HOLMAN

REPORT TO THE CONGRESS

January 31, 1987

Refugee Resettlement Program

U.S. DEPARTMENT OF HEALTH AND HUMAN SERVICES

Family Support Administration
Office of Refugee Resettlement

REPORT TO THE CONGRESS

January 31, 1987

Refugee Resettlement Program

U.S. DEPARTMENT OF HEALTH AND HUMAN SERVICES

Family Support 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, 1985, through September 30, 1986, is the twentieth in a series of reports to Congress on refugee resettlement in the U.S. since 1975 -- and the sixth 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 67,000 for FY 1986. Approximately 62,000 refugees actually entered the United States during that period.

- As in FY 1985, the large majority of refugees admitted in FY 1986 came from Vietnam, Cambodia, and Laos -- about 45,000. Of the total refugee arrivals in FY 1986, 73 percent were from East Asia, 15 percent were from Eastern Europe and the Soviet Union, 10 percent were from the Near East and South Asia, 2 percent were from Africa, and less than one percent were from Latin America and the Caribbean.

Initial Reception and Placement Activities

- In FY 1986, 13 non-profit organizations were responsible for the reception and initial placement of refugees through cooperative agreements with the Department of State.

- During FY 1986, the Bureau for Refugee Programs in the Department of State conducted in-depth reviews of initial reception and placement activities in 8 sites around the United States.

Domestic Resettlement Program

- o Refugee Appropriations: ORR obligated approximately $409 million in FY 1986 for the costs of assisting refugees and Cuban and Haitian entrants as provided for under the Refugee Act of 1980. Of this, States received $316 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.

- o 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 57.4 percent of eligible refugees who had been in the U.S. 31 months or less were receiving some form of cash assistance at the end of FY 1986. This compares with an approximate cash assistance utilization rate of 55.5 percent for refugees here three years or less in September 1985 -- one year earlier.

  - -- Social Services: In FY 1986, ORR provided approximately $56 million for a broad range of social services such as English language training and employment-related training to refugees and entrants.

  - -- Targeted Assistance: ORR received a final appropriation of $48 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 7,637 children have entered the program. The number remaining in the program as of September 30, 1986, was 3,812 -- a decrease of 0.1 percent from the 3,828 a year earlier. States reporting the largest numbers of unaccompanied children served were New York (884), California (775), Minnesota (732), and Illinois (652).

-- Program Monitoring: ORR efforts to monitor the State-administered refugee resettlement program focused on five key areas in FY 1986: (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.

o Matching Grant Program: Grants totaling $3.8 million were awarded under the matching grant program in FY 1986 whereby Federal funds of up to $957 per refugee were provided on a matching basis for national voluntary resettlement agencies to provide assistance and services to eligible refugees. In FY 1986, four voluntary agencies were awarded continuation grants by ORR.

o Refugee Health: The Public Health Service continued to station public health advisors in Southeast Asia and Europe 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 these activities amounted to about $8 million in FY 1986.

o Refugee Education: About $16 million was distributed to school districts in FY 1986 to meet the special educational needs of children at the elementary and secondary levels. BY ED

o National Discretionary Projects: ORR obligated approximately $9 million in FY 1986 to support projects to improve refugee resettlement operations at the national, regional, State, and community levels. Among the projects funded were demonstration projects for refugee mental health, planned secondary resettlement, and assistance to Highland Lao refugees in California's Central Valley, to name a few. Sixteen States were awarded a total of $4.2 million in FY 1986 to provide services to underserved populations and to fill important service gaps in their respective State programs through a Comprehensive Discretionary Social Services program.

- Program Evaluation: During FY 1986, contracts were awarded for: An Evaluation of Health Services Options; a Study of Refugee Program Options; and a Study of Southeast Asian Refugee Youth. 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 1986: An Assessment of the MAA Grant Initiative; a Study of the Economic and Social Adjustment of Non-Southeast Asian Refugees in the United States; and an Evaluation of ORR's Discretionary Grant Support for Enhanced Skills Training and Multiple Wage Earners.

- Data and Data System Development: Development and maintenance of ORR's computerized data system on refugees continued during FY 1986. Records were on file by the end of FY 1986 for approximately 925,000 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 1986 as required by the Refugee Act of 1980. After consultations, President Reagan set a world-wide refugee admissions ceiling for the U.S. at 70,000 for FY 1987.

- Reauthorization of the Refugee Act of 1980, as amended: During 1986, the Congress enacted legislation to reauthorize the Refugee Act of 1980, as amended (P.L. 99-605). Funds for the refugee program were appropriated under the Continuing Resolution for FY 1987.

- U.S. Coordinator for Refugee Affairs: Jonathan Moore was confirmed as the new U.S. Coordinator for Refugee Affairs.

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 1986.

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 1986 compared with FY 1985. Approximately 806,000 were in the U.S. at the end of FY 1986, and, of these, about 6 percent had been in the U.S. less than one year, and only 18 percent had been in the country for three years or less.

- o 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 1986, Vietnamese made up 63 percent of the total, 19 percent were from Laos, and about 17 percent were from Cambodia.

- o Approximately 105,000 Soviet refugees arrived in the U.S. between 1975 and 1986. Many other smaller groups of refugees have arrived in the U.S. since enactment of the Refugee Act in 1980 such as 26,000 Poles, 23,000 Romanians, 18,000 Afghans, 16,000 Ethiopians, 11,000 Iranians, and 6,000 Iraqis.

- o Migration to California continued to affect refugee population distribution during FY 1986, but at the same time several States in other areas of the U.S. experienced steady growth due to both secondary migration and initial placements of refugees.

- o About 85 percent of Southeast Asian refugees are residing in 18 States. California, Texas, and Washington have held the top three positions since 1980.

Economic Adjustment

- o The Fall 1986 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 41 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 84 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 higher.

- o 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, 37 percent of the employed adults sampled had held white collar jobs in their country of origin, but only 19 percent hold similar jobs in the U.S.

- o 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 affect labor force participation, unemployment rates, and earnings. Refugees who spoke no English had a labor force participation rate of only 9 percent and an unemployment rate of 29 percent. For refugees who spoke English well, their corresponding labor force participation rate was 61 percent, and their unemployment rate was 15 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 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 1986, more than 75,000 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 1986 and activities planned for FY 1987 to improve refugees' prospects for self-sufficiency, to implement refugee mental health initiatives, and to improve Federal program planning.

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:

- o an updated profile of the employment and labor force statistics for refugees who have entered the United States under the Immigration and Nationality Act within the five-fiscal-year period immediately preceding the fiscal year within which the report is to be made and for refugees who entered earlier and who have shown themselves to be significantly and disproportionately dependent on welfare (Part III, pages 104-127 of the report);
- o 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 (Part II, pages 19-58);
- o a description of the geographic location of refugees (Part II, pages 7-15 and Part III, pages 95-103);
- o 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 43-52 and 72-86) 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 16-18);

- o 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 19-89) and Appendices C, D, E);
- o the plans of the Director of ORR for improvement of refugee resettlement (Part IV, pages 131-137);
- o 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 27-39, and Part III, pages 104-127);
- o any fraud, abuse, or mismanagement which has been reported in the provision of services or assistance (Part II, pages 45-52);
- o a description of any assistance provided by the Director of ORR pursuant to section 412(e)(5) (Part II, page 28);*

---

* 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."

- o a summary of the location and status of unaccompanied refugee children admitted to the U.S. (Part II, pages 40-42); and
- o 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 128-130).

In response to the reporting requirements listed above, refugee program developments from October 1, 1985, until September 30, 1986, are described in Parts II and III. Part IV looks beyond FY 1986 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 seventh prepared in accordance with the Refugee Act of 1980 -- and the twentieth 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 otherwise 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 1986, President Reagan established a ceiling of 67,000 refugees. Approximately 62,000 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 1986.* 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 1986, more than 62,000 refugees entered the United States, as compared with about 68,000 in FY 1985. This represents a decline of 8 percent. Of the total refugee arrivals in FY 1986, 73 percent were from East Asia, 15 percent were from Eastern Europe and the Soviet Union, 10 percent were from the Near East/South Asia, 2 percent were from Africa, and less than one percent were from Latin America and the Caribbean. These proportions are nearly identical to the refugee population arriving during FY 1984 and 1985. In terms of absolute numbers, admissions from most areas of the world were slightly lower in 1986 than in the two previous years.

During FY 1986, 4,284 persons (in 3,359 cases) were granted political asylum after arrival in the United States. This represents a drop of 34 percent as compared with 6,514 successful asylum applicants in FY 1985. From 1980 through 1986, an average of 4,258 cases annually have been granted asylum by the Immigration and Naturalization Service (INS).

o Southeast Asian Refugees

In FY 1986, 45,391 Southeast Asian refugees arrived in the United States, closely approaching the admissions ceiling of 45,500 previously established. This represents a 9 percent drop from the 49,853 refugees admitted from Southeast Asia during FY 1985. Since the spring of 1975, the United States has admitted 806,245 refugees from Southeast Asia as of September 30, 1986 (Appendix A, Table 1). Monthly arrivals during FY 1986 averaged approximately 3,800, with a rather stable flow being maintained during the year (Table 2).

Compared with FY 1985, most States received a smaller number of Southeast Asian refugees in FY 1986, and this was especially true of the larger States. 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 15,000 arrivals, 33.4 percent of the total.

The top ten States remained the same in FY 1986 as in FY 1985, with small shifts in rank. The proportion of refugees placed in the top ten States was 69.6 percent in FY 1986 as compared with 69.8 percent in FY 1985. The top ten States in terms of Southeast Asian refugee arrivals during FY 1986 are listed below:

State	Number of New Southeast Asian Refugees	Percent
California	15,168	33.4%
Texas	3,493	7.7
Washington	2,100	4.6
New York	1,946	4.3
Massachusetts	1,941	4.3
Minnesota	1,936	4.3
Illinois	1,548	3.4
Pennsylvania	1,380	3.0
Virginia	1,177	2.6
Florida	883	1.9
TOTAL	31,572	69.6
Other States	13,819	30.4
TOTAL	45,391	100.0%

As in past years, Texas was the State with the second highest number of new refugee arrivals from Southeast Asia, with nearly 3,500 new refugees, approximately 8 percent of the total. The State of Washington regained its historic position in third place, with 2,100 arrivals. The States of New York, Massachusetts, and Minnesota occupied the next three places with nearly identical totals of roughly 1,940 each.

In FY 1986 the proportion of refugee arrivals from Vietnam was just under half of the arriving Southeast Asians, at nearly 50 percent, compared with 51 percent in FY 1985. The proportion from Cambodia dropped to 22 percent in FY 1986 compared with 39 percent in FY 1985, while the share of refugees from Laos climbed to 28 percent from 10 percent in FY 1985. Vietnamese refugees were the majority group among the new Southeast Asian arrivals in most States during FY 1986 as in earlier years. However, ten States received a majority of Cambodians and nine States had a majority from Laos. Arrivals from Laos predominated especially in Arkansas, Minnesota, Wisconsin, and among the smaller States in Montana and Wyoming. Cambodians were a majority in the New England States. 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 continued to be the second most common State for Cambodian resettlement, with Washington ranking third. Texas was second in rank for Vietnamese and third for Lao. Minnesota ranked second for refugees from Laos, while New York held third place among arriving Vietnamese.

The arriving Southeast Asian refugee population continues to be very young demographically. In FY 1986 the median age of the arriving Vietnamese refugees was 20.5 years at the time of arrival, while the refugees from Cambodia and Laos were only 17.6 and 16.2 years of age, respectively. One-third of the Vietnamese, 22 percent of the Cambodians and 36 percent of the Lao were children of school age. Additionally, 29 percent of the Cambodians and 20 percent of the Lao were preschool-age children, while 9 percent of the Vietnamese were in this age group. Less than 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, 55 percent of the arriving refugees were males. The excess of young males in the arriving Vietnamese population was less pronounced than has been the case in recent years.

o Eastern European and Soviet Refugees

The number of refugees arriving from the Soviet Union increased slightly for the first time since 1980, although emigration is still tightly restricted. Nearly 800 Soviet refugees arrived in the U.S. in FY 1986, compared with fewer than 700 in FY 1985 and more than 20,000 yearly in 1979 and 1980. Since 1975, about 105,000 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, the same percentage as in FY 1985. California again placed second with 31 percent, followed by Massachusetts (7 percent) and Illinois (6 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 among the oldest of the arriving nationality groups, with a median age at the time of arrival of 37.0 among the FY 1986 arrivals. Women outnumbered men with 54 percent of the total, and their median age was significantly higher, at 41.4 compared with 33.1 for the men. Only about 15 percent of the Soviets were children of school age, while another 15 percent were age 65 or older.

During FY 1986, the number of refugees from Eastern Europe was less than 9,000, a small decline from the more than 9,000 resettled in FY 1985. The majority arrived from Poland, with about 3,600, and Romania, with 2,600, with smaller numbers from Czechoslovakia (1,400), Hungary (650), and other countries. The number of refugees from Eastern Europe resettled since 1975 now totals about 74,000.

California received the most Eastern European refugees in FY 1986, with New York in second place. Together these States resettled about 34 percent of the refugees from Czechoslovakia, Hungary, Poland, and Romania who arrived in FY 1986. Other States that received significant numbers

in FY 1986 were Illinois (particularly Poles and Romanians), Michigan (Poles and Romanians), Texas (Poles and Romanians), Massachusetts (refugees from Czechoslovakia), Pennsylvania (Poles), New Jersey (Poles) and Washington (Hungarians). Table 4 contains a complete listing by State of the numbers resettled of these four nationality groups.

In age-sex structure, the refugee populations arriving in FY 1986 from these four Eastern European countries are rather similar to each other, but different from the Soviets. Their median ages range from 26 to 28, with rather small differences in age distribution between men and women. On average, the men are one or two years older. These characteristics do not differ from those of earlier years. Between 14 and 17 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 31 to 46 percent of the arrivals from each country. None are over age 65, except for Romanians, with 1.2 percent over age 65. Sixty percent or more of the refugees from Czechoslovakia, Hungary, Poland, and Romania are males.

o Latin American Refugees

About 150 Cuban refugees arrived in the United States in FY 1986, a number similar to the two previous years and 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 1986 settled in Florida. New Jersey and California absorbed most of the rest.

