsors are not available.

Each LIRS case is monitored and traced through a standardized system designed to meet individual refugee needs, emphasize early refugee employment, coordinate with community resources, and prevent duplication of services. This system not only ensures that refugees receive the 90-day services mandated by the U.S. Department of State, and that those services are documented as required, but also provides the capacity to serve active cases for up to 12 months after arrival.

The Lutheran system is a three-tiered partnership of local sponsors, regional staff support, and national administration. In general, local sponsors are the primary "case managers" who arrange for initial housing, food, clothing, job placement, health care, enrollment of minors into school, and orientation to American life. These services are most heavily concentrated during the first six months after arrival. Goals are developed early on between the sponsor and the refugee toward long term self-sufficiency.

Regional offices, currently 25, usually related to accredited and affiliated Lutheran social service agencies, provide professional support to sponsors and refugees. They are responsible for recruiting and training local sponsors and then for ensuring and documenting that all core services are provided. These regional offices also provide a variety of other services, such as translation and bilingual counseling, and take part in consultations with state and local government officials for planning and coordination.

The national office in New York City supports and monitors regional and local case management. This includes monitoring regional offices through annual on-site visits and quarterly reports; ensuring appropriate local sponsorship; coordinating reception services at ports of entry and final destination; assuring that tracking and monitoring requirements are met; providing technical assistance in such areas as job development, ESL training and administration of volunteer networks; collecting travel loans; providing grants or loans to refugees in specific situations;

coordinating resettlement of unaccompanied minors; acting as liaison with Interaction, the Refugee Data Center, and the Refugee Resource Center; consulting with government agencies; and, in general, helping local sponsors extend resources as far as possible.

During this fiscal year, LIRS successfully placed, before the Department of State deadline, all of its 5,617 cases approved for travel to the U.S. The highest concentrations of LIRS-resettled refugees are in Florida, Minnesota, Pennsylvania, Southern California, and New England. The largest percentages of those sponsored directly by congregations are in Minnesota, Pennsylvania, Arizona, and North Dakota.

It is LIRS policy to place refugees where there are existing refugee support groups. However, open cases that have no family or other contacts in the U.S. or those involving distant relatives are not placed in areas already heavily impacted with refugee populations such as in Southern California.

During the summer of 1985, LIRS reviewed its relationship with mutual assistance associations (MAAs). Responses to a detailed questionnaire show that local agencies or churches work with more than 265 groups. The contact with MAAs is regular and the cooperation positive and growing. Few negative experiences were reported.

LIRS presumes that refugees do not need special services beyond those reasonably involved in resettlement such as language and job training. As a matter of policy, the agency believes that public assistance should only be used by refugees in emergency or unusual situations, or as a temporary means of support until the newcomer learns a marketable trade or skill.

LIRS's management of a Favorable Alternate Site Project (FASP) in Greensboro, North Carolina, exemplifies the successful use of the agency sponsorship model. The Office of Refugee Resettlement, state, and local authorities have recognized that the project objectives to limit secondary migration by fostering earling employment, were met. Ninety-five percent of employable heads-of-household are working, and many family units have second, third, and even fourth employable persons on jobs.

This year, LIRS also continued to achieve positive results through participation in ORR's matching grant program, in which ORR matches on a dollar-for-dollar basis the cash and in-kind contributions made to each refugee. Two new sites in Minnesota and North Carolina were added to the already existing sites in Pennsylvania and South Dakota. In the current funding cycle, 142 clients were participating in the program as of August 1, 1985. Of these, 106 are either fully or partially economically self-sufficient; none is using cash assistance.

In cooperation with 26 child welfare agencies located in 18 States and the District of Columbia, LIRS continues to place unaccompanied minors from Southeast Asia into foster homes. Amerasian children have become a significant part of this system, along with new program planning required by their special needs.

The agency served as a primary coordinator and the fiscal manager for two national conferences: The ACVA/PAID conference on Asian-American children and the HSS-ORR/LIRS/USCC conference on unaccompanied minors. The former, held in New York City in October 1984, was the first national conference on this subject and led to the development of recommendations

by the Interaction Subcommittee on Children in areas of orientation/counseling overseas, domestic resettlement, and biodata modification. The latter, held in Washington, D.C. in November 1984, brought together over 260 foster care workers from ORR, LIRS, and USCC to exchange information on program operation and concerns.

In addition, LIRS staff from Minnesota, Massachusetts, and New York City met with ORR in February 1985, as members of the Unaccompanied Minors Workgroup, to discuss future program needs, criteria, and staff development. Increasingly, LIRS is called upon to provide consultation, coordination, and leadership on a broad range of issues concerning refugee children.

Participation in international conferences on children's issues included the European Standing Committee of Unaccompanied Minor Refugee Programs, held in The Netherlands in June 1985, as well as a meeting called by Redd Barna (Save the Children Consortium) in Norway the same month.

LIRS re-examined its European refugee processing through attendance at the admissions consultation convened by the U.S. Coordinator for Refugee Affairs in Vienna in July 1985. Refugee camps visited in July included Traiskirchen, Austria, and Camp Latina, Italy; visits were made to camps in Thailand and the Philippines in August.

The attached table shows refugees sponsored through LIRS by month and nationality for the fiscal year.

LUTHERAN IMMIGRATION AND REFUGEE SERVICE

ARRIVALS FOR FISCAL YEAR 1985 BY MONTH AND NATIONALITY

Month	Viet.	Khmer	Lao	Europe	Africa	Near East	Latin America	TOTAL ARRIVALS	NON-REFUGEE ARRIVALS*	TOTAL REFUGEE ARRIVALS
OCT 84	161	80	39	47	2	18	0	347	23	324
NOV 84	203	75	85	59	15	26	0	463	36	427
DEC 84	211	178	31	67	5	14	4	510	27	483
JAN 85	188	79	37	37	0	3	0	344	6	338
FEB 85	115	133	107	40	7	53	0	455	39	416
MAR 85	231	227	55	122	25	44	0	704	33	671
APR 85	193	105	0	70	8	27	0	403	23	380
MAY 85	253	199	11	103	18	40	5	629	9	620
JUN 85	237	173	29	84	4	12	0	539	21	518
JUL 85	107	150	11	48	21	18	4	359	14	345
AUG 85	207	168	23	48	44	12	5	507	19	488
SEP 85	240	195	37	84	43	20	0	619	12	607
TOTAL	2346	1762	465	809	192	287	18	5879	262*	5617

* = Non-refugee arrivals include immigrants, American citizens and humanitarian parole.