Most of the arriving Cubans had been long-term political prisoners, and their age-sex composition reflects this background. Nearly two-thirds were males. The Cubans' median age was 51.8 at arrival, and one-fourth of them were at least 65 years old.

o 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 1986 nearly 1,300 Ethiopians arrived with refugee status, which represents a continued decline from the levels of several previous years. About 15,000 Ethiopians have entered the United States in refugee status since 1980. They were more widely dispersed about the country than are most refugee groups. The largest number settled in California, which received 25 percent. Significant numbers also settled in Texas (11 percent), New York (5 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 1986 was 24.2 years; men averaged 25.5 years while the average age of the women was 21.8 years. Sixty-seven percent of the arriving Ethiopians were men. Again, this age/sex profile is like that of Ethiopians who arrived in earlier years.

o Near Eastern Refugees

Iran accounted for the largest number of refugees arriving from the Near East during FY 1986 as in the two prior years, with about 3,200

arrivals. Approximately 2,400 refugees arrived from Afghanistan and about 300 from Iraq. The total number of refugees arriving from the Near East was stable in FY 1986 compared with the previous year. Slightly fewer refugees arrived from Iran than in the previous year, and the numbers from Afghanistan and Iraq increased, compared to 1985 levels.

California was the most common destination for refugees arriving from the Near East: 37 percent of the Afghans, 55 percent of the Iranians, and 31 percent of the Iraqis settled there. The Iraqis also settled in Illinois and Michigan. 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 and Maryland 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 1986 were relatively young, although older on average than the Southeast Asians. The median age of Afghans was 21.1, while that of Iraqis was 23.1, 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 24.9, 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 19 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, but the sex ratio ranged from only 51 percent males in the Afghan population to 59 percent among the Iranians and 65 percent among the Iraqis.

o Other Refugees and Asylees

During FY 1986, the number of applications for refugee status granted worldwide by the Immigration and Naturalization Service (INS) declined to 52,081 from the FY 1985 total of 59,436. This was the lowest total since the passage of the Refugee Act of 1980. The numbers approved by country 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 United States. Table 7 contains a tabulation of applications for refugee status granted by INS, by country of chargeability, under the Refugee Act from 1980 through 1986.

INS approved claims for political asylum status from 3,359 cases, covering 4,284 persons, in FY 1986. This represents a drop of 27 percent from the number of cases approved in FY 1985, but still a high number compared to the historical pattern. A complete listing of the countries from which persons came who were granted asylum from FY 1980 through FY 1986 is shown in Table 8. During this seven-year period, 57 percent of all favorable asylum rulings went to Iranians. Thirty-five percent of all favorable asylum rulings in FY 1986 were granted to Iranians. More than 1,000 Nicaraguans and nearly 400 Poles were also given political asylum in FY 1986. Other countries from which at least 50 asylees came, in order, were Ethiopia, Romania, El Salvador, and Syria.

RECEPTION AND PLACEMENT ACTIVITIES

In FY 1986, the initial reception and placement of refugees in the United States was carried out by 13 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 1986, the Bureau's monitoring program included 8 in-depth reviews of refugee resettlement in Dallas and Fort Worth, Texas; Detroit and Grand Rapids, Michigan; Central Valley, California; Rochester, New York; Greensboro, Raleigh, and Charlotte, North Carolina; Oklahoma City, Oklahoma; Richmond, Virginia; and Green Bay, La Crosse, Milwaukee, and Madison, Wisconsin. A followup visit to Phoenix and Tucson, Arizona, was also conducted. As a result of the monitoring, strengths and weaknesses of voluntary agency programs have been identified and, where needed, corrective action has been recommended.

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

The Bureau continued to fund a resettlement demonstration project in Chicago, Illinois. The project was funded through March of 1986. The demonstration project, developed by six voluntary agencies, concentrated on the initial six months after a refugee arrives in the U.S. and emphasized intensive in-house job development and case management work with each refugee family. Income maintenance and medical assistance were funded through the voluntary agencies, obviating any need for employable refugees to apply for public assistance. The goal of the project was to assist refugees in attaining self-sufficiency at an early date through an intensive service delivery program. The objective was to place 75 percent of employable refugees in appropriate jobs within the six-month period. On August 8, 1986, the Bureau awarded a contract to Urban Systems Research and Engineering, Inc. to evaluate the project. The results of the evaluation should be available in the Spring of 1987.

DOMESTIC RESETTLEMENT PROGRAM

Refugee Appropriations

In FY 1986, the refugee domestic assistance program functioned under the authority of a Continuing Resolution (P.L. 99-190). The total funding which HHS obligated under the program in FY 1986 was approximately $409 million.

Of that amount, $215.6 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 agencies. In addition, demonstration grants totaling about $43.5 million were awarded to the States of California and Oregon in FY 1986.

About $56.4 million was awarded for social services to help States provide refugees with English language training, vocational training, and other support services, the purpose of which is to promote economic self-sufficiency and reduce refugee dependence on public assistance programs. States also received $2.9 million to utilize refugee mutual assistance associations (MAAs) as qualified providers of social services to refugees and to strengthen their service delivery capacity.

In FY 1986, ORR awarded $9.0 million under the national discretionary funds program to finance a variety of special projects. Of that amount, about $4.2 million was awarded to States for a comprehensive

social services strategy which emphasized employment-related services to underserved populations as well as services in newly-established or small refugee communities. The remaining $4.8 million supported activities designed to improve refugee resettlement operations at national, regional, State, and community levels.

As in the three previous years, ORR continued to fund a targeted assistance program. This program totaled $47.9 million in FY 1986. 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. Of the $47.9 million, $5.7 million was targeted for health care to qualified entrants in Florida, and $4.8 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 $3.8 million in FY 1986 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.

Obligations for health screening and followup medical services for refugees amounted to $8 million in FY 1986. 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, the Department of Education, through an interagency agreement with ORR, obligated $15.9 million in FY 1986. 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 $5.7 million.

ORR Obligations: FY 1986
(Amounts in $000)

A.	Refugee Resettlement Program	
	1. State-Administered Program:	
	a. Cash Assistance, Medical Assistance, State Administration, Unaccompanied Minors, and SSI	$215,633
	b. Social Services (States' Formula Allocation)	56,392
	Subtotal, State-Administered Program	272,025
	2. Refugee Demonstration Projects	43,480
	3. MAA Incentive Grant Program	2,862
	4. Discretionary Projects and Other Special Projects	8,989
	5. Targeted Assistance	
	a. Refugees and Entrants	37,316
	b. Health Care for Entrants	5,746
	c. Education - Entrant Children	4,788
	Subtotal, Targeted Assistance	47,850
B.	Voluntary Agency Matching Grant Program	3,805
C.	Preventive Health: Screening and Health Services	7,968
D.	Education Assistance for Children	15,882
E.	Federal Administration	5,726
	Total, Refugee Program Obligations	408,587

CMA[a/], Social Services, MAA Incentive, and Targeted Assistance Obligations: FY 1986 Funds

State	CMA	Social Services	MAA Incentive	Targeted Assistance
Alabama	$ 481,867	$ 325,669	$ 13,600	$ 0
Arizona	2,221,330	638,157	33,312	0
Arkansas	255,677	223,910	11,688	0
California b/	117,211,298	18,034,879	941,421	15,297,949
Colorado	2,025,534	803,246	33,544	310,567
Connecticut	2,084,600	861,859	35,991	0
Delaware	6,260	75,000	0	0
Dist. of Columbia	982,706	223,175	7,213	0
Florida	3,246,289	1,264,384	66,001	20,398,993
Georgia	1,400,400	929,490	48,519	0
Hawaii	1,646,000	232,789	12,152	341,984
Idaho	742,508	240,003	12,528	0
Illinois	9,498,011	2,296,784	119,488	1,606,446
Indiana	268,614	223,009	9,313	0
Iowa	2,726,007	523,289	27,316	0
Kansas	2,377,152	726,944	37,946	382,812
Kentucky	509,822	232,719	9,718	0
Louisiana	1,014,568	804,078	41,973	261,516
Maine	828,686	324,627	13,556	0
Maryland	1,937,508	957,236	49,968	318,147
Massachusetts	15,019,748	2,185,067	124,094	828,142
Michigan	4,173,100	960,726	49,895	0
Minnesota	13,813,647	1,408,306	73,141	975,031
Mississippi	495,139	169,076	5,808	0
Missouri	840,416	643,429	33,587	148,767
Montana	253,267	75,000	5,000	0
Nebraska	283,672	160,926	6,720	0
Nevada	278,755	248,604	0	0
New Hampshire	306,081	101,828	5,315	0
New Jersey	3,491,000	791,315	41,307	777,821
New Mexico	451,458	124,857	6,518	0
New York	12,340,697	4,076,438	212,790	1,285,347
North Carolina	679,710	493,323	25,751	0
North Dakota	606,333	116,533	6,083	0
Ohio	1,642,714	964,173	40,264	0
Oklahoma	493,323	639,133	26,838	0

State	CMA	Social Services	MAA Incentive	Targeted Assistance
Oregon c/	$ 9,787,477	$ 840,817	$ 38,671	$ 873,288
Pennsylvania	5,802,483	1,801,546	94,041	597,769
Rhode Island	2,240,581	443,935	23,173	426,956
South Carolina	194,805	108,209	5,649	0
South Dakota	130,833	102,938	5,373	0
Tennessee	567,979	515,243	26,896	0
Texas	4,808,362	4,052,576	211,544	700,690
Utah	2,285,998	669,719	27,967	213,009
Vermont	359,593	75,000	5,000	0
Virginia	5,746,282	1,762,701	92,013	814,226
Washington	17,794,900	2,211,076	115,418	1,290,540
West Virginia	38,080	93,750	0	0
Wisconsin	2,723,130	539,614	27,692	0
Wyoming	12,600	75,000	0	0
TOTAL	$259,113,000	$56,392,105	$2,861,795	$47,850,000

a/ Funds for cash assistance, medical assistance, and related State administrative costs, including aid to unaccompanied minors, and SSI State Supplementation.

b/ Includes $39,790,618 demonstration grant, which is part of the CMA figure.

c/ Includes $3,689,000 demonstration grant, which is part of the CMA figure.

State-Administered Program

o 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.

On January 30, 1986, ORR published final rules in the Federal Register (45 CFR Part 400) which set forth requirements concerning general administration of State programs, submittal and approval of State plans, immigration status and identification of refugees, child welfare services (including services to unaccompanied minors), and Federal funding for a State's expenditures. The rules went into effect on April 30, 1986.

ORR also published on January 30, 1986, a notice of proposed rule-making (NPRM). The NPRM concerned proposals affecting cash and medical assistance to refugees; job search, employability services, and employment on the part of applicants for and recipients of refugee cash assistance; and refugee support services. ORR received numerous public comments on the NPRM and is currently reviewing these comments prior to taking further action.

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.

o 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 31 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 31 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 31 months in this country is reimbursed by ORR.*

---

* In order to meet the Gramm-Rudman-Hollings legislative requirements of reducing available funds by 4.3 percent, ORR was only able to reimburse States for cash and medical assistance costs for a period of 31 months because of insufficient funds. This ORR policy was implemented March 1, 1986. Previously the reimbursement period for States was for 36 months.

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. Pursuant to regulation, 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 1986, 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, continues to test a Medicaid demonstration project.

After the first 18 months in the U.S., 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 19th through 31st months of residence in the United States.

Based on information provided by the States in their Quarterly Performance Reports to ORR, approximately 57.4 percent of refugees who had been in the United States 31 months or less were receiving some form of cash assistance at the end of FY 1986. This compares with an approximate 55.5 percent cash assistance utilization rate calculated on a 36-month base for the end of September 1985 -- one year earlier.* However, because of the change in the base period resulting from the change in the reimbursement period, the two rates are not directly comparable. The reason for the increase can be attributed largely to the reduction from 36 to 31 months and the corresponding calculation for dependency on a more recently arrived population.

At the close of FY 1986, seven of the 18 States with the largest estimated populations of Southeast Asian refugees (at least 10,000 persons) showed a decline in their dependency rates from the close of FY 1985. One possible explanation for the dependency rate declines for

---

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

Oregon and California is that both States have been operating demonstrations over the last year to reduce reliance on welfare and to encourage early employment.

State	Percentage Point Decline in Dependency Rate
California	- 3.6%
Kansas	- 3.3%
Louisiana	- 2.5%
Maryland	- 4.7%
Massachusetts	- 7.9%
Oregon	-13.8%
Pennsylvania	- 5.8%

The following table shows cash assistance utilization among time-eligible refugees as of September 30, 1986. However, the figures can not be compared to last year's information because the FY 1986 data are based on refugee cash assistance use during a refugee's first 31 months in the U.S. while the FY 1985 data cover the first 36 months.