POLISH AMERICAN IMMIGRATION AND RELIEF COMMITTEE, INC.

The Polish American Immigration and Relief Committee, Inc. (PAIRC) was founded after World War II, in the fall of 1946, to care for the expected masses of refugees to arrive from Poland, Germany, and other parts of the world. The United States Refugee Program began in 1958 its contractual relationship with the Polish American Immigration and Relief Committee for independent operations both in the United States and in Europe.

The Polish American Immigration and Relief Committee is the only international Polish American Immigration service in the free world. Through its United States offices and its branch offices in Munich, Paris, Rome, Vienna, and Brussels, the Committee has aided more than 37,760 refugees, mainly Poles, but in many cases also other East European nationals.

The Polish American Immigration and Relief Committee, Inc., is an organization dedicated to assisting refugees seeking a new life in the free world, particularly in the U.S., but also advises on emigration problems to other countries.

The paramount aim of PAIRC is the integration of refugees into American life and their speedy resettlement, so that the newcomers may become self-sufficient and productive members of their adopted country and not a drain on its economy.

The most effective way to reach this objective is to assist refugees in finding employment and living quarters, to direct them to the most convenient English language centers, and to provide individual counseling regarding their initial problems in the integration process, so that they

may function effectively, and upgrade their skills, status, and education according to individual and local needs. When emergencies arise, the Polish American Immigration and Relief Committee, Inc. assists the refugees financially as well.

After settling the refugees, PAIRC continues to provide information and counseling and to followup on each case in order to help them become independent citizens in the shortest possible time.

Individual files are kept on all recent and past arrivals as to their address and place of work. Many keep in touch and seek additional information and special assistance on their way to becoming American citizens.

PAIRC does not seek prospective immigrants still living in their native country. The Committee assists those refugees who have registered with one of the local PAIRC European offices.

The processing of the prospective refugees begins in Europe and is handled by PAIRC's European representatives who aid them in presenting their cases and preparing the necessary applications and documents for the U.S. authorities. As soon as the refugees are processed for the U.S., the New York PAIRC headquarters prepares for their arrival. PAIRC abandoned a practice of resettling refugees in cooperation with co-sponsors unless they are a refugee's relatives or close friends with well-established residency. This kind of relationship contributes to an early adaptation of newcomers to the American way of life. PAIRC acts as liaison between the refugee and co-sponsors, advising and guiding them as

to what is required. PAIRC staff's experience in dealing with refugees who arrive from Poland and its knowledge of both Polish American affairs and the situation and problems existing in Poland constitute a unique asset in handling each case according to its individual needs. At the same time, the prospective immigrant is advised as to what to expect in the U.S. regarding living conditions and jobs and how to make resettlement as painless as possible.

Upon arrival in the U.S.A., the refugee is met at the port of entry, transported to the first lodging facility, provided with initial financial assistance, and helped in applying for a Social Security card and in finding living quarters and employment. If the immigrant's co-sponsor lives outside of New York City, PAIRC arranges for transportation to the refugee's final destination.

PAIRC stresses the individual approach in handling of each case, providing help, advice, and information. The office serves as a combination labor exchange, real-estate office, and, most important, an advisory and counseling office for the new arrivals. From the first days outside of Poland until the refugees resettle in the U.S.A., they are helped and directed.

The Polish American Immigration and Relief Committee, is a member of Interaction and cooperates with State and local government agencies. Although it has expertise in handling specific needs of Polish refugees and can give more attention and understanding to these new immigrants, PAIRC always had realized the advantages of working with other organizations well experienced in handling social problems.

Because of its contacts with local public and private manpower and employment agencies, as well as Polish-American organizations and media such as the Polish American Congress, veterans' organizations, Medicus, Polonia Technica, and Polish Parishes, PAIRC is able even better to help the newly arrived Polish refugees.

In fiscal year 1985 PAIRC resettled 529 Polish refugees. Thanks to a favorable economic climate employable people were placed in jobs. The domestic resettlement program has improved and PAIRC did not encounter any substantial problems, though unfortunately medical aid, in some States, is still tied to public assistance.

In fiscal year 1986 PAIRC expects to resettle similar number of refugees.

PRESIDING BISHOP'S FUND FOR WORLD RELIEF

I. Mission of the PFBWR/EC*

The specific mission and work of the Presiding Bishop's Fund for World Relief/Episcopal Church (PBFWR/EC or "The Fund") is based on the Christian imperative expressed in the 25th chapter of the Gospel according to St. Matthew, "to minister to the hungry and thirsty, the sick and those in prison, to clothe the naked and welcome the stranger." Through the Fund, this response is seen as a ministry integral to the overall mission of the Episcopal Church in addressing the totality of human needs, both the spiritual as well as the physical.

The Fund's work is accomplished through its fourfold response in the areas of emergency/disaster relief, rehabilitation, development and refugee/migration assistance, both in the United States and overseas. The Fund's assistance to refugees incorporates aspects of all other areas of the PBFWR/EC ministry.

In the past year this refugee ministry has been directly supported not only by the $560 per capita grants from the Bureau for Refugee Programs of the Department of State but also through some $400,000 of Church monies contributed to the Fund on a average of $230 per arriving refugee. In addition, many thousands of private dollars have been given regionally and locally, to provide assistance for

---

* The full legal name of the Fund is: The Presiding Bishop's Fund for World Relief, of the Domestic and Foreign Missionary Society of the Protestant Episcopal Church in the United States of America.

refugees resettled in the U.S. through The Presiding Bishop's Fund for World Relief. In addition to the commitment of private financial resources, the Fund's refugee work is greatly enhanced by "in-kind" donations by members of sponsoring Episcopal Church parishes and friends in their communities.