Cash Assistance Dependency Among Time-Eligible Refugees
September 30, 1986, and September 30, 1985

	Total Cash Recipients as of:		Estimated 31-month Refugee Population as of:	Estimated 36-month Refugee Population as of:	Dependency Rates	
	9/30/86	9/30/85 a/	9/30/86	9/30/85	9/30/86	9/30/85
Alabama	282	254	883	942	31.9%	27.0%
Alaska	0	0	0	0	0.0	0.0
Arizona	118	95	2,308	2,120	5.1	4.5
Arkansas	32	33	473	808	6.8	4.1
California	57,259 b/	59,436 c/	65,952 d/	65,730	86.8	90.4
Colorado	677	638	1,863	2,044	36.3	31.2
Connecticut	458	522	2,021	2,519	22.7	20.7
Delaware	26	4	55	31	47.3	12.9
District of Columbia	26	45	444	541	5.9	8.3
Florida	1,595	1,696	3,803	4,606	41.9	36.8
Georgia	696	784	2,903	3,388	24.0	23.1
Hawaii	451	596	696	839	64.8	71.0
Idaho	104	199	848	865	12.3	23.0
Illinois	2,865	2,884	7,355	8,415	39.0	34.3
Indiana	202	227	675	653	29.9	34.8
Iowa	522	486	1,774	1,888	29.4	25.7
Kansas	1,133	1,482	2,125	2,620	53.3	56.6
Kentucky	300	237	665	676	45.1	35.1
Louisiana	356	535	2,239	2,903	15.9	18.4
Maine	290	499	772	936	37.6	53.3
Maryland	937	1,114	3,142	3,231	29.8	34.5
Massachusetts	5,616	7,004	7,791	8,750	72.1	80.0
Michigan	1,157	1,265	2,686	3,474	43.1	36.4
Minnesota	3,560	3,465	4,862	5,082	73.2	68.2
Mississippi	104	106	263	401	39.5	26.4
Missouri	337	676	1,960	2,340	17.2	28.9
Montana	26	25	75	77	34.7	32.5
Nebraska	126	110	342	464	36.8	23.7
Nevada	166	141	728	900	22.8	15.7

	Total Cash Recipients as of:		Estimated 31-month Refugee Population as of:	Estimated 36-month Refugee Population as of:	Dependency Rates	
	9/30/86	9/30/85 a/	9/30/86	9/30/85	9/30/86	9/30/85
New Hampshire	30	74	229	367	13.1%	20.2%
New Jersey	705	976	2,468	2,969	28.6	32.9
New Mexico	102	149	375	450	27.2	33.1
New York	4,757	5,253	12,547	16,201	37.9	32.4
North Carolina	139	196	1,484	1,778	9.4	11.0
North Dakota	68	100	370	420	18.4	23.8
Ohio	1,449	1,616	2,421	2,816	59.9	57.4
Oklahoma	233	234	1,825	1,854	12.8	12.6
Oregon	1,185 e/	1,721	2,354	2,686	50.3	64.1
Pennsylvania	2,558	3,628	5,220	6,620	49.0	54.8
Rhode Island	844	838	1,661	1,436	50.8	58.4
South Carolina	47	60	237	390	19.8	15.4
South Dakota	23	33	294	371	7.8	8.9
Tennessee	444	494	1,878	1,860	23.6	26.6
Texas	2,374	2,138	12,250	14,654	19.4	14.6
Utah	523	659	1,788	1,939	29.3	34.0
Vermont	90	45	156	196	57.7	23.0
Virginia	1,740	1,778	5,307	6,354	32.8	28.0
Washington	5,928	5,544	7,386	7,492	80.3	74.0
West Virginia	21	9	60	66	35.0	13.6
Wisconsin	1,670	927	1,935	1,924	86.3	48.2
Wyoming	13	1	20	28	65.0	3.6
Guam	26	15	43	36	60.5	41.7
Total U.S.	104,390	111,046	182,011	200,201	57.4%	55.5%

NOTES:

a/ Caseload data derived from the Quarterly Performance Reports or QPRs (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 9/30/1986. Please note that caseload data may include children born in the U.S. to refugee families while the base population does not include these children. This factor inflates the calculated dependency rate to an unknown degree, which may be significant in States with large AFDC caseloads.

b/ California's cash assistance data include 42,072 recipients participating in the State's Refugee Demonstration Project (RDP) as of 9/30/1986. Data for AFDC and RCA recipients were developed from partial persons/case ratios.

c/ California's cash assistance data include 31,986 recipients participating in the State's Refugee Demonstration Project (RDP) as of 9/30/1985.

d/ California's estimated base population as of 9/30/86 is the sum of the estimated 36-month population of refugees eligible for RDP and the estimated 31-month population of other refugees. This blended estimate was necessary because the RDP caseload included people in the U.S. up to 36 months.

e/ Oregon's cash assistance data include 347 recipients participating in the State's Refugee Early Employment Demonstration Project (REEP) as of 9/30/1986.

Use of Cash Assistance by Nationality

The Refugee Assistance Amendments of 1982 direct 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 1986; States reported on their cash/medical assistance caseloads as of June 30, 1986. Reports covered refugees in the U.S. for no more than 36 months.

Table 11 (Appendix A) summarizes the findings of the 1986 data collection with all 49 participating States, the District of Columbia, and Guam reporting.* A caseload of 101,806 is covered, including SSI recipients in some States, which is equal to 94 percent of the total nationwide caseload at that time. Of that caseload, the largest group was reported to be Vietnamese, and Southeast Asians of all nationalities comprised 83 percent. (They are about 73 percent of the time-eligible population.) Soviet and Eastern European refugees comprise less than 5 percent of the reported caseload while they are about 15 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 12 and 72 percent of time-eligible refugees. These calculations show relatively high dependency among the Southeast Asians compared with most other groups. In the two States where Southeast Asians could not be

---

* Alaska does not participate in the Refugee Resettlement Program.

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 proportion as their Southeast Asian arrivals in 1984-86, the best estimates of nationwide dependency rates are about 64 percent for Vietnamese, 72 percent for Lao (including Hmong), and 58 percent for Cambodians.

Among the other nationality groups, refugees from Afghanistan have a dependency rate of about 52 percent, while the dependency rate for Ethiopians is 32 percent. Those from the Soviet Union have a dependency rate of 26 percent. Refugees from Eastern Europe (other than Poland) show a dependency rate of about 20 percent, while refugees from Poland have the lowest dependency rate, at roughly 12 percent.

o 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 1986, as in previous fiscal years, ORR allocated social service funds on a formula basis. Under this formula, about $56 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 small refugee populations received at least a minimum of $75,000 in social service funds.

Additionally, almost $3 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 $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 60-71.

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 1986, 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.

o Targeted Assistance

In FY 1986 ORR received a final appropriation of about $48 million for targeted assistance activities for refugees and entrants. ORR approved applications from 20 States on behalf of the 41 qualifying county areas under the formula-based targeted assistance program.

The fundamental scope of the county targeted assistance program remains identical to that since its inception in FY 1983 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.

Two changes were made in FY 1986 which are intended to enhance the targeted assistance program's ability to address the employment needs of refugees in local areas of high need. First, States were required to include in their applications to ORR an assurance that, for each qualified local area, cash assistance recipients (time-eligible or time-expired recipients under any program of the State or locality) would make up a percent of the clientele no less than the State's final FY 1985 cash assistance dependency rate (as determined by ORR). This provision ensures that the programs are focused on refugees who are most in need and can most benefit from the services, and allows enough flexibility that the employment needs of other clients are not ignored. Second, the FY 1986 announcement allowed for the first time the option that a State

with more than one qualified targeted assistance county could, but was not required to, determine an alternative formula for the allocation of targeted assistance funds among those counties in accordance with current needs.

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.

Under the county targeted assistance program, ORR awarded $5.7 million to Florida for providing health care to eligible entrants and $4.8 million to the Dade County public school system in Florida in support of education for entrant children.

o Unaccompanied Refugee Children

ORR continued supporting programs which provide care for refugee children in the United States. These children, identified in countries of first asylum as unaccompanied minors, are sponsored through two of the national voluntary resettlement agencies -- United States Catholic Conference (USCC) and Lutheran Immigration and Refugee Service (LIRS). The children usually are placed in programs operated by local affiliates of those national agencies, although in a few States the children are placed in the public child welfare system. Legal responsibility is established under State law in such a way that the children become eligible for basically the same range of child welfare benefits as non-refugee children in the State. Unaccompanied 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 birthday, 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 7,637 children have entered the program. Of these, 964 or 12.6 percent subsequently were reunited with family, and 2,861 or 37.4 percent have been emancipated, after having reached the age of majority. Based on reports received from the States, the number in the program as of September 30, 1986, was 3,812 -- a decrease of 0.1 percent from the 3,828 in care a year earlier. During FY 1986, 99 children were reunited with family and 659 were emancipated.

Unaccompanied children are located in 38 States, Guam, and the District of Columbia. New York has the largest number, with 884, followed by California with 775, Minnesota with 732, and Illinois with 652.

The arrival of about 300 Amerasian children from Vietnam through the Orderly Departure Program prompted ORR, the national voluntary agencies, and several of their local affiliates specializing in the care of Amerasians, 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 (INS) in implementing P.L. 97-359, known as the Amerasian Children's Act, which is administered by INS.

A major activity in 1986 was a study of the future of the program, conducted by a national interagency workgroup made up of representatives from ORR, the Department of State, USCC and LIRS, their local affiliates, and State government. With the numbers of new admissions to the program dwindling and the number of emancipees, due to age, accelerating, the workgroup sought to devise a strategy that would: (1) Preserve ethnic-specific care for children as the program grows smaller over the next few years; and (2) maintain a capacity to absorb children who might be referred in future emergencies. The workgroup designated 18 provider

agencies as Core Providers to receive the bulk of incoming referrals on a more-or-less permanent basis, 14 as Secondary Core Providers to receive cases for which referrals could not be made to Core Providers, and 14 local programs which will receive no new referrals (except when needed to facilitate family reunions) and thus be phased out as their current caseload is emancipated or reunited with family.

Other major activities in FY 1986 were: (1) The publication of an ORR regulation in January 1986 which covered, among other things, refugee child welfare services, including services for unaccompanied minor refugees (45 CFR Part 400, Subpart H); and (2) the development of a proposed Statement of Goals, Priorities, Standards, and Guidelines for the Unaccompanied Minor Refugee and Cuban-Haitian Entrant Programs. Standards represent detailed explanations of the regulations, and the Guidelines reflect criteria developed by the national workgroup as a means for evaluating program activities of States and local provider agencies. ORR expects to issue both a final Statement in 1987 and a uniform national monitoring package shortly thereafter to improve program management.

ORR also continued its work in computerizing the list of unaccompanied minors, which it is required to maintain by the Refugee Act, and its record of the children's progress, which will be used to develop aggregate data and evaluate the effectiveness of individual provider agencies and States, thereby improving program performance. Reports submitted by the States indicated that most children continue to make satisfactory progress as they move toward adulthood.

o Program Monitoring

In FY 1986, ORR continued to carry out its program monitoring responsibility of the State-administered refugee resettlement program through continued oversight of the States. During the fiscal year, ORR updated its State Plan Guidelines; reviewed State submissions of State plans and plan amendments, State estimates, and quarterly program performance and financial status reports; provided technical assistance to State agencies; and conducted direct monitoring of key aspects of State programs. The following is a description of specific activities conducted during FY 1986.

-- State Plan Submissions: As a result of the issuance of the final regulation for the refugee resettlement program (45 CFR Part 400) on January 30, 1986, 30 States either amended or resubmitted State plans in the last quarter of FY 1986. By the end of November 1986, the ORR Regional Offices had reviewed the State submissions and approved the State plans or plan amendments of 19 States. The State plan submissions of the other 11 States were granted conditional approval by ORR, subject to additional information to be provided by the States. The remaining 21 States have not submitted a State plan amendment and, thus, still operate under their existing State plans.

-- Review of State Estimates: In FY 1986, the Office of Management and Budget (OMB) granted ORR a three-year approval of the State Estimate Form (Form ORR-1) after a one-year trial period in FY 1985. Part A of this form contains State estimates of funding needs for cash assistance, medical assistance, and State administration of the program. Part B

collects information on the State's planned allocation of ORR-funded social services dollars and the number of refugees to be served under each of the priority services (English language training, employment services, vocational training, and case management).

Information submitted by the State in Part A has been used by ORR to assess the level of grant awards which ORR would make to the States to reimburse State costs for direct assistance to refugees. Part B provides ORR with planning information prior to the beginning of a fiscal year to assure that States allocate sufficient resources to comply wih the service priorities prescribed by ORR and required in the Refugee Act.

Information submitted by the States in FY 1986 indicated that 90 percent of their total social service allocation for FY 1987 would be targeted on priority services. To date, nine States have revised their estimates to correspond more closely to ORR program priorities, and seven States have received a waiver of these priorities, due to special local circumstances, in order to provide services which are more consistent with the needs of their refugee population.

-- Field Monitoring of State-Administered Program: During the fiscal year, the ORR Regional Offices directly monitored key components of the State-administered refugee resettlement program. A summary of significant field monitoring activities in the regions during FY 1986 follows:

(a) Region I/II

ORR Region I/II reviewed the State administration of refugee employment services and providers in New York, Massachusetts, and Connecticut. The Regional Office helped to redesign the Employment Development Plan in New York and improve performance contracting in Massachusetts. A review of Connecticut's procurement system was also initiated. The State plan of Connecticut was amended to reflect the procurement system.

ORR Region I conducted a casefile review in New York as a followup to an audit, initiated by the HHS Office of the Inspector General, which identified a high error rate in the refugee cash assistance program. The review indicated that the State of New York's regulations for the refugee cash assistance (RCA) Program were not consistent with ORR regulations and that local county administration of the program needed improvement. The Region has advised the State of the deficiencies identified in this review.

(b) Region III/IV

ORR Region III/IV reviewed employment services and case management contracts in the District of Columbia, Maryland, Pennsylvania, and Virginia. Pennsylvania then modified the State case management system, and Maryland, D.C., and Virginia entered into a cooperative agreement to avoid duplication of services.

The Regional Office followed up on a casefile review conducted in FY 1985 in Pennsylvania which identified significant numbers of ineligible cash recipients in the refugee caseload. The Region recovered $900,000 in overpayment funds claimed by Pennsylvania. Subsequently, the State removed ineligible recipients from the caseload. This action has substantially reduced the Pennsylvania refugee welfare dependency rate.

ORR Region III/IV also conducted a region-wide desk audit of client eligibility in refugee social services programs, reviewed the functional linkage between cash assistance/medical assistance and employment services, and reviewed State policy manual references to refugee cash/medical assistance programs. In response, South Carolina amended its State policy manual to reflect ORR's work registration requirements. Tennessee and Kentucky implemented a process to notify the voluntary resettlement agencies of refugee applications for public assistance. Alabama began to document refugee employment registration and job referrals.