II. GOALS OF THE PBFWR/EC IN GLOBAL REFUGEE RESPONSE INCLUDING U.S. RESETTLEMENT

The goals of the PBFWR/EC refugee ministry during FY 1985, as stated by the PBFWR/EC Board of Directors and its Refugee/Migration Committee, were:

A) Fulfilling the imperative of this ministry by encouraging the active participation of the Church-at-large in resettlement services and followup care of refugees through:

1. Networks for information gathering and dissemination.
2. Communication of both Government and Church policy to encourage appropriate response.
3. Training for Church and community volunteers.

B) Continued strengthening of existing international ecumenical response to refugees especially within the Anglican Communion, (a worldwide network representing some 75 million people in 29 Anglican Provinces of which the Episcopal Church in the U.S.A. is one), including assistance to refugees in areas of first asylum.

C) Continued careful monitoring of the work and responsibilities of assigned staff; recommendations for the allocation of funds for the refugee ministry which include the expenditure of U.S. Government derived funds and fulfillment of Cooperative Agreement obligations.

D) The monitoring of Government actions and legislation relating to migration matters and sharing PBFWR/EC concerns with the various Governmental units and the Church-related constituencies.

E) The resettlement of approximately 1,750 refugees through U.S. dioceses and congregations.

The PBFWR/EC believes that the goal of placement and resettlement of refugees is to enable refugees to become self-supporting, independent, and contributing members of the American community as soon as possible after arrival. Refugees should be encouraged to preserve and develop cultural, family, and individual strengths while becoming employed early in the resettlement process.

III. PBFWR/EC POLICY AND ORGANIZATIONAL STRUCTURE

Policy and practices as well as national operations are overseen by the PBFWR/EC Board of Directors, and especially its Refugee/Migration Committee. The Fund's program is directed from the Episcopal Church Center in New York City in coordination with regional Field offices and Dioceses. In addition to the Executive Director, who reports to the Executive For World Mission, and the Assistant Director for Migration Affairs, the New York office has four executive staff officers and one

legal migration lawyer consultant in the Refugee/Migration section. There are three regional field offices with officers located in Los Angeles, California; Fort Worth, Texas; and New York City, New York. A national field officer is based in Seattle, Washington.

On the local diocesan and parish level, services for anchor relatives, parish sponsors, as well as refugees are coordinated by the Diocesan Refugee Coordinators (DRCs) usually in consultation with a diocesan committee. DRCs and diocesan committees are appointed by the Diocesan Bishop (who has the Canonical and legal jurisdiction for the Church in the region) throughout the 98 dioceses of the U.S. and Puerto Rico.

The Fund always uses the Diocesan structure of the Episcopal Church in refugee programming through which resources and the expertise of related programs are committed. The Fund allocates to each diocese $250 of the per capita Reception and Placement (R&P) grant it receives from the Bureau for Refugee Programs of the Department of State. The Fund augments this allocation with $100 per capita of church monies for "impact aid" in designated locations for up to 1,000 refugees, as well as with emergency grants upon the Diocesan Bishop's request.

Grants to support diocesan refugee ministries are approved by the PBFWR/EC Board of Directors upon the submission of a project proposal, signed by the Bishop in whose diocese the program will be carried out. These grants are almost entirely from Church dollars and help to provide sponsorship development, language and job training, as well as other important requisites for successful resettlement. Church dollar-supported grants in the amount of over $281,294 were awarded in

FY 1985. The Fund provided over $13,000 in Church monies for enabling grants for individuals in need of emergency assistance. Also granted was $24,860 as scholarship assistance for professional recertification and short term vocational programs which would ensure employment opportunities for individual refugees.

IV. SPECIFIC RESETTLEMENT ACTIVITIES DURING FY 1985

A major thrust of the FY 1985 program was the continued training of Diocesan Refugee Coordinators to better equip them to assist refugees and sponsors meet the stated goals of resettlement. This training emphasized achieving early employment, providing English language training, and fulfilling the "core services" as outlined in the Fund's Cooperative Agreement with BRP/DOS.

A "resource manual" is provided by the Fund's staff to assist DRCs with the provision of services to refugees received, placed, and resettled through the PBFWR/EC. The manual contains information and guidance on the roles of the DRCs and sponsors, as well as an overview of services available to refugees and sponsors. The manual provides information on:

1. Core service requirements;
2. Sponsorship development;
3. Sponsor training;
4. Processing procedures;
5. Communication resources;
6. Language and cultural orientation materials;
7. Information on financial reporting; and
8. Program monitoring procedures.

Early employment of refugees continues to be an essential aspect of the Fund's resettlement program goals and activities. There is a variety of job counseling and placement programs supported by the participating dioceses and the Fund. Most counseling and placement assistance is provided by the sponsor, the DRC, or diocesan staff.

During FY 1985 several dioceses initiated or greatly enhanced existing employment services to which the Fund has contributed:

A) Dioceses of New Hampshire

The PBFWR/EC provided funds to enable the special training of congregationally based volunteer sponsors. These sponsors have developed a network that has provided employment for almost every refugee case within the first few weeks of arrival.

B) Diocese of West Tennessee

A special diocesan-wide task force on employment was established to help facilitate job development and placement. In addition, the established refugee community has worked with the diocese to assist new arrivals with employment and acculturation.

C) Diocese of Ohio

The PBFWR/EC funded a language training and vocational skills program designed to foster the self-reliance of the Laotian and Hmong refugees in the Toledo area.

Seed monies were also provided for the expansion of a "live bait" business for refugees to encourage self-sufficiency by creating employment opportunities.

D) Diocese of New York

The diocese has linked its refugee job developers into the network of Episcopal Inter-Parish Councils (IPCs). The job developer, working with the broad membership in the IPCs, has been very successful in matching refugees with jobs suited to their skills.

E) Diocese of San Joaquin (California)

A program supported by three of the major funding bodies of the Episcopal Church, including the Presiding Bishop's Fund for World Relief, United Thank Offering, Coalition for Human Needs (with funds additional to those of the PBFWR/EC), continues to assist the Hmong-Lao community with ESL, job skills, acculturation, and the development of agricultural marketing and sewing cooperatives. Employment services are provided to both the primary and secondary wage earners to enable greater self-sufficiency.