(c) Florida Office

The ORR Florida Office, which is responsible for program oversight of the State of Florida, worked closely with the State Agency to update the State plan and to ensure compliance with ORR's priorities. As a result, Florida revised its State plan to be more responsive to the needs of refugees as well as to the priorities and objectives of the refugee program.

The ORR Florida Office also conducted routine monitoring reviews of State social services contracts and service providers. Several deficiencies were found with respect to client eligibility and the issue of equal access to services by all eligible clients. In one instance, the State was found to limit service contracts to entrants only. The ORR Florida Office has since worked with the State to revise State instructions to service providers to include both refugees and entrants in the social service programs.

(d) Region V

ORR Region V conducted a review of State administration of refugee programs in Michigan, Minnesota, and Wisconsin. The Region identified issues in those States related to the linkage between welfare and employment services as well as to the need to improve State monitoring of local agencies and providers. The Region is working with the States to follow through on these findings.

ORR Region V also conducted reviews of social service programs and other national initiatives in Wisconsin, Ohio, and Minnesota with a focus on priority clients and casefile management. Based on the

findings of the review, the Region provided technical assistance to the State agencies to improve operations.

The Region conducted a followup casefile review in Minnesota. The review, conducted in Hennepin and Ramsey counties, showed significant improvement in the quality of documenting the cash assistance caseload. The error rate has been reduced to less than 3 percent. Financial reviews were also conducted in Ohio and Michigan. The Region identified $500,000 in improper claims submitted by Ohio and $50,000 of ORR funds improperly claimed by Michigan.

(e) Region VI/VII/VIII

Region VI/VII/VIII conducted State program management reviews in Colorado, Iowa, and Kansas. The Colorado review focused on the relationship between State and local government, the Iowa review related to the case management system; and the Kansas review covered both the State administration of social services and its social service providers. The Region also conducted reviews in Louisiana, Missouri, and Oklahoma which focused on the States' program management and project monitoring capacities.

In response to the reviews, the Region recommended action steps to improve the State/local government relationship in Colorado, the eligibility verification process prior to cash assistance award in Iowa, and the work registration process and the selection of qualified service providers in Kansas. Other activities undertaken

by the Region include assisting Missouri to increase its capacity in monitoring local service providers, training eligibility workers in processing refugee cases, and addressing unmet medical needs of refugees in Oklahoma.

(f) Region IX

ORR Region IX conducted reviews of the State of California's Refugee Demonstration Project (RDP) in four counties (Los Angeles, Orange, San Diego, and Santa Clara). The purpose of these reviews was to assure that the RDP was achieving its objectives of referring employable RDP recipients to employment-related services on a mandatory basis. A review of the State case management system was conducted in Hawaii.

The Region brought to the attention of the State of California key program management and programmatic issues which may hinder the expected outcomes of the RDP. In addition, the Region recommended that the State increase its efforts to serve hard-to-place refugees.

(g) Region X

ORR Region X conducted managment reviews in Oregon, Washington, and Idaho to evaluate State performance. A review of administrative cost allocations was also undertaken in Oregon and Washington. The Region participated as well in State monitoring of local planning to increase the number of welfare recipients in service programs. Following the reviews, Oregon and Washington altered cost allocation methods to meet Federal standards.

The Region conducted monitoring reviews of the Comprehensive Discretionary Social Services (CDSS) projects and the Mutual Assistance Association (MAA) project in Idaho; the Refugee Early Employment Project (REEP) in Oregon; and case management and employment services in Washington. The review in Oregon showed that service goals under REEP are being achieved; however, the welfare reduction objective for Oregon is yet to be met. The Washington review helped to identify barriers to employment, and the State has since restructured case management and instructional services.

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

o New York

The results of three audits conducted in New York State are as follows: (1) $1,806,833 was found unallowable for Federal reimbursement because various requirements of the Refugee Resettlement Program were not met. In addition, a clerical error made by the State overstated a claim by $285,029. A total recovery of $2,091,862 was recommended. (2) A medical audit recommended a recovery of $227,588 for inpatient and other costs and of $30,786 for costs related to abortions, amounting to a total recommended recovery of $258,374. And (3) medical assistance to ineligible Cuban refugees was provided after October 1, 1983. A recovery of $1,059,973 was recommended.

o New Jersey

The State's Auditor found that salary costs for a Cuban/Haitian Entrant Program vendor could not be documented for December 1983. A recovery of $22,444 was recommended.

o Maryland

Because of an administrative oversight by the State, a revised expenditure report for the period July 1, 1982, to September 30, 1983, was overstated. A recovery of $716,949 was recommended.

o California

Los Angeles County claimed reimbursement for ineligible refugees for the period October 1, 1982, through December 31, 1984. A recovery of $3,105,483 was recommended. Orange County claimed reimbursement for ineligible refugees for the period October 1, 1982, through December 31, 1984. A recovery of $717,938 was recommended. A total recovery of $3,823,421 was recommended.

Voluntary Agency Matching Grant Program

In response to an Administration request, Congress 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 to complement those services provided under the Department of State's initial reception and placement grants and to provide an alternative to the State-administered programs funded by ORR. In FY 1984, a grant announcement and program guidelines were issued to further define and clarify requirements of the program. These requirements spelled out "essential services" which consist of: maintenance services (food and housing) to be provided for up to three months following the initial 30 days of assistance 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.

In FY 1986, the Federal matching funds available per refugee were reduced from $1,000 to $957 due to the implementation of the Gramm-Rudman-Hollings legislation. Agencies were awarded continuation grants totaling $3.8 million. A list of the agencies participating in the program and the FY 1986 Federal funds awarded to them follows.

AGENCY	FEDERAL GRANT
Council of Jewish Federations	$1,215,794
International Rescue Committee	388,546
Lutheran Immigration and Refugee Service	320,954
United States Catholic Conference	1,880,000
TOTAL	$3,805,294

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 1986 by activities in first-asylum camps, in refugee processing centers (RPCs), and after a refugee's arrival in the United States.

Medical and other volunteers continued to treat refugee health problems as well as to 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. A CDC public health advisor was posted in Europe to monitor the health screening of 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 Public Health Service (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 necessarily constituting a public health hazard, might adversely affect their successful resettlement and employment, ORR provided $5.9 million to State and local health agencies through an interagency agreement with CDC. These funds were awarded through grants by the PHS Regional Offices and provide for the conduct of health assessments of refugees soon after resettlement in the U.S.

ORR provided $2.5 million through an interagency agreement with PHS's Office of Refugee Health (ORH) for the National Institute of Mental Health (NIMH) to continue a grant program to create focal points for refugee mental health issues 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 totaling $1.6 million were made to 11 States with large refugee populations. A contract was renegotiated for $0.7 million with the University of Minnesota to maintain its Technical Assistance Center and to provide support and assistance to State mental health agencies. (See pages 62 and 63.)

In cooperation with ORH and CDC, ORR again 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 carrier refugee 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 four to five months in RPCs 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-administered program, funds are distributed through formula grants which are based on the number of eligible refugee children in the States. State educational agencies 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 1986, $15.9 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

---

* The FY 1986 Continuing Resolution (P.L. 99-190) funded the Educational Assistance Program for Children at the $16.6 million level. However, with the reductions mandated by the Gramm-Rudman-Hollings legislation, the total amount available for such assistance was $15,886,000. Under the allocation formula, $15,882,360 was actually distributed to State educational agencies.

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.

The following funds have been available for distribution since the Transition Program annually since it 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
1986	1986-87	$15,886,000****

---

* 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 $19.7 million 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.

**** The FY 1986 Continuing Resolution (P.L. 99-190) funded the Educational Assistance Program for Children at the $16.6 million level; however, with the reductions mandated by the Gramm-Rudman-Hollings legislation, the total amount available for such assistance was $15,886,000. Under the allocation formula, $15,882,360 was actually distributed to State educational agencies.

National Discretionary Projects

During FY 1986, the Office of Refugee Resettlement funded a number of projects, at a total cost of approximately $9 million, to support activities designed to improve refugee resettlement operations at national, regional, State, and community levels. In addition, activities supported by funding allocated during FY 1985 also were carried out during FY 1986. These discretionary funds were designed to address one or more of the following objectives:

1. To encourage States to develop comprehensive refugee social service programs;
2. To reduce the effects of large concentrations of refugees on communities;
3. To establish program standards and performance measures for refugee programs;
4. To strengthen the capacity of refugee mutual assistance associations;
5. To leverage mainstream program funds from other agencies by using discretionary funds as the stimulus;
6. To provide technical assistance to improve the quality of service to refugees;
7. To improve the effectiveness of the refugee program through information dissemination;
8. To avert State program shutdowns because of funding uncertainties.

o Comprehensive Discretionary Social Services (CDSS)

The Comprehensive Discretionary Social Services program was designed to encourage States to analyze their current refugee social service programs, identify unmet needs, prioritize those needs, and submit competitive grant applications to meet needs which the States deemed most critical. In the past, ORR committed its discretionary social service funds to support special service initiatives which ORR considered particularly promising in terms of reducing refugee dependency. It was then necessary for States to prepare a separate application for each discretionary program, an exercise which States considered onerous and a deterrent to effective State planning.

CDSS sought to overcome these problems and enhance State flexibility by placing a substantial amount of discretionary funding under a single program announcement; States could submit a single application covering a variety of program activities, thereby implementing a more comprehensive service strategy. In designing the CDSS program announcement, ORR's national priorities, particularly early self-sufficiency, were highlighted as a part of the review criteria. In all, ORR funded 36 service components in 17 States totaling $4,158,064 for FY 1986. The amounts are listed by State below.

State	Amount	Activities
Arizona	$329,359	Vocational counseling, ESL
Colorado	55,051	CM, ESL
District of Columbia	138,175	ES, crisis intervention for Cubans
Iowa	325,541	ES, VESL
Kansas	276,800	MH, ES, child care, job development
Kentucky	95,106	ESL, ES, MH, day care
Maine	60,300	Skills training, ES
Minnesota	304,401	ES, ESL, support services
Missouri	164,480	Skills training
Nebraska	128,732	Support services
New York	500,000	ES, ESL, secondary wage earners
North Carolina	240,255	MH, day care, driver training
Ohio	300,363	Skills training, support services
Oklahoma	30,640	ES for Hmong
Oregon	300,000	Skills training, ES
Washington	408,861	ESL, OJT
Wisconsin	500,000	ES
TOTAL	$4,158,064	

Key:
- CM - Case management
- ES - Employment services
- ESL - English as a second language
- MH - Mental health
- OJT - On-the-Job training
- VESL - Vocational English as a second language.

o National Refugee Mental Health Project

The National Refugee Mental Health project entered its second year with nearly $2.5 million provided via an interagency agreement to the Office of Refugee Health, PHS, and through that office to the National Institute of Mental Health. Of the $2.5 million, about $2.3 million was actually awarded to eligible States. The program consists of two major elements: (1) A national refugee mental health resource development and technical assistance center; and (2) a multi-year cooperative agreement program designed to improve mainstream mental health services available to refugees.

A total of $702,000 was awarded in FY 1986 to the University of Minnesota Hospitals for resource development and the technical assistance center, augmenting the $316,000 awarded in FY 1985.

Under the program to improve mental health services to refugees, twelve State mental health agencies received awards totaling about $1.7 million in FY 1985 and eleven received a total of almost $1.6 million in FY 1986. 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 populations. States receiving cooperative agreement funding in FY 1986 were:

State	Amount
California	$208,680
Colorado	108,879
Hawaii	108,593
Illinois	145,700
Minnesota	139,255
New York	200,000
Rhode Island	84,050
Texas	168,265
Virginia	167,997
Washington	154,717
Wisconsin	76,654
TOTAL:	$1,562,790

o Refugee Materials Center

ORR has provided funding for the last three years under a cooperative agreement with Department of Education to operate the Refugee Materials Center in Kansas City. This Center serves as the repository as well as the reproduction and distribution point for all refugee-related materials. During the last year, the Center has increased its holdings by nearly 250 titles to its present total of more than 1,000.

During FY 1986, ORR allocated $297,000 for the Center's operation, including $100,000 for the printing and distribution of the Mainstream English Language Training (MELT) technical assistance package and other materials.

o Augmentation of Funding for States Without Available Social Service Funds on September 30, 1986

The refugee social service contracts of several States terminate on, or near, the end of the Federal fiscal year. The absence of an ORR appropriation at that time can thus result in a costly interruption of services to refugees until a new ORR appropriation is approved and funds are apportioned for the new fiscal year.

To counteract this problem, ORR allocated a total of slightly over $1.0 million to all such States, thereby averting an otherwise necessary shutdown of activities.* Recipients of these allocations were:

State	Amount
Alabama	$ 65,134
Colorado	160,649
Connecticut	172,372
District of Columbia	34,544
Indiana	44,602
Kentucky	46,544
Maine	64,925
Mississippi	57,815
Nebraska	32,185
Ohio	192,835
Utah	133,944
West Virginia	18,750
TOTAL:	$1,024,299

* For budgetary purposes, the augmentation of funding is included as part of the States' social services formula allocation rather than under discretionary projects in the table on page 22. It is also included in the amounts listed for social services in the table on pages 23-24.

o 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 1986, six PSR grants totaling about $1.0 million were awarded as follows:

Grantee	Amount
Lao Family Community, Inc. 4336 Covington Highway, #107 Decatur, Georgia 30035 (Resettlement Phase)	$198,559
Hmong Natural Association P.O. Box 1168 Marion, North Carolina 28752 (Planning and Resettlement Phases)	177,474
Lutheran Family Services P.O. Box 13167, 811 North Elm St. Greensboro, North Carolina 27405 (Planning and Resettlement Phases)	212,125
Hmong-American Planning & Development Center 3006 Pearson Drive Grand Prairie, Texas 75051 (Resettlement Phase)	190,290
Catholic Social Services 1400 N. Meridian Street, #217 Indianapolis, Indiana 46206 (Planning Phase)	32,718
Catholic Family and Community Services 1825 West Northern Avenue Phoenix, Arizona 85021 (Planning and Resettlement Phases)	194,782
TOTAL:	$1,005,948

o Family Farm Development

ORR awarded $93,445 to the Arkansas Family Farm Development Network to provide short-term farm development and business management training and followup technical assistance for farm operations to 5-8 Highland Lao and Cambodian refugee communities. Up to 80 refugees living in high welfare communities will learn the basics of farming operations, business management, marketing, accounting, and tax reporting requirements.