F) Diocese of Olympia (Washington)

An existing job development program was expanded, as a result of a grant from the Fund, to train volunteers to provide refugees with ESL and acculturation services and employment opportunities, particularly in the Seattle area.

Innovative programs in sponsorship development and social service followup have also been developed on the diocesan level.

G) Diocese of Connecticut

The Diocese of Connecticut has expanded its sponsorship network by clustering parishes and networking ecumenically. The ministry to Cambodians has been a central theme in the diocesan program. To support the growing community the Presiding Bishop's Fund funded a Cambodian mental health caseworker.

H) Diocese of Long Island

The PBFWR/EC has enabled the Diocese of Long Island to secure the services of a Romanian Orthodox priest as an intern caseworker for the large Romanian population in the boroughs of Queens and Brooklyn. The priest provides a special welcome to new arrivals offering both pastoral care and serving as a link to jobs in the Romanian community. He maintains contact with the refugees throughout stages of the resettlement process and encourages the repayment of the ICM travel loans.

The Presiding Bishop's Fund also directed the diocesan program to opportunities to secure Volunteers for Mission who serve as full time refugee case managers. The local Church contributes all living accommodations so that volunteers from across the country can offer their professional skills and expertise to refugees.

I) Diocese of Oregon

The Presiding Bishop's Fund has provided funding to a DRC in the diocese of Oregon to enable her to complete a degree in therapeutic psychology, specializing in services to victims of torture and persecution and the special cross-cultural needs of Amerasian children. She has made a commitment to provide pro-bono services to refugees and is counseling sponsors where refugees have special problems due to prior trauma.

J) Diocese of Southwest Florida

The Diocese of Southwest Florida's sponsorship of an Ethiopian Orthodox Deacon has resulted in a firm commitment of the diocesan program to Ethiopians. The PBFWR/EC, the diocese, and the local church have provided funds to support the deacon's outreach ministry to the growing Ethiopian community. The deacon provides critically needed pastoral support and assists in refugees in the acculturation process.

K) Diocese of Chicago

The Diocese of Chicago is expanding its ethnic ministries to reach out to Polish, Iranian, Afghan, ethnic Chinese from Southeast Asia, and Romanian refugees. Partnerships are being developed with religious leaders of each of these ethnic communities to strengthen resettlement services.

L) Diocese of Rio Grande

The DRCs in the Diocese of the Rio Grande have offered their time and talent as communication specialists. They have developed an ESL video training program, to be used by volunteers, that is suited especially to teach English to homebound women and refugees with little formal education. This program, called "Let's Learn Language" is being used across the country and has been requested by overseas offices.

V. RESETTLEMENT STATISTICS

The numbers of refugee arrivals and sponsorship assurances through The Presiding Bishop's Fund for World Relief have been increasing. This is due, in part, to increased filing of "interest" requests by sponsors and heightened activity by the DRCs, especially in promoting parish sponsorship.

Specific information on the numbers of refugees resettled via the PBFWR/EC and their country of origin is contained in the following statistical report, "Fiscal Year 1985 Arrival Summary".

FY 1985

Refugee Arrivals

African	
Angolan	3
Ethiopian	105
South African	1
SUBTOTAL	109
European	
Bulgarian	8
Czechoslovakian	13
Hungarian	16
Polish	61
Romanian	288
Yugoslavian	1
SUBTOTAL	387
Indochinese	
Khmer	599
Laotian	57
Vietnamese	262
SUBTOTAL	918
Latin American	
Cuban	2
SUBTOTAL	2
Soviet	
Armenian	1
Russian	1
SUBTOTAL	2
Near East	
Afghan	24
Iranian	296
Iraqi	2
SUBTOTAL	322
Total FY 1985 Refugee Arrivals	1,742

UNITED STATES CATHOLIC CONFERENCE

Migration and Refugee Services of the United States Catholic Conference (MRS/USCC) is the official agency of the U.S. Catholic Bishops for assisting local diocesan resettlement offices in the humane work of helping refugees and immigrants. As the largest resettlement agency in this country, MRS/USCC resettled 26,578 refugees in FY 1985. By area of regional origin, this number breaks down to:

East Asia	21,541
Soviet Union and Eastern Europe	2,660
Near East and South Asia	1,825
Latin America	74
Africa	478

One hundred eighty-four resettlement offices within 165 Catholic dioceses, along with thousands upon thousands of volunteers, make up the community-based network of MRS/USCC.

The MRS office in Washington, D.C. formulates policies at the national level. Also in Washington, there are specialized offices for coordinating information on service resources for diocesan operations and for dealing with governmental agencies, laws, regulations and policies and with international matters. Regular meetings with Congress, the Department of State, the Department of Labor, the Department of Health and Human Services, and the Immigration and Naturalization Service interface MRS with the government at many levels. The Washington office also oversees the New York and the four regional offices in their support of the work done by the dioceses.

The New York MRS office acts as the national operations center. Coordinating its efforts with those of Washington and the regional MRS offices, the New York office assumes major responsibilities for serving as the liaison between the overseas processing and the domestic resettlement system; coordinating the allocation and placement of refugees as well as the transportation arrangements to the refugees' final U.S. destinations; coordinating the financial disbursements for program costs and direct assistance to refugees; coordinating services to refugee children; and processing Orderly Departure Program cases.

Regional program offices are located in Lebanon, Pennsylvania; Fort Smith, Arkansas; San Clemente, California; and Washington, DC. They are responsible for directly supporting the diocesan resettlement offices' efforts. To ensure effective implementation of the MRS/USCC resettlement policies in the dioceses, the regional offices engage in monitoring, evaluation and technical assistance, including assistance in preparing diocesan budgets and reports for the national office. These regional offices also present USCC policies to the HHS/ORR regional offices and state refugee coordinators.

MRS also maintains regional immigration offices in Washington, D.C.; New York, New York; San Francisco, California and El Paso, Texas which work directly with local immigration offices operating in 42 dioceses. These offices provide professional guidance for dioceses offering immigration services.

At MRS, we have found that the most popular and effective approach to the resettlement process is one that involves a group of interested and committed individuals. Thus, the principal actors in the MRS resettlement program are, and have always been, the staff and volunteers

in the local dioceses. Basic services provided to refugees through MRS diocesan programs include securing sponsors for the refugees before their arrival, arranging for living quarters, providing for at least the first month's rent and food and for meeting them at the airport. After the refugees' arrival, the services include orientation to the community, counseling for job-hunting, health screening when necessary, registering for social security, and for any children, school. Services are coordinated through a case-management approach, establishing a direct and cooperative working relationship between the individual refugee or refugee family, the sponsor or anchor relative and the case manager. An individualized service plan for each case is developed--the overriding principle being to help the refugee achieve self-sufficiency as soon as possible (USCC/MRS' Back-to-Basics model). MRS/USCC has found that the quickest, most humane and most cost-effective strategy to achieve self-sufficiency is to give the refugee the opportunity to work in a paid job as soon as possible after he or she enters the country. This employment should be supplemented by vocational and English language training if such training is needed. This need would be established by the case manager, the sponsor and the individual refugee.

In order to implement the principles of the Back-to-Basics model, USCC/MRS designed a demonstration project, the Chicago Project, which lasted from March 1, 1983 to March 31, 1984. Goals of the project included: to decrease the dependence of refugees on public assistance; to employ those refugees involved in the project within six months after

their arrival; and to develop a more efficient resettlement program. MRS was pleased with the success of the Project and hopes to test further the assumptions of the Back-to-Basics model using the authority established in the Fish-Wilson Amendment to the 1985 Continuing Appropriations Resolution.

MRS has long been working toward a more efficient resettlement program wherein public and private resources are coordinated so that all necessary services are provided to the refugee. We are encouraged by recent changes in administrative and legislative policy which emphasize the importance of the achievement of rapid self-sufficiency by the refugee and we look forward to close collaboration among the Federal, State and local governments, other voluntary agencies and mutual assistance associations to coordinate future refugee policies.

WORLD RELIEF

During FY 1985, World Relief, the humanitarian arm of the National Association of Evangelicals, resettled 5,893 of the 67,407 refugees admitted to the United States. The primary mission of the Refugee Services Division (RSD) was to demonstrate its Christian commitment by providing quality resettlement through a thoroughly professional staff and qualified sponsors.

Founded in 1944 to aid post World-War II victims, World Relief is now assisting self-help projects around the world, with a deep commitment to refugees. In cooperation with the United Nations, it is the lead agency in caring for over 16,000 Miskito Indians displaced from Nicaragua to Honduras. It also has large staffs working in the Refugee Processing Centers at Galang in Indonesia and Bataan in the Philippines.

With its International Office in Wheaton, Illinois, World Relief is an active member of Interaction and the Association of Evangelical Relief and Development Organizations (AERDO).

Organization

In the United States, World Relief is a subsidiary corporation of the National Association of Evangelicials, which represents 49 denominations, a plethora of other religious organizations, and approximately 20,000 missionaries throughout the world.

The Refugee Services Division (RSD) of World Relief is administered from its national office near New York City in Congers, New York. Under supervision of this senior management team, resettlement activities were carried out through a nationwide network of thirteen professional offices located in metropolitan Boston, New York, Washington (DC), Miami, Atlanta, Chicago (2), Dallas, Phoenix, Los Angeles, San Francisco, Seattle and San Diego.

From the inception of its refugee resettlement program in 1979, World Relief regional offices have generated a larger network of churches, colleges, seminaries, home-mission groups and para-church organizations--which together provide a broad range of support and services for refugees. In FY 1985, this included sponsorships, cash contributions, gifts-in-kind, technical assistance, public relations assistance, and a variety of volunteer services.

Sponsorship Models

World Relief uses many different kinds of sponships, four most commonly:

1. Congregational. In this model, a local church plays the major role in delivery of services, with World Relief regional staff providing systematic professional guidance to the congregation. A caseworker takes the lead in developing an employment plan and monitoring to ensure progress toward refugee self-sufficiency. Other staff provide assistance to the congregation during the pre-arrival period, with support, counseling, and monitoring during the post-arrival period.
2. American Family. In this model, an American family or cluster of families provides core services, with World Relief staff lending the same professional assistance as in all models.
3. Refugee Family. This model is used primarily for cases where a refugee family is reunited with a relative in the United States. Prior to arrival, World Relief staff work with the anchor relative to develop a resettlement plan, which carefully

delineates responsibility for delivery of core services. Degree of responsibility is relative to resources and capabilities, with World Relief staff developing supplemental goods and services. Again, a caseworker is assigned to the family to provide professional support and direction.

4. Office. In this model, World Relief paid staff, supplemented by community volunteers, provide direct core services to the refugee or refugee family.

Job Placement

World Relief is committed to rapid assimilation of refugees into the American way of life. A constant goal is to settle refugees in non-impacted areas that are enjoying economic growth. Regional offices have designed many programs in which public and private resources are combined to reach this goal.

Refugees Resettled During FY 1985

Region of Origin	Cases	People
Africa	142	237
Europe	273	445
Indochina	1,238	4,864
Near East	130	338
Latin America	4	9
TOTAL	1,787	5,893

APPENDIX D

STATE REFUGEE COORDINATORS

STATE REFUGEE COORDINATORS

REGION I/II

Connecticut:
Mr. Edward Savino
State Refugee Coordinator
Department of Human Resources
1049 Asylum Street
Hartford, Connecticut 06115
(203) 566-4329

Maine:
Mr. David Stauffer
State Refugee Coordinator
Bureau of Resource Development
Department of Human Services
Augusta, Maine 04330
(207) 289-2971

Massachusetts:
Dr. Daniel Lam
State Refugee Coordinator
Department of Public Welfare
600 Washington Street
Room 405
Boston, Massachusetts 02111
(617) 727-8190 or 727-7888

New Hampshire:
Ms. Susan Calegari
State Refugee Coordinator
Division of Human Resources
11 Depot Street
Concord, New Hampshire 03301
(603) 271-2611

New Jersey:
Ms. Rowena Bopp
State Refugee Coordinator
Commissioner's Office
(CN 700)
Department of Human Services
Trenton, New Jersey 08625
(609) 984-3470

Ms. Jane Burger
Refugee Program Manager
Division of Youth and Family Services
(CN 717)
1 South Montgomery Street
Trenton, New Jersey 08625
(609) 292-8395