Family Farm Development Network $93,445
P.O. Box 1899
Little Rock, Arkansas 72203

o Refugee Women Helping Women Project

A grant to the Southeast Asian Women's Alliance in Seattle, Washington, was awarded to provide special services to 200 refugee women caught up in cultural conflicts in the new world. The project focuses its services on home-bound refugee women who are not able to participate in traditional programs. Refugee women trained in dealing with cross-cultural conflicts and domestic violence issues help other refugee women prepare themselves to be secondary wage earners in the United States. The program provides child care assistance and other supportive services leading to eventual job placement.

Southeast Asian Women's Alliance $50,000
3004 South Alaska
Seattle, Washington 98101

o Refugee Reports

ORR provided a grant of $35,000 to the American Council for Nationalities Service, publisher of the newsletter Refugee Reports, to enable it to expand its capacity to serve the refugee resettlement community through an outreach and promotional program. ORR regards Refugee Reports as an important tool for enhancing communication among program participants.

American Council for Nationalities Service — $35,000
95 Madison Avenue
New York, New York 10016

o Social and Economic Assistance to Highland Lao Refugees

A continuation 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 are 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 — $221,635
Agriculture and Natural Resources
2120 University Avenue
Berkeley, California 94720

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 1986, 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.

o 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 1986, 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.

o Technical Assistance by ORR Regional Offices and States

Five ORR Regional Offices, the ORR Florida Office, and three States received a total of $355,454 to implement technical assistance contracts to improve refugee services within their jurisdictions.

Program Evaluation

During the reporting period, the Office of Refugee Resettlement continued its program of evaluation and research in order to: assess the effects and outcomes of ORR-funded programs and special initiatives; clarify and examine program and policy options for the refugee program; and examine the extent and process of refugees' social and economic adjustment. Descriptions of evaluation contracts awarded in FY 1986 follow:

o Evaluation of Health Services Options, contracted to Lewin and Associates, Inc., of Washington, D.C.; Refugee Policy Group of Washington, D.C.; and Berkeley Planning Associates of Berkeley, CA, for $99,886. This is a "task order" contract. The purpose is: to collect, organize, and present practical information on the range of health care service delivery and financing options (e.g., State medically needy programs with spend-down provisions, HMOs, community health centers, State/county programs for indigents, health insurance plans, to name a few) available to refugees who are not on cash assistance; to discuss available health options for refugees relative to specific circumstances or refugee characteristics; to develop a health information manual as well as a strategy for distribution of this information; and to make recommendations on how ORR can improve refugee utilization of these health care options.

o Study of Refugee Program Options, contracted to Lewin and Associates, Inc., of Washington, D.C.; Refugee Policy Group of Washington, D.C.; and Berkeley Planning Associates of Berkeley, CA, for $99,661, as part of a "task order" contract. The purpose is to examine refugee program and policy options in light of the program's current and changing circumstances such as: the decrease in arrival numbers; the changing nature of the caseload with regard to free case/family reunification, ethnicity of arrivals, and legal status of arrivals; and the changing capacity, activities, and expectations of the private sector. These and other related conditions suggested that it was important to review the program and the possibilities for improving it at a time when detailed knowledge about alternative options will likely be necessary.

The study is reviewing what is known about the outcomes of refugee resettlement for clients, communities, and participating organizations; how outcomes relate to resettlement strategies; what conditions impede or enhance positive outcomes; and what options are available in implementing resettlement which represent choices for individuals and organizations. The existing information from previous ORR studies and other available research and data have been used to postulate a set of propositions relating to options around such issues as entry into the labor market, vocational training, direct placement, timing and duration of services, and other questions related to the implementation of refugee resettlement.

During early FY 1987 the study team will conduct site visits to discuss the options/propositions with service providers, resettlement workers, and refugee leaders, among others, to see the extent to which their experience confirms, disputes, or differs from what is postulated and what their experience says about the circumstances that affect service strategies. A final report will be developed which identifies problems and possible approaches to solving them, makes recommendations, and explains the basis on which each recommended action or approach is made.

o A Study of Southeast Asian Refugee Youth, contracted to San Diego State University of San Diego, CA, for $38,086; to the University of Minnesota of Minneapolis-St. Paul, MN, for $32,441; and to the Institute for the Study of Human Issues of Philadelphia, PA, for $29,915. ORR awarded three contracts for an in-depth study of refugee youth to understand better the activities and roles of Southeast Asian refugee youth in the economic self-sufficiency process. The studies will describe and analyze the current employment and educational pursuits of Southeast Asian refugee youth in three local communities -- San Diego, Minneapolis-St. Paul, and Philadelphia -- including their aspirations, expectations, and strategies for their educational and employment futures. It will examine the opportunities and obstacles which they perceive to exist, as well as the roles, responsibilities, and relationships which they have in their families and communities in pursuing economic self-sufficiency. In carrying out tne studies the researchers will explore the attitudes, values, and concerns of refugee youth with regard to their current and future economic situation.

The present and future progress of refugee youth toward their own educational and employment goals is an important aspect of the self-sufficiency goal of the refugee program. ORR survey data indicate that, in households receiving public assistance, refugee youth are wage earners as frequently as spouses and only slightly less than half as frequently as the heads of households themselves. Given the potential contribution of refugee youth in the economic adjustment of their families, it is important that ORR gain a greater understanding of the activities and roles of refugee youth in relation to economic self-sufficiency. The studies are expected to be completed during FY 1987.

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

- Evaluation of the Refugee Targeted Assistance Grants Program, contracted to Research Management Corporation (RMC) of Falls Church, VA, for $299,683, for Phases I and II and for $182,956 in FY 1986 for Phase III. Phase I was completed in FY 1985 and the findings reported in last year's Report to the Congress. Phase II was completed in FY 1986. The focus of this study was to examine targeted assistance program (TAP) projects that serve "hard-to-place" refugee clients to determine: what is being done to serve the "hard-to-place"; what strategies seem to be effective; what problems exist in serving these clients; and what are some possible solutions. "Hard-to-place" was defined as refugee clients with large families, on welfare for long periods of time, with low English and employment skills, or with other special barriers to self-sufficiency. At the time the Phase II study began in October 1985, few TAP projects could be identified that were serving this type of client in substantial numbers.

The following findings and conclusions are based on site assessments of nine projects identified as serving some type of hard-to-place caseload:

1. Projects serving all or mostly hard-to-place clients had lower placement rates than those serving "regular" clients or a mix of both. The differences between types of projects narrowed considerably, however, on the criterion of 90-day retentions, in which hard-to-place projects had almost as good rates as the others. Starting wages for hard-to-place clients were slightly lower than those for other clients.

2. Projects serving hard-to-place clients cost more per placement than did other projects. This was largely a function of the lower placement rates mentioned above. It was also logical that since more staff effort was required with these clients, the costs would be higher.

3. Within the funding mechanisms at the State and county levels, some accommodation of costs and performance standards should be made for those projects serving hard-to-place clients.

4. An explicit focus on the hard-to-place client was a prominent feature in the planning and implementation of projects which were effectively serving hard-to-place clients. If such clients are to be served with any assurance in the future, county and State plans for targeted assistance should include strategies, structures, and resources to support such a focus.

5. Deliberate and specialized strategies for recruitment of hard-to-place clients appeared to be associated with effective service to them.

6. Service delivery for hard-to-place clients appeared to be more effective when it was augmented by a broad range of support services, along with employment services. It seemed to be important that these clients had easy and regular access to these services even beyond the job placement phase.

7. The welfare system provided many barriers to self-sufficiency for hard-to-place refugees; therefore, TAP job developers and counselors needed to be knowledgeable about their local welfare rules and be able to communicate them clearly to clients as well as relate them specifically to their clients' work circumstances.

Phase III of the Targeted Assistance Grants Program evaluation intends to focus on the impact the local projects have had on individual clients' employment and economic circumstances. The major activity will be an analysis of retrospective case histories of a sample of hard-to-place clients -- approximately 320 at six sites -- and an assessment of their labor force participation and self-sufficiency status before and after TAP intervention.

The following evaluation studies were completed in FY 1986:

o Assessment of the MAA Incentive Grant Initiative, contracted for $99,838 to Lewin and Associates, Inc. of Washington, D.C.; Refugee Policy Group of Washington, D.C.; Berkeley Planning Associates of Berkeley, CA; and American Institute for Research of Palo Alto, CA. In FY 1982, the Office of Refugee Resettlement launched the MAA Incentive Grant Initiative to broaden the involvement of refugee mutual assistance associations (MAAs) in the refugee resettlement system. Designed to encourage States to fund MAAs as part of their general refugee social service program and to help MAAs survive beyond the period of Federal support for refugee programs, the MAA Incentive Grant Initiative has grown from a 12-State competitive grant program to one involving formula allocations to States throughout the country. The effort has also entailed a series of technical assistance activities for MAAs.

This study assessed the impact of the MAA Incentive Grants on State policies and MAA development and examined the implications of the initiative for the overall resettlement system and ethnic community development. The study also examined shortcomings in the achievement of some of the objectives of the initiative.

The study found that the ORR Incentive Grant program has generally been successful in encouraging State support of MAAs in the service delivery system. Several States that previously had made little or no commitment to MAAs are now giving at least some support -- and, in some cases, substantial support -- to the refugee-based organizations. Many States were already on their way to building MAA participation before the grants became available, but the program buttressed this evolving support for refugee groups and often gave these States more flexibility in funding MAAs. However, MAA development has not made much progress in some States. Contributing factors may include unsupportive attitudes on the part of State or local governments, lack of interest or capability on the part of informal MAAs to take on a formal service role, a local environment in which there are few problems that an MAA needs to address, and lack of sufficient funding.

The Incentive Grants, in combination with State initiatives, have had a wide range of effects on MAAs and their service delivery role. In general, there has been considerable progress in the development of administrative and service capacity among funded MAAs. Most of the 35 MAAs examined in the study had implemented effective governance structures, appropriate staffing arrangements, recordkeeping and accountability systems; and well-planned service systems.

Many MAAs with these capacities include not only service organizations that predate the Incentive Grants and have had considerable time to develop, but also several newer organizations that only began a service role with the onset of special funding. Moreover, although this study was not designed to evaluate service outcomes, there were signs that many MAAs are effectively providing services, including, in many cases, ORR priority services. These organizations are serving substantial caseloads and have documented service provision and outcomes to meet State reporting requirements. There was acknowledgment from a wide range of respondents in several sites that MAAs are serving refugees at least as well as traditional providers, if not more effectively.

Although the general trend is encouraging, some MAAs funded by the refugee program have not yet completed this developmental process. For some organizations this is simply because they have just begun their new roles as service providers. For others, however, a number of factors have impeded organizational development: tne funding process has been rushed; the timing and flow of funds have not matched the developmental needs of new organizations; cash flow problems have led to instability; and capacity-building activities have received a late or low priority in the funding process. Some MAAs are experiencing particular difficulties in their new service roles, including community perceptions of ethnic favoritism and disputes or tensions within the organization.

Of particular concern is the reliance of most MAAs on one funding source -- the refugee program. Only a relatively few MAAs, most of these concentrated in a few States, have broadened their funding base beyond the refugee program. Of the 35 MAAs visited or contacted by phone in this study, only six had non-refugee funding sources beyond minimal amounts from dues or individual contributions. This finding is troubling because of the hope that ORR and others had for MAA longevity beyond the availability of refugee-specific funds. The MAAs themselves acknowledge the advantages of diversified funding, including the freedom to provide services deemed most important by the community and greater prospects for long-term stability.

This study indicates that the various initiatives to involve MAAs in service delivery have contributed to the overall resettlement system where they have both increased the availability of culturally appropriate services and brought refugee leaders into positions through which they can advocate for continuing improvement in the refugee resettlement system.

o A Study of the Economic and Social Adjustment of Non-Southeast Asian Refugees in the United States, contracted for $292,455 to Research Management Corporation of Falls Church, Virginia. The purposes of the study were to conduct a community-based, qualitative assessment of the economic and social adjustment of four non-Southeast Asian refugee groups 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 this program effectively serves different populations. The study was conducted as twelve separate field studies of ethnic groups resettling in communities. The communities and ethnic groups studied in each were as follows:

Dallas, Texas--Ethiopians, Poles
Chicago, Illinois--Poles, Romanians
Northern Virginia/Washington, D.C.--Afghans, Ethiopians
Los Angeles, California--Afghans, Ethiopians, Romanians
New York, New York--Afghans, Poles, Romanians

The final report of the study is contained in two volumes. Volume I is a description and analysis of the findings on economic and social adjustment. Volume II contains the twelve independent ethnic group studies and a description of the context of each of the five sites. Selected findings describing each of the four groups are as follows:

- o Afghans: Most Afghans in the sites studied live in rather large, extended family households. The adults are generally well educated, and their working backgrounds include mostly professionals, business owners, and some skilled tradespeople. Their labor force participation is about average for adults in the U.S., but employment rates are lower than average. Their use of public assistance was found to be higher than the other groups studied.

- o Ethiopians: Ethiopian refugees in the U.S. are typically single males in their twenties. Their common households are composed of related or unrelated singles; a few live in small nuclear families. Most were students before coming to the U.S. Their labor force participation is quite high, and employment rates varied greatly across sites, as did their use of public assistance.

- o Poles: Most of the Polish refugees studied were single adults or married couples in their twenties and thirties. They generally live in small nuclear family groups or as unrelated singles. Their educational levels are rather high with some variation across sites; adults are either college-educated professionals or skilled tradespeople. Almost all Polish refugees are employed, and accordingly they make little use of public assistance. They generally knew little English upon arrival but learned it rapidly if they did not live and work exclusively among other Poles.