New York:
Mr. Bruce Bushart
State Refugee Coordinator
Department of Social Services
40 North Pearl Street
Albany, New York 12243
(518) 474-9629

Rhode Island:
Mr. Paul McLaughlin
State Refugee Coordinator
Department of Human Services
600 New London Avenue
Cranston, Rhode Island 02920
(401) 464-3128

Vermont:
Ms. Judith May
State Refugee Coordinator
Charlestown Road
Springfield, Vermont 05156
(802) 885-9602

REGION III/IV

Alabama:
Mr. Joel Sanders
State Refugee Coordinator
Bureau for Cash Assistance
Department of Pensions and Security
64 N. Union Street
Montgomery, Alabama 36130 (205) 261-2875

Delaware:
Ms. Janet Loper
Refugee Coordinator
Division of Economic Services
Department of Health and Social Services
P.O. Box 906, CP Building
New Castle, Delaware 19720 (302) 421-6153

District of Columbia:
Mr. Wallace Lumpkin
Director
Refugee Resettlement Program
Department of Human Services
801 North Capitol Street, N.E., Rm 336
Washington, D.C. 20002 (202) 727-5588

Georgia:
Mr. Mark Hendrix
State Refugee Coordinator
Division of Family and Children's Services
Office of Planning and Development/DHR
878 Peachtree Street, N.E., Room 401
Atlanta, Georgia 30309 (404) 894-7661

Kentucky:
Mr. Roy Butler
State Refugee Coordinator
Department of Human Resources
Bureau for Social Insurance
275 East Main Street
Frankfort, Kentucky 40621 (502) 564-3556

Maryland:
Mr. Frank J. Bien
State Refugee Coordinator
Maryland Office of Refugee Affairs
Department of Human Resources
Rooms 621-625
101 West Read Road
Baltimore, Maryland 21202 (301) 659-1863

Mississippi:
Ms. Jane Lee
State Refugee Coordinator
Department of Public Welfare
P.O. Box 352
Jackson, Mississippi 39205 (601) 354-0341 Ext. 221

North Carolina:
Mr. Robert B. Edmundson, Jr.
State Refugee Coordinator
Family Services Section
Department of Human Resources
325 North Salisbury Street
Raleigh, North Carolina 27611 (919) 733-4650

Pennsylvania:
Mr. Ron Kirby
Office of Policy, Planning and Evaluation
P.O. Box 2675
Harrisburg, Pennsylvania 17120 (717) 783-7535

South Carolina:
Hiram L. Spain, Jr.
Acting State Refugee Coordinator
Agency for Refugee Resettlement
Division of Social Services
P.O. Box 1520
1520 Confederate Avenue
Columbia, South Carolina 29202-9988 (803) 758-2996

Tennessee:
Ms. Martha Roupas
State Refugee Coordinator
Department of Human Services
400 Deaderick Street
Nashville, Tenessee 37219 (615) 741-2587

Virginia:
Ms. Anne H. Hamrick
State Refugee Coordinator
Virginia Department of Social Services
Blair Building
8007 Discovery Drive
Richmond, Virginia 23288 (804) 281-9029

West Virginia:
Mrs. Cheryl Posey
Refugee Coordinator
West Virginia Department of Human Services
1900 Washington Street, East
Charleston, West Virginia 25305 (304) 885-8290

Florida Office of Refugee Resettlement

Florida:

Ms. Nancy Wittenberg
Refugee Programs Administrator
Department of Health and
Rehabilitative Services
1317 Winewood Blvd., Building 1, Rm 420
Tallahassee, Florida 32301
(904) 488-3791

REGION V

Illinois:
Mr. Edwin Silverman
Refugee Resettlement Program
Department of Public Aid
Bureau of Social Services
624 S. Michigan Avenue, 11th Floor
Chicago, Illinois 60605
(312) 793-7120

Indiana:
Mr. Robert Igney
Policy and Program Development
Department of Welfare
141 S. Meridian Steet, 4th Floor
Indianapolis, Indiana 46204
(317) 232-4975

Michigan:
Ms. Paula Stark, Director
Office of Employment Development Services
Department of Social Services
300 S. Capitol Avenue, Suite 711
Lansing, Michigan 48926
(517) 373-7382

Ms. Joyce Savale
Resettlement Assistance Office
Department of Social Services
Michigan Plaza Bldg., Suite 462
1200 Sixth Street
Detroit, Michigan 48226
(313) 256-9776

Minnesota:
Ms. Jane Kretzmann
Coordinator of Refugee Programs
Department of Human Services
Space Center Building, 2nd Floor
444 LaFayette Road
St. Paul, Minnesota 55101
(612) 296-2754

Ohio:
Mr. Michael M. Seidemann
Department of Human Services
Program Development Division
State Office Tower, 30th Floor
30 E. Broad Street
Columbus, Ohio 43215
(614) 466-5848

Wisconsin:
Ms. Sue Levy
Refugee Assistance Office
Department of Health and
Social Services
Rm 480
P.O. Box 7851
Madison, Wisconsin 53707
(608) 266-8354

REGION VI

Arkansas:
Mr. Curtis Ivery, Executive Director
State Coordinator for Refugee Resettlement
Division of Social Services
Department of Human Services
Donaghey Bldg., Suite 1300
P.O. Box 1437
Little Rock, Arkansas 72203

Refugee Resettlement Unit Manager:
Ms. Glendine Fincher
(501) 371-2434

Louisiana:
Ms. Joan Abed
State Refugee Coordinator
Office of Human Development
Department of Health and Human Services
1755 Florida Street
P.O. Box 44367
Baton Rouge, Louisiana 70804
(504) 342-2763

Planning Officer:
Ms. Marcia Daigle
(504) 342-6786

New Mexico:
Ms. Charmaine Espinosa
State Coordinator of Refugee Resettlement
New Mexico Human Services Department
Pera Building, Rm 104
Santa Fe, New Mexico 87503

(505) 827-4212

Oklahoma:
Mr. Robert Fulton
Director, Department of Human Services
Coordinator for Refugee Resettlement
P.O. Box 25352
Oklahoma City, Oklahoma 73125

Refugee Resettlement Unit Manager:
Mr. Jim Hancock
(405) 521-3431

Texas:
Mr. M.J. Raymond
Associate Commissioner for Services to
the Families and Children
State Coordinator for Refugee Programs
John H. Winter Human Services Center
701 W. 51st Street
P.O. Box 2960
Austin, Texas 78769
(512) 450-3448

Assistant Coordinator:
Ms. Lee Russell
(512) 450-4172

REGION VII/VIII

Colorado:
Ms. Laurie Bagan
State Refugee Coordinator
Colorado Refugee Services Program
190 East Ninth Avenue
Denver, Colorado 80203

(303) 863-8211

Iowa:
Mr. Michael V. Reagen
Coordinator for Refugee Affairs
Bureau of Refugee Programs
4626 S.W. 9th Street
Des Moines, Iowa 50319

Chief, Bureau of Refugee Programs:
Mr. Marvin Weidner
(515) 281-3119

Kansas:
Mr. Phil Gutierrez
Refugee Resettlement Coordinator
Department of Social and
Rehabilitation Services
State Office Building
Topeka, Kansas 66612

(913) 296-3349

Missouri:
Ms. Patricia Harris
Division of Family Services
Refugee Assistance Program
P.O. Box 88
Broadway State Office Building
Jefferson City, Missouri 65103

(314) 751-2456

Montana:
Ms. Norma Harris
Refugee Resettlement Coordinator
Department of Social and
Rehabilitation Services
111 Sanders
Helena, Montana 59601

Program Manager:
Mr. Boyce Fowler
(406) 444-3865

Nebraska:
Ms. Maria Diaz
Coordinator of Refugee Affairs
Department of Social Services
301 Centennial Mall South
Lincoln, Nebraska 68509

(402) 471-3121

REGION VII/VIII (continued)

North Dakota:
Mr. Donald L. Schmid
Acting Refugee Resettlement Coordinator
Department of Human Services
State Capitol, 3rd Floor
New Office Wing
Bismarck, North Dakota 58505
(701) 224-4809

South Dakota:
Mr. Vern Guericke
Refugee Resettlement Coordinator
Department of Social Services
Kneip Building
700 N. Illinois Street
Pierre, South Dakota 57501
(605) 773-3493

Utah:
Mr. Sherman Roquiero
State Refugee Coordinator
Department of Social Services
150 W. North Temple
Salt Lake City, Utah 84103
Program Manager:
Ms. Ann Cheves
(801) 533-5094

Wyoming:
Mr. Steve Vajda
Refugee Relocation Coordinator
Department of Health and Social Services
390 Hathaway Building
Cheyenne, Wyoming 82002
(307) 777-6100

REGION IX

Arizona:
Ms. Linda A. Bacon
Refugee Program Coordinator
Arizona Department of Economic Security
P.O. Box 6123
Phoenix, Arizona 85005

(602) 255-3826

California:
Ms. Linda McMahon
Director
Department of Social Services
744 P Street
Sacramento, California 95814
(916) 445-2077

Program Manager:
Mr. Walter Barnes
Chief, Office of Refugee Services
Department of Social Services
744 P Street
Sacramento, California 95814
(916) 324-1576

Guam:
Mr. Dennis Rodriguez
Director
Department of Public Health and
Social Services
P.O. Box 2816
Government of Guam
Agana, Guam 96910

Contact:
Julita Lifoifoi
011-671-477-8966

Hawaii:
Mr. Walter W. F. Choy
Executive Director
Department of Labor and Industrial Relations
Office of Community Services
State of Hawaii
335 Merchant Street, Room 101
Honolulu, Hawaii 96813
(808) 548-2130

Assistant Coordinator:
Mr. Dwight Ovitt
(808) 548-2133

Nevada:
Ms. April Wilson
Deputy Administrator of Social Services
251 Jeanell Drive
Carson City, Nevada 89710

(702) 885-4709

REGION X

Idaho:
Ms. JoAnn Davich
State Refugee Coordinator
Department of Health and Welfare
Refugee Services Program
450 West State Street, 7th Floor
Boise, Idaho 83720 (208) 334-2631

Oregon:
Mr. Ron Spendal
State Refugee Coordinator
Department of Human Resources
100 Public Service Building
Salem, Oregon 97310 (503) 373-7177

Washington:
Ms. Liz Dunbar
State Refugee Coordinator
Bureau of Refugee Assistance
Department of Social and Health Services
Mail Stop 31-B
Olympia, Washington 98504 (206) 753-3086

APPENDIX E

REFUGEE HEALTH PROJECT GRANTS

CDC HEALTH PROGRAM FOR REFUGEES
PROJECT GRANT AWARDS AND PROJECT DIRECTORS
FY 1985

REGION I

Connecticut ($85,250)	Douglas Lloyd, M.D. Connecticut Department of Human Services 79 Elm Street Hartford, CT 06115
Maine ($20,808)	William S. Nersesian, M.D. Bureau of Health Maine Department of Human Services State House, Station 11 Augusta, ME 04333
Massachusetts ($190,928)	Bailus Walker, Jr., Ph.D., M.P.H. Commissioner Massachusetts Department of Public Health 600 Washington Street Boston, MA 02111
New Hampshire ($6,764)	William T. Wallace, Jr., M.D., M.P.H. Division of Public Health Service Health and Welfare Building Hazen Drive Concord, NH 03301
Rhode Island ($58,050)	H. Denman Scott, M.D. Rhode Island Department of Health 75 Davis Street Providence, RI 02908
Vermont ($10,000)	Roberta R. Coffin, M.D. Vermont Department of Health 115 Colchester Avenue Burlington, VT 05401

REGION II

New Jersey ($97,195)	William E. Parkin, D.V.M. State Epidemiologist New Jersey State Department of Health CN 360 John Fitch Plaza Trenton, NJ 08625

New York ($370,729)	Dale L. Morse, M.D. New York State Department of Health Tower Building, Empire State Plaza Albany, NY 12237

REGION III[1]