- o Romanians: The majority of Romanian refugees are married adults in their twenties and thirties. They typically live in nuclear family households with one to three children, although some large families also exist in this population. The educational levels of the adults are fairly high, with a significant number of college-educated professionals and the rest being skilled tradespeople. Their labor force participation is high, but their employment rates are lower than might be expected from their qualifications. Their use of public assistance is moderate.

Conclusions regarding refugee program implications are summarized below:

1. The resettlement, adjustment, and employment service agencies should have staff who speak the language of the non-Southeast Asian refugee groups served and who understand well their current social, cultural, and political backgrounds. Such staff members need not be full-time, but a variety of arrangements for part-time service to fill these needs are available and feasible.

2. Realistic cultural orientation should be provided for incoming non-Southeast Asian groups. Most of them come from socialist nations, have unrealistic images of life in the U.S., and are confused and frustrated by matters that could be explained in orientation without much difficulty.

3. Cross-cultural training of non-native staff members of voluntary agencies and service providers could alleviate many of the problems the members of the four groups faced. Such training could develop an understanding in staff of how to capitalize on the motivations and positive distinctive features of the non-Southeast Asian groups to promote their self-sufficiency more effectively.

4. English language training, if it is to be effective for these non-Southeast Asian groups, must capitalize on their generally advanced literacy in their own, and sometimes other, languages. Programs which focus more on literacy, and less on oral and survival language skills, would better maintain the interest and motivation of the non-Southeast Asian groups.

5. Alternatives to the welfare system in most States should be sought, and experiments with these alternatives should continue. Despite the high motivation of these non-Southeast Asian groups, they also have higher expectations than often assumed, and they typically come from a country where much is provided for them by the Government. Thus they often use welfare for reasons not generally found among other refugee groups. Useful alternatives might somehow provide support without allowing the refugee into the welfare system, or might allow temporarily scaled-down payments to make up differences in inadequate wages, or make medical benefits available for entry-level jobs which do not provide them.

6. Employment services in the form of vocational counseling and professional recertification are greater needs among these groups than among some others. Most Ethiopians enter this country with high school academic educations, but need to work here. Vocational counseling could help them obtain training for better jobs than their current entry-level ones and thus to better pursue their higher education goals. The Afghans, Poles, and Romanians have large numbers of adult professionals who would benefit from recertification programs and realistic professional job counseling.

o 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 was a "task order" contract which was awarded in FY 1985 for $99,648, to assess the outcomes of ORR's national discretionary grants for two programs funded in FY 1984: (1) Enhanced Skills Training (EST), which provided grants to States for skills training, job placement, and post-training assistance for hard-to-place refugees and entrants; and (2) Multiple Wage Earners (MWE), which provided grants to States for social services to underserved refugees and entrants, such as hard-to-place men, women, and youth in large households, in order to increase the number of wage earners in these households thereby reducing their need for public assistance. The major findings are summarized below:

Client Targeting: Many of the discretionary projects failed to recruit and/or enroll appropriate clients, as a result of a variety of factors including: an absence of procedures for individualized screening and service planning; eligibility criteria that were defined either too broadly or too narrowly; a lack of detailed familiarity with the service needs of the target population; and an absence of a referral system with other service providers.

Service Strategy: The majority of the enhanced skilled training projects did not meet the ORR requirement to offer skills training programs to disadvantaged groups. Contrary to the intent of this grant program, many EST projects focused on direct job placements for a range of refugee clients, rather than on providing skills training to hard-to-place clients to achieve stable job placements for this group.

The primary service strategy implemented by the MWE projects was short-term classroom skills training, followed by job placement in entry-level jobs, rather than the provision of intensive supportive services and immediate job placement, as intended by the program.

Outcomes: Multiple Wage Earner projects experienced success in placing underserved individuals in entry-level (minimum wage) jobs. Since projects did not generally target or track an entire household, it was not possible to document MWE project success in terms of increasing total household earnings to achieve self-sufficiency. MWE projects showed that classroom training offering a simulated work environment was an effective strategy for placing refugees with little work experience in entry-level jobs. Some of the factors that appeared to contribute to the projects' success in job placements included: (1) targeting specific industries and occupations of interest to refugees; (2) designing short-term training that was based on a detailed understanding of the performance expectations of specific employers; and (3) building vocationally-oriented English language training into the skills training curriculum to impart vocabulary and communication skills essential for job success.

Only a small proportion of all job placements made through enhanced skills training projects were in jobs paying more than $3.65 per hour. In most cases, EST projects were not able to place participants in jobs that offered fringe benefits, stable employment, or opportunities for advancement. Some factors contributing to these limited outcomes included: the general inexperience of the EST projects in developing and operating skills training programs; a lack of sufficiently detailed labor market information to accurately target occupations with local growth potential; the absence of labor market opportunities in several sites experiencing high unemployment and a declining manufacturing base; and, in some projects, participants' lack of the prerequisite basic skills to successfully complete the skills training curriculum.

Data and Data System Development

Maintenance and development of ORR's computerized data system on refugees continued during FY 1986. 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 1986 for approximately 925,000 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 1986 to develop this data file. Findings pertaining to the refugees who adjusted their status during FY 1986 are reported in the "Adjustment of Status" section, pages 126 and 127.

In FY 1986, 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 1980-1984 tax years are presented in the "Economic Adjustment" section, pages 102 through 125. This data series will be continued in future years.

In FY 1986, ORR continued to work with the Refugee Data Center (funded by the Bureau for Refugee Programs, U.S. Department of State) to improve the ability to exchange records between the two data systems.

This project has enhanced the coverage of ORR's data system. From the Refugee Data Center's records ORR is adding information on certain background characteristics of refugees at the time of arrival, including educational achievement, English language ability, and occupation. Reports summarizing this information are being developed.

KEY FEDERAL ACTIVITIES

Congressional Consultations on Refugee Admissions

Consultations with the Congress on refugee admissions took place in September 1986, as required by the Refugee Act of 1980. After considering Congressional views, President Reagan signed a Presidential Declaration in October 1986, setting a world-wide refugee admissions ceiling for the U.S. at 70,000 for FY 1987. This includes subceilings of 40,500 refugees from East Asia; 10,000 from the Soviet Union and Eastern Europe; 8,000 from the Near East/South Asia; 3,500 from Africa; and 4,000 from Latin America/Caribbean. An additional 4,000 refugee admissions numbers are to be held as an unallocated reserve for contingent refugee admissions needs. These reserve numbers will not be used unless a viable method can be designed and agreed upon for the resettlement costs involved to be borne by the private sector. The President also 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

In November 1986, the Refugee Assistance Extension Act of 1986 was signed into law. The Act (P.L. 99-605) reauthorized the refugee program for fiscal years 1987 and 1988. Funds for the refugee program were appropriated under the Continuing Resolution for FY 1987 (P.L. 99-500).

New U.S. Coordinator for Refugee Affairs

The President announced and the Senate confirmed the appointment of Jonathan Moore to be the new U.S. Coordinator for Refugee Affairs.

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 remain the largest category among recent refugee arrivals, although the number arriving in the United States declined by about 9 percent in FY 1986 compared with FY 1985. By the end of the year, approximately 806,000 were in the country. At that time, less than 6 percent had been in the U.S. for under one year, and only 18 percent had been in the country for three years or less. About 37 percent of the Southeast Asians arrived in the U.S. in the peak FY 1980-1981 period.

Vietnamese continue as 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 1986, the Vietnamese made up 63 percent of the total, while 19 percent were from Laos, and about 17 percent were from Cambodia.* About 37 percent of the refugees from Laos are from the highlands of that nation and are culturally distinct from the lowland Lao; this figue has dropped by only one percentage point in three years.

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 1986, the median age of the resident population of people who had arrived as refugees was 25, without a significant age difference between men and women. Approximately 3.5 percent of the refugees were preschoolers in late 1986; 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

---

* Due to rounding, totals may not add to 100%.

families in the U.S. is known to be considerably larger. The school age population (6-17) of refugee children is about 27 percent of the total, and an additional 19 percent are young adults aged 18-24. A total of 56 percent of the population are adults in the principal working ages (18-44). About 3 percent, or roughly 23,000 people, are aged 65 or older.

At more than 800,000 persons the Southeast Asians are approaching the the Southeast Asians level of the Cubans, who remain the largest of the refugee groups admitted since World War II. Most Cubans 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 the total Cuban population of refugee origin is not available.

Approximately 105,000 Soviet refugees arrived in the United States between 1975 and 1986; 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 the Soviet refugee population is over 40, and at least 20 percent are in their sixties or older.

---

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

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 almost 26,000, with the largest numbers arriving in 1982 and 1983. More than 23,000 Romanian refugees have entered since April 1, 1980, along with more than 7,000 refugees from Czechoslovakia and lesser numbers from the other Eastern European nations. By the end of FY 1986, the refugee population from Afghanistan was over 18,000 while that from and Ethiopia was in excess of 16,000. More than 11,000 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.

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 1986, 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 1986, 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 1986, 18 States were estimated to have populations of Southeast Asian refugees of at least 10,000 persons. These States were:

State	Number	Percent
California	316,200	39.2%
Texas	61,100	7.6
Washington	37,500	4.6
New York	29,600	3.7
Illinois	26,600	3.3
Pennsylvania	26,600	3.3
Minnesota	26,500	3.3
Massachusetts	25,300	3.1
Virginia	21,900	2.7
Oregon	18,600	2.3
Louisiana	14,600	1.8
Florida	13,700	1.7
Ohio	11,200	1.4
Colorado	11,100	1.4
Michigan	10,900	1.4
Wisconsin	10,800	1.3
Kansas	10,400	1.3
Georgia	10,300	1.3
TOTAL	682,900	84.7%
Other	123,300	15.3%
TOTAL	806,200	100.0%

The top 12 of these States were also the top 12 States in terms of Southeast Asian population one year previously, at the close of FY 1985. Ohio moved into 13th place, up from 15th place one year earlier. California, Texas, and Washington have held the top three positions since 1980. New York with almost 30,000 refugees is in fourth place. Illinois, Pennsylvania, and Minnesota have nearly identical populations in the middle twenty-thousands, closely followed by Massachusetts. Virginia with nearly 22,000 and Oregon with more than 18,000 round out the top ten States.

The proportion of Southeast Asian refugees living in California is now estimated at 39.2 percent, a small decline from the estimated 39.8 percent of one year earlier. Over a three-year period from 1983 to 1986, ORR data show a declining trend in secondary migration to California, and the current estimate of 316,200 refugees incorporates that data retroactively. Texas, Washington, Minnesota, and Massachusetts are estimated to have increased their share of the refugee population by small fractions during FY 1986, growing through secondary migration and new arrivals. Illinois, Pennsylvania, Virginia, Oregon, and most of the other leading States maintained a slow but steady growth and a constant share of the refugee population. Similarly, the refugee populations of most States grew slighty or remained relatively stable during FY 1986.

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, 1986, 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, 1986. 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. Fifteen States (and territories) were able to add information on persons receiving only social services and not covered by cash/medical reporting systems. The reports received in 1986 covered approximately 55 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 112,415 refugees, 55 percent of the refugee population whose residence in the U.S. was less than three years as of the reporting date. Of these refugees, 75 percent were still living in the State in which they were resettled initially, and the resettlement site of an additional 5 percent could not be established. The reported interstate migrants numbered 21,771. Of this migration, 42.8 percent, representing 9,326 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 significantly reduced from the findings of earlier years. (In 1983 and 1984, this method showed that 63 percent of all reported in-migrants went to California.) Texas was the second favored destination in 1986, attracting 2,002 people or 9.2 percent of the total reported migration. Massachusetts and Washington State each attracted well over 1,000 in-migrants. Almost every State experienced both gains and losses

through secondary migration. On balance, ten States (Alabama, Arkansas, California, Maryland, Massachusetts, Minnesota, Oklahoma, Rhode Island, Washington and Wisconsin) gained net population through secondary migration. The States losing the most people through out-migration in order were Texas, California, Illinois, New York, Virginia, and Washington 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 again experienced the most out-migration of any State, losing 2,984 people, and was the source of 13.7 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 1984, 1985, and 1986 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 May 1986. 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, and in some cases a smaller adjustment was made. 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 14 States were adjusted in this way. The sum of the estimates so derived was controlled to the actual total of refugee arrivals during the three years. 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 enacted in 1982 and 1986, stress the achievement of employment and economic self-sufficiency by refugees as soon as possible 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 local 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 seek work. The general state of the American economy also influences 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 tnat can include several dependent children as well as dependent adults. For FY 1986 the process of refugee economic adjustment appears to have followed patterns similar to these of previous years, with a few exceptions, as discussed below.

Current Employment Status of Southeast Asian Refugees

In 1986, ORR completed its 15th 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 1981 through April 1986 and is the most recent and comprehensive data available on the economic adjustment of these refugees. Unlike annual surveys conducted prior to the 1985 survey, the 1986 survey continues the plan initiated last year to 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.*

Results of the 1986 survey indicate a labor force participation rate of 41 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 85 percent were employed as compared with 93 percent for the U.S. population. Thus, for refugees who entered the U.S. after April 1981, labor force participation was lower than for the overall United States population, and the unemployment rate was higher. These averages are calculated for purposes of comparison with the United States population. They include many Southeast Asian refugees who have been in the country for only a short time, and also exclude from the sample refugees who arrived before May 1981 and are likely to be residing in self-sufficient households (although some sampled refugees are members of households which contain refugees who arrived earlier).

When employment status is considered separately by year of entry, the results indicate the relative progress of earlier arrivals and the

---

* A technical description of the survey can be found on pages 117 and 118, following the text of this section.

relative difficulties faced by more recent arrivals. Refugees arriving in 1986 had a labor force participation rate of 31 percent and an unemployment rate of 25 percent, both increases over the 1985 first-year figures. Those who had arrived in 1985 had a labor force participation rate of only 25 percent, but an unemployment rate of 20 percent. Refugees who had arrived in the period 1981-1983 have participated in the labor force at rates of about 40-50 percent over the past three years and have unemployment rates decreasing into the teens.