District of Columbia ($82,500)	Mr. Richard H. Hollenkamp 1875 Connecticut Avenue Room 815 Washington, D.C. 20009
Maryland ($155,397)	Ms. Jeannette Rose Department of Health and Mental Hygiene 201 W. Preston Street, Room 307-A Baltimore, MD 21201
Pennsylvania ($75,519)	Ms. Patricia Tyson Pennsylvania Department of Health P.O. Box 90 Harrisburg, PA 17120
Philadelphia ($111,165)	Mr. Barry Savitz Philadelphia Health Department 500 South Broad Street Philadelphia, PA 19146
Virginia ($118,677)	Mr. Herbert W. Oglesby Office of Management for Community Health 109 Governor Street Richmond, VA 23219

REGION IV[2]

Alabama ($11,392)	Mr. H. E. Harrison Director, Bureau of Area Health Services Alabama Department of Public Health State Office Building, Room 305 Montgomery, AL 36130
Florida ($134,408)	Mr. Gary Clarke Department of Health and Rehabilitative Services 1323 Winewood Boulevard Tallahassee, FL 32301

[1]Delaware and West Virginia did not apply for FY 85 funds.
[2]Mississippi did not apply for FY 85 funds.

Georgia ($139,011)	Keith Sikes, D.V.M. Georgia Department of Human Resources 878 Peachtree Street, N.E. Atlanta, GA 30309
Kentucky ($28,080)	Mr. Charles D. Bunch Barren River District Health Center 1133 Adams Street Bowling Green, KY 42101
North Carolina ($76,900)	Ms. Dara L. Murphy Refugee and Migrant Health Office North Carolina Division of Health Services P.O. Box 2091 Raleigh, NC 27602
South Carolina ($31,575)	Richard Parker, D.V.M. Bureau of Disease Control South Carolina Department of Health and Environmental Control 2600 Bull Street Columbia, SC 29201
Tennessee ($60,000)	Mr. W. Dick Achuff Refugee Health Program Tennessee Department of Public Health & Environment 100 9th Avenue, North Ben Allen Road Nashville, TN 372119-5405

REGION V

Illinois ($257,678)	Bernard Turnoch, M.D. Illinois Department of Public Health 535 Jefferson Street Springfield, IL 62761
Indiana ($43,005)	Charles L. Barrett, M.D. Director, Communicable Disease Control Indiana State Board of Health 1330 West Michigan Indianapolis, IN 46206

Michigan ($111,063)	Mr. Douglas Paterson Michigan Department of Public Health 3500 North Logan Street P.O. Box 30035 Lansing, MI 48909
Minnesota ($161,986)	Mr. Michael Moon, Chief Communicable Disease Section Minnesota Department of Health 717 Delaware Street, S.E. Minneapolis, MN 55440
Ohio ($145,160)	Thomas J. Halpin, M.D. Chief, Bureau of Preventive Medicine Ohio Department of Health 246 North High Street Columbus, OH 43216
Wisconsin ($76,108)	Mr. Ivan E. Imm Director, Bureau of Prevention Wisconsin Department of Health One West Wilson Street Madison, WI 53701

REGION VI

Arkansas ($50,400)	Mr. Charles W. McGrew, M.P.H. Bureau of Public Programs Arkansas Department of Health 4815 West Markham Street Little Rock, AR 72201
Louisiana ($76,148)	Mr. Sam Householder Louisiana Department of Health and Human Services P.O. Box 60630 New Orleans, LA 70160
New Mexico ($62,161)	Ms. Mary Lou Martinez New Mexico Health and Environmental Department P.O. Box 968 Santa Fe, NM 87503
Oklahoma ($58,970)	Mr. Stephen W. Ronck Director, Refugee Health Program Oklahoma State Department of Health P.O. Box 53551 Oklahoma City, OK 73152

Texas ($444,755)	Ms. Eleanor R. Eisenberg Texas Department of Health 1100 West 49th Street Austin, TX 78756

REGION VII[3]

Iowa ($108,423)	Mr. Paul Carlson Iowa State Department of Health Lucas State Office Building Des Moines, IA 50319
Kansas ($71,391)	Ms. Sarah Harding Kansas Department of Health and Environment Forbes AFB, Building 740 Topeka, KS 66620
Missouri ($46,456)	H. Denny Donnell, Jr., M.D. Missouri Department of Social Services P.O. Box 570 Jefferson City, MO 65102

REGION VIII[4]

Colorado ($83,500)	John Emerson, D.V.M., Acting Chief, Communicable Disease Control Colorado Department of Health 4120 East 11th Avenue Denver, CO 80220
Montana ($5,000)	Mr. Dennis Lang Missoula City-County Health Department 301 Alder Missoula, MT 59802
North Dakota ($12,000)	Mr. Fred F. Heer North Dakota State Department of Health State Capitol Bismarck, ND 58505
South Dakota ($15,000)	Mr. Kenneth Senger South Dakota State Department of Health Joe Foss Building Pierre, SD 57501

[3]Nebraska did not apply for Fy 85 funds.
[4]Wyoming did not apply for FY 85 funds.

Utah ($81,500)	Ms. Judi Alder Utah State Department of Healt 150 West North Temple Salt Lake City, UT 84110

REGION IX

Arizona ($76,063)	Robert G. Harmon, M.D. Director, Division of Public Health Maricopa County Health Department P.O. Box 2111 Phoenix, AZ 85001
California ($2,061,380)	James Chin, M.D. State of California Department of Health Services 2151 Berkeley Way Berkeley, CA 94704
Hawaii ($75,000)	Mr. Leslie Matsubara Director's Office State of Hawaii Department of Health P.O. Box 3378 Honolulu, HI 96801
Nevada ($37,614)	Ms. Catherine Lowe Division of Health Nevada State Department of Human Resources 505 E. King Street, Room 200 Carson City, NV 89710

REGION X[5]

Idaho ($19,718)	Ms. Rosemary Shaber, R.N. North Central District Health Department 1221 F. Street Lewiston, ID 83501
Oregon ($102,155)	Mr. David M. Gurule Office of Community Health Services Oregon State Health Division P.O. Box 231 Portland, OR 97207
Washington ($299,018)	Mr. Gary Johnson Health Services Division M/S LJ-12 Olympia, WA 98504

[5]Alaska did not apply for FY 85 funds.

☆U.S. GOVERNMENT PRINTING OFFICE: 1986-621-467/143