A comparison of data from ORR's 1986 and previous annual surveys illustrates refugee labor force participation rate trends over time. 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. However, while the first-year figure for the 1986 arrivals was a strong 31 percent, second- and third-year participation rates for 1985 and 1984 arrivals did not increase as has historically been the case. Thirty percent of 1984 arrivals were in the labor force in October 1984; this figure rose to 42 percent in the October 1985 survey, and returned to 34 percent for 1986. The rate for 1985 arrivals during their first year in the U.S. was 28 percent, and dipped slightly to 25 percent this year. Available data do not allow a definite determination of cause for this change, but it would appear, in light of the low 1986 unemployment rates for those groups, that a larger portion of the refugees who are not employed are

also not in the labor force in 1986, as compared to previous years. Nevertheless, the ratio of employed refugees to all refugee adults has actually increased for each annual cohort, over the 1985 ratio.

For the total Southeast Asian refugee population, labor force participation has remained relatively steady over most of the past few years -- 56 percent in 1982 and 55 percent in 1983 and 1984. The rate dropped 10 points to 44 percent in 1985, largely due to the survey changes already mentioned, and dropped a few points, to 41 percent, in 1986, as described 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 1986 survey, even excluding the pre-1981 arrivals who were taken into account in previous samples, produced an unemployment rate of 16 percent. Employment trends over time are observable when examined by year of entry. For 1983 arrivals, unemployment decreased from 55 percent in 1983 to 36 percent in 1984, to 17 percent in 1985, and to 10 percent in 1986. For 1984 arrivals, it decreased from 41 percent in 1984, to 36 percent in 1985, and to 18 percent in 1986. Last year's arrival cohort shows an unemployment rate reduction from 50 percent in their initial year to 20 percent. The figures for 1986 arrivals are especially notable, with a 31 percent labor force participation rate being at the high end of the range for a first-year group, while the unemployment rate of 25 percent is about half of that historically found for that group.

Current Employment Status of Southeast Asian Refugees*

Year of Entry	Labor Force Participation (Percent)					Unemployment (Percent)					1986 Response Rate**
	In 1982	In 1983	In 1984	In 1985	In 1986	In 1982	In 1983	In 1984	In 1985	In 1986	
1986	—	—	—	—	31	—	—	—	—	25	91
1985	—	—	—	28	25	—	—	—	50	20	75
1984	—	—	30	42	34	—	—	41	36	18	82
1983	—	21	42	41	40	—	55	36	17	10	74
1982	25	41	45	45	50	62	30	12	16	19	57
1981	42	46	51	46	46	41	17	16	12	14	68
Total Sample***	56	55	55	44	41	24	18	15	17	16	71
U.S. rates****	64	64	65	65	65	10	8	7	7	7	—

* Household members 16 years of age and older.

** Proportion of original sample of 1,171 successfully located and interviewed, by year of entry. The total number interviewed, 836, was 71 percent of the original sample. See Technical Note, page 117.

*** For the 1982-1984 surveys, the figures for "total sample" include refugees who had arrived since 1975. For the 1985-1986 surveys, the figures for "total sample" include only refugees who had arrived during the five-year period preceding the survey.

**** September 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 socioeconomic status from those they held in their country of origin. For example, 37 percent of the employed adults sampled had held white collar jobs in their country of origin; 19 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 doubling of those in skilled blue collar occupations over the proportions in those jobs in Southeast Asia. Over the past three years, survey results indicate little change in the proportion of employed refugees in the service sector, in farming and fishing, and in skilled jobs. The proportion in semi-skilled jobs has steadily increased from 19 percent in 1984 to 32 percent in 1986, while white collar employment has leveled off after a drop in 1985 due to the sampling changes discussed earlier.

Current and Previous Occupational Status

Occupation	In Country of Origin	In U.S.
Professional/Managerial	9.3%	2.6%
Sales/Clerical	27.8%	16.1%
(TOTAL WHITE COLLAR)	(37.1%)	(18.7%)
Skilled	9.3%	20.9%
Semi-skilled	6.0%	32.0%
Laborers	1.8%	4.6%
(TOTAL BLUE COLLAR)	(17.1%)	(57.5%)
Service workers	6.2%	22.3%
Farmers and fishers	39.6%	1.5%

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. Limited English ability as a reason for not seeking work has declined for all age groups below levels of previous years, after a small increase in 1985 due to changes in sampling design. The response category "other," which includes responses in which more than one reason is cited, as well as reasons not listed, doubled in 1986 for all age groups except the oldest, for which the increase was about 60 percent above last year's response.

Reasons for Not Seeking Employment*

Age Group	Percent Citing: Limited English	Education	Family Needs	Health	Other
16-24	1.8%	82.2%	1.8%	3.4%	10.8%
25-34	4.2%	23.3%	38.2%	5.5%	28.8%
35-44	8.9%	17.4%	33.0%	11.2%	29.5%
Over 44	7.7%	7.7%	9.6%	40.2%	34.8%

* The total of those not seeking work for the reasons cited above equals 100 percent for each age group when added across. "Other" category includes responses combining reasons for not seeking employment. This table includes all household members 16 years of age and older.

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 judged themselves to be fluent in English, the labor force participation rate was similar to that for the overall United States population. Refugees who said they spoke no English, however, had a labor force participation rate of only 9 percent and an unemployment rate of 29 percent.

Effects of English Language Proficiency

Ability to Speak and Understand English	Labor Force Participation	Unemployment	Average Weekly Wages*
Not at all	8.6%	28.6%	$204.68
A little	38.4%	20.5%	$186.86
Well	50.9%	10.5%	$205.67
Fluently	61.0%	15.0%	$228.39

Note: Labor force and unemployment figures refer to all household members 16 years of age and older.

* 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 1986 survey indicate that, when estimating their own abilities at the time of their arrival, more refugees who arrived in the early 1980's reported that they had had no English language competence upon arrival, and increasing proportions of subsequent arrivals have reported that they had some English competence at time of arrival. The percent of 1986 arrivals reporting no English speaking ability at time arrival was 46 percent, as compared to about 60 percent for 1982 arrivals. Increases in English language skill among newer arrivals at time of entry may reflect the provision of ESL training in refugee processing centers overseas, while the gradual decrease in the proportion of refugees speaking English well or fluently may reflect a shift in the demographic profile of those who are admitted as refugees. However, there has been little difference in educational level between 1982 and later arrivals, averaging about five to six years for each cohort.

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
1986	4.9	45.7	2.8
1985	5.3	52.3	3.5
1984	5.8	46.8	7.5
1983	5.8	50.6	6.0
1982	5.8	59.6	4.8
1981	8.1	58.2	10.1

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 1986 survey who arrived from 1981 to 1986.

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 119.) 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. Weekly income of employed persons shows a

general increase over time. However, 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 may reflect some differences in employment potential among cohorts, altnough the reasons for this shift are not known at this time.

Working toward economic self-sufficiency is one part of a refugee's overall process of adjustment to the United States. But influences on the process of achieving economic self-sufficiency are numerous and interrelated. An examination of the differences between refugee households that are receiving public cash assistance only, those receiving both cash assistance and earned income, and those not receiving cash assistance highlights some of the difficulties:

Households that receive no cash assistance are slightly smaller than assisted households and have, on an average, five members and two wage earners. Households receiving cash assistance average over six members, with 1-2 persons employed in those households where some earned income is also received.

Household age structure also differs for the three types of households. Nearly one-fifth of all members of households receiving cash assistance only are under six years of age, and almost half are under 16. Households not receiving cash assistance have only 10 percent under six years. With an average size of five members, this can be interpreted

to mean that only half of the self-supporting households have a child under six, and these households have on average less than two members under 16 years. Households with both earned and assistance income have age characteristics similar to those with earned income only, except that the average household size is larger.

Overall, findings from ORR's 1986 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 shows a slight polarizing of the population by household income source, with under 20 percent of sampled households receiving both earned and assistance income, less than either those with earned income only (36 percent) or assistance income only (45 percent). The survey also shows that both labor force participation and unemployment are down significantly, producing a reduction in the pool of unemployed refugees who are seeking work and a net gain in percent of refugees employed. These trends may indicate continued progress of many refugees toward self-sufficiency, but they also indicate that some refugees who have had difficulty in finding work have withdrawn from the labor force.

Technical Note: The ORR Annual Survey, with interviews held between September 5 and October 24, 1986, was the 15th in a series conducted since 1975. It was designed to be representative of Southeast Asians who arrived as refugees between May 1, 1981, and April 30, 1986, the cutoff date for inclusion in the sample. The sampling frame used was the ORR

Refugee Data File for persons arriving from May 1981 through April 1986. 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 since 1985 the sample has been limited to refugees who arrived over the most recent five years.

The 1986 sample included 1,171 persons, of whom 579 were first selected for the 1983 survey, 200 in 1984, 205 in 1985, and 187 in 1986. A total of 836 interviews were completed, or 71.4 percent of the full sample.

Of the 720 refugees sampled from 1983 through 1985 and interviewed in 1985, 641 (89 percent) were interviewed again in 1986. In addition, 45 refugees from the earlier samples who were not interviewed in 1985 were located and interviewed in 1986. Of the 187 refugees first sampled in 1986, 150 (80 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	22.9%	40.9%	28.2%	41.4%	41.3%	40.0%	35.7%
Unemployment	23.1%	17.1%	24.7%	5.8%	11.4%	19.1%	19.1%
Weekly income of employed persons	$174.78	$179.92	$159.70	$197.96	$177.45	$211.69	$235.56
Percent in English training	29.0%	22.0%	17.8%	19.9%	15.0%	12.3%	26.9%
Percent in other training or schooling	27.1%	22.6%	27.1%	35.6%	23.4%	35.9%	24.5%
Percent speaking English well or fluently	32.5%	35.0%	29.2%	46.2%	46.3%	50.0%	36.1%
Percent speaking no English	18.4%	11.3%	13.5%	8.0%	12.2%	12.3%	13.7%

---

* In previous reports this table has included a percent figure of refugees living in households in which some cash assistance was being received. Since measured changes in use of assistance over time may result from changes in the sample as well as changes in household composition under the current longitudinal survey design, the item was omitted from this report. Nearly one-third of the individuals covered were not in the same households one year earlier.

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

	Households With Assistance Income Only	Households With Assistance and Earned Income	Households With Earned Income Only
Average household size	6.3	6.3	5.0
Average number of wage-earners per household	0.1	1.7	2.2
Percent of household members:			
Under the age of 6	19.0	11.9	10.0
Under the age of 16	44.6	32.1	27.2
Percent of households with at least one fluent English speaker	1.1	2.8	6.0
Percent of sampled households	45.2	18.9	35.9

Incomes of Southeast Asian Refugees

Through an interagency agreement with the Internal Revenue Service (IRS), ORR obtains 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 1984, 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.

---

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

"Household" Income and Tax Liability

The first data are compiled from forms in the 1040 series.* They 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 1984, 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, 1982-1984**

Tax Year	All Cohorts	1975 Arrivals	1976-79 Arrivals
1982	$1,193	$ 963	$229
1983	$1,286	$1,024	$262
1984	$1,527	$1,202	$326

---

* The IRS has advised ORR that the data compiled from the 1040 series in earlier years covering tax years 1980-1983 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 and 1983 tabulations, which are summarized here. Data for earlier years were not available for revision. This material should not be used as a time series with data presented in the past.

** Refugees who arrived from 1975 through late 1979.

From 1982 to 1984, 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. By 1984 the median income of the 1975 cohort was in the same category as that of all U.S. tax filing units:

Median Adjusted Gross Income of Tax Filing Units, Southeast Asian Refugees, 1982-1984*

Tax Year	All Cohorts	1975 Arrivals	1976-79 Arrivals	Ratio, 75/76-79	All U.S. Tax Units**
1982	$12,192	$14,232	$ 8,803	1.62	$14-15,000
1983	$12,808	$14,698	$ 9,655	1.52	$15-16,000
1984	$14,377	$16,377	$11,105	1.47	$16-17,000

* 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 26 percent of all refugees admitted between 1975 and 1984, were paying well over $100 million yearly in Federal income taxes by 1984.

Percent of Refugee Tax Returns Showing Tax Liability

Tax Year	All Cohorts	1975 Arrivals	1976-79 Arrivals	Total Tax Liability (millions)
1982	77.2%	79.6%	70.8%	$114.2
1983	77.9%	79.5%	74.0%	$113.6
1984	80.7%	81.7%	78.4%	$138.5

These tax filing unit data show that the 1975 arrivals had achieved incomes equivalent to those of other U.S. residents by 1984, while the later refugee arrivals lagged behind. 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 1980-1984 period, aggregate income earned by these Southeast Asian refugees from wages increased by 78 percent. 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
1984	$1,366,648	$16,518	$1,117	$34,992

The wages 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%
1984	32.3%	10.9%

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. From 1982 to 1984 a declining number of refugees received unemployment compensation, 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 1986, 75,217 refugees adjusted their immigration status under this provision. A total of nearly 460,000 refugees have become permanent resident aliens in this way since 1981.

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. The number of Cubans adjusting status under the Cuban Refugee Adjustment Act of 1966 was 31,950 in FY 1986. This figure includes both refugees and entrants, who were permitted to adjust status under this Act beginning in 1985. In the twenty years since this legislation was passed, nearly 450,000 Cubans have become permanent resident aliens under its provisions. Data pertaining to the adjustment of status of other refugee groups under special legislation during FY 1986 are not available; these provisions are no longer being used for large numbers of refugees.

(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 under Section 209 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. In FY 1986 the maximum of 5,000 political asylees were granted permanent resident alien status. This represents the third consecutive year in which the maximum number was reached, since a backlog exists of persons eligible under this provision of the law.

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. A substantial amount of time is necessary to complete the process, and many people do not apply for naturalization as soon as they become eligible.

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, an estimate of their naturalization rate can be made. The 1975 cohort of refugees first became eligible in 1980, and each year another group becomes eligible. From 1980 through 1985, the most recent year for which data are available, approximately 67,000 former Southeast Asian refugees became U.S. citizens. This represents about 16 percent of those eligible for naturalization by the close of FY 1985.

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

The basic purpose of the domestic refugee resettlement program is to help refugees become employed and self-sufficient as soon as possible after their arrival in the United States and to give Federal funds for costs that would normally be a State or local responsibility. States are paid for the costs incurred providing cash and medical assistance to refugees who have been here 31 months or less. Under a separate grant, States are awarded funds to support a broad range of social services critical to refugees' adjustment in their new homeland and in developing the basic skills and knowledge necessary to provide for the economic security of the individual or family.

ORR does not anticipate any major problems in providing for the needs of those refugees admitted at the ceiling of 70,000, including a contingency reserve of 4,000, set by the President for the coming fiscal year 1987. 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 Bill Gee, Director of ORR, as part of the Congressional Consultations on proposed refugee admissions for FY 1987.

Of course, it is difficult to estimate with precision the future costs for cash and medical assistance since ORR's estimates depend on the future number of refugees who arrive, the time of their arrival, the proportion who will require cash and medical assistance, and the period of time for which they require such assistance.

Welfare Dependency Rates

Currently, over one-half of the refugees who have been in the country less than 31 months are living in households that receive public assistance. In some States, the number appears to be over fifty percent even after five years. On the other hand, there are States with welfare dependency rates at or less than 35 percent. This is due, in part, to thriving local or State economies which create employment opportunities. In many instances, it also reflects welfare policies of States with relatively low benefit levels which make employment, even entry-level jobs in many cases, preferable to welfare. Most importantly, the success of many States may be attributed to a commonly shared view that the refugees' long-term interests are best served by early work experience where they can renew their sense of self-worth, of pride in self-reliance, and of independence in the freedom of making economic choices.

The challenge of implementing an even more effective resettlement program requires innovative thinking in developing or improving upon existing service and policy responses which create opportunities for

self-sufficiency and economic independence. It also requires a clearer understanding of the major barriers which prohibit or discourage successful resettlement. It demands that ORR direct its funding resources towards responsive solutions. Through the collective wisdom and experience of those in the refugee program network, including refugee-based organizations, such solutions can be identified and initiated.

The Office of Refugee Resettlement recognizes the importance of approaching the problem of welfare dependency from three fronts: (1) removing the institutional barriers (i.e., statutory, regulatory, program policy) which discourage self-sufficiency; (2) focusing our employment initiatives on refugees who, without special efforts, cannot be placed in jobs (such as second wage earners in a household); and (3) meeting the special needs of refugees which would provide disabling effects should they go unmet or unrealized.

The following sections highlight ongoing initiatives or those proposed for FY 1987 which reflect ORR's determination to address the barriers to self-sufficiency noted above and to obtain Federal cost reductions which are essential in our efforts to address the national deficit.

o Wilson/Fish Demonstration Projects

The Wilson/Fish Amendment to the Immigration and Nationality Act, contained in the FY 1985 Continuing Appropriations Resolution, is the vehicle enabling ORR to develop alternative projects which promote early

employment of refugees. It provides to States, voluntary resettlement agencies, and others the opportunity to develop innovative approaches for the provision of cash and medical assistance, social services, and case management.

In the summer of 1985, 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. Both of these projects got fully underway in FY 1986 and will continue to operate in FY 1987. ORR looks toward the second year of operation as the critical stage in determing the extent to which the projects increase refugee employment.

The California Demonstration Project (RDP)

On July 1, 1985, the State of California began implementing a three-year refugee demonstration project (RDP). The RDP is designed to test whether the removal of refugee employment disincentives found in the AFDC program will result in more refugees becoming employed and to test the effects of increased employment experience upon refugee self-sufficiency. The project intends to: (1) increase the participation of refugees in employment services and training programs specifically designed for refugees; (2) increases refugees' potential for economic independence by allowing them a transition into entry-level full-time employment without immediately forfeiting the entire cash grant and other benefits; and (3) reduce long-term program costs through grant reductions as a result of employment.

At the inception of the project, refugee cases which were on AFDC and in which the principal wage earner or caretaker relative had been in the United States for 24 months or less (as of July 1, 1985) were converted from AFDC to the RDP and are required to participate in the project. Newly applying refugee cases in which the principal wage earner or caretaker relative 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.

Generally RDP participants are eligible for the same level of cash assistance that they would receive under AFDC but are subject to the requirements of the RDP, which are similar to those for the refugee cash assistance (RCA) program.

The State of California has provided the following data on the RDP covering the last quarterly period in FY 1986 -- from July 1, 1986, through September 30, 1986:

-- 10,074 cases totaling 42,072 individuals were enrolled in the RDP as of 9/30/86.

-- Of the 42,072 participants in the RDP, 17,670 were 18 years of age and above; 24,402 were under 18 years of age.

-- Of the RDP participants, 2,487 were enrolled in English language training, 282 were enrolled in job training, 2,445 were receiving employment-related services, and 154 were receiving other support services.

-- During the quarter, 203 clients entered employment, and 168 had been sanctioned.

The Oregon Refugee Early Employment Project (REEP)

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 place: (1) 75 percent of all employable participants in full-time, permanent employment within 18 months of their arrival in the U.S.; (2) 50 percent of employable participants within 12 months of their arrival; and (3) 25 percent of employable participants within 6 months of their arrival -- reducing the aggregate 18-month dependency rate for these clients from 80 percent to 50 percent.

The three-year project serves needy refugees who do not meet the AFDC or SSI categorical requirements (i.e., 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.

The State of Oregon has provided the following data which covers the period for the inception of the project in mid-September 1985 until September 30, 1986:

-- Over the 12-1/2 month period, 595 individuals had been enrolled in the project.

-- Thus far, 210 participants had been placed into jobs. Of those, 87 were still working after 90 days.

o High Welfare Utilization States Conference

In May 1986, ORR convened a meeting of refugee coordinators from seven States where large numbers of refugees utilize cash assistance (California, Washington, Wisconsin, Minnesota, New York, Pennsylvania, and Massachusetts) to discuss ways to reduce refugee welfare dependency. A number of recommendations for consideration by ORR and the respective States came out of this conference. Followup activities are currently being formulated.

o Comprehensive Discretionary Social Services (CDSS)

For the second year in a row, ORR made available to States, on a competitive basis, a considerable portion of its discretionary funds for two important purposes: (1) to encourage States to analyze their current service delivery strategies and through this process identify critical, unmet service needs; and (2) to encourage the development of initiatives targeted to refugees who, for various reasons, are difficult to serve and to those who have special needs currently not encompassed in State social service delivery systems. Approximately $4 million was awarded in FY 1986 for projects in 17 States.

o Refugee Mental Health Initiative

In furthering ORR's commitment to the mental health needs of refugees, approximately $2.5 million was awarded in FY 1986 as part of a multi-year cooperative agreement with the National Institute of Mental Health (NIMH). The purpose of implementing a national refugee mental health strategy is: (1) to encourage States to provide culturally sensitive diagnostic and preventive mental health services to high-need refugee populations; and (2) to establish a national Refugee Mental Health Resource Development and Technical Assistance Center to aid States, mental health agencies, and refugee service providers.

o Regional Consultations on Refugee Resettlement

During the current fiscal year, the Office of Refugee Resettlement, in collaboration with the Department of State's Bureau for Refugee Programs and the Office of the U.S. Coordinator for Refugee Affairs, hosted a series of six regional consultations on refugee resettlement. These consultations were held in Atlanta, Boston, Seattle, Dallas, Chicago, and San Diego. Over 1,000 representatives of Federal, State and local governments, national and local voluntary resettlement agencies, refugee-based organizations, and service providers participated in these policy forums. The theme of the consultations, "Refugee Resettlement: A New Decade," was chosen for the purpose of focusing attention on adjustments that are likely to be made in a new era of changing international and domestic circumstances.

o ORR Planning Workgroup

Contrary to the resettlement experiences of the past decade, the next several years offer a different set of fiscal realities and the potential for changed direction in the refugee program. What this adds up to is the need for those involved in the refugee program to plan for, rather than respond to, changes visible on the horizon.

With this in mind, the Director of ORR convened a Policy and Planning Workgroup in the Summer of 1986 to make recommendations as to what the priorities of ORR should be for the next three years including a plan for targeting scarce funding and staff resources. The workgroup was also charged with taking a close look at ways in which the coordination between Federal and State agencies could be improved. The workgroup consisted of persons from each of the key sectors within the domestic refugee resettlement program: States, Mutual Assistance Associations, national voluntary agencies, and ORR Central and Regional offices. The recommendations of the Workgroup were recently made available to the Director of ORR and will be taken into account by ORR as it plans its activities for the coming fiscal year.

APPENDIX A

TABLES

TABLE 1

Southeast Asian Refugee Arrivals in the United States:
1975 through September 30, 1986

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
October 1, 1985--September 30, 1986	45,391
TOTAL	806,245

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 1986

Month	Number of Arrivals		
	Southeast Asians	All Others	Total
October	4,212	707	4,919
November	3,164	1,515	4,679
December	3,857	1,284	5,141
January	4,135	1,335	5,470
February	2,253	1,652	3,905
March	4,277	1,664	5,941
April	4,073	1,423	5,496
May	3,339	1,290	4,629
June	3,456	1,488	4,944
July	3,817	1,358	5,175
August	2,986	1,265	4,251
September	5,822	1,879	7,701
TOTAL	45,391	16,860	62,251

FY 1986: October 1, 1985 - September 30, 1986.

TABLE 3

Southeast Asian Refugee Arrivals by State of Initial Resettlement: FY 1986

State	Country of Citizenship			
	Cambodia	Laos	Vietnam	Total
Alabama	40	95	134	267
Alaska	4	22	13	39
Arizona	108	89	460	657
Arkansas	0	81	56	137
California	2,363	3,979	8,826	15,168
Colorado	53	181	281	515
Connecticut	108	252	161	521
Delaware	0	7	23	30
District of Columbia	33	18	56	107
Florida	144	224	515	883
Georgia	256	224	343	823
Hawaii	4	89	158	251
Idaho	75	47	79	201
Illinois	418	449	681	1,548
Indiana	70	63	58	191
Iowa	87	339	325	751
Kansas	22	106	389	517
Kentucky	126	37	224	387
Louisiana	86	171	342	599
Maine	104	3	43	150
Maryland	163	90	249	502
Massachusetts	943	323	675	1,941
Michigan	29	190	272	491
Minnesota	394	1,154	388	1,936
Mississippi	0	0	137	137
Missouri	205	185	323	713
Montana	0	22	11	33
Nebraska	11	44	71	126
Nevada	7	31	93	131
New Hampshire	24	16	6	46
New Jersey	15	41	380	436
New Mexico	20	58	48	126
New York	471	363	1,112	1,946
North Carolina	196	105	172	473
North Dakota	22	0	29	51

State	Country of Citizenship			
	Cambodia	Laos	Vietnam	Total
Ohio	191	199	204	594
Oklahoma	69	92	232	393
Oregon	122	235	356	713
Pennsylvania	419	166	795	1,380
Rhode Island	179	173	19	371
South Carolina	11	5	55	71
South Dakota	10	8	22	40
Tennessee	358	322	131	811
Texas	684	977	1,832	3,493
Utah	271	141	208	620
Vermont	20	1	4	25
Virginia	304	262	611	1,177
Washington	783	549	768	2,100
West Virginia	0	5	8	13
Wisconsin	32	653	52	737
Wyoming	0	8	1	9
Guam	0	0	14	14
Other	0	0	0	0
TOTAL	10,054	12,894	22,443	45,391

TABLE 4

Eastern European[a/] and Soviet Refugee Arrivals by State of Initial Resettlement: FY 1986

State	Country of Citizenship					
	Czechoslovakia	Hungary	Poland	Romania	USSR	Total
Alabama	0	0	11	3	0	14
Alaska	0	0	9	5	0	14
Arizona	14	3	22	105	6	150
Arkansas	4	0	14	0	0	18
California	342	84	477	661	247	1,811
Colorado	31	7	29	2	5	74
Connecticut	31	48	110	37	11	237
Delaware	0	0	2	1	0	3
District of Columbia	6	6	48	4	0	64
Florida	40	28	72	69	8	217
Georgia	32	11	22	20	0	85
Hawaii	5	0	3	2	0	10
Idaho	54	7	35	17	4	117
Illinois	65	27	435	271	49	847
Indiana	16	3	31	17	0	67
Iowa	6	6	17	3	3	35
Kansas	3	0	3	0	1	7
Kentucky	0	0	3	0	0	3
Louisiana	0	0	4	0	1	5
Maine	5	0	77	1	0	83
Maryland	34	5	80	40	11	170
Massachusetts	145	3	72	14	59	293
Michigan	22	23	282	168	0	495
Minnesota	8	1	44	16	0	69
Mississippi	0	0	4	0	0	4
Missouri	48	24	65	45	7	189
Montana	3	0	0	0	0	3
Nebraska	9	0	19	13	0	41
Nevada	7	5	10	1	4	27
New Hampshire	5	2	5	3	0	15
New Jersey	50	29	233	73	14	399
New Mexico	2	0	4	3	0	9
New York	99	79	673	438	313	1,602
North Carolina	2	6	44	18	1	71
North Dakota	24	10	13	15	0	62

State	Country of Citizenship					Total
	Czechoslovakia	Hungary	Poland	Romania	USSR	
Ohio	25	24	29	72	6	156
Oklahoma	0	0	13	7	1	21
Oregon	5	3	13	84	2	107
Pennsylvania	42	24	195	92	17	370
Rhode Island	0	39	16	2	0	57
South Carolina	0	1	0	2	0	3
South Dakota	4	11	29	9	0	53
Tennessee	11	1	48	8	9	77
Texas	47	17	163	141	8	376
Utah	61	2	16	0	0	79
Vermont	69	3	6	16	0	94
Virginia	4	7	10	12	6	39
Washington	31	104	65	82	3	285
West Virginia	0	0	3	3	0	6
Wisconsin	10	0	21	9	1	41
Wyoming	3	0	0	0	0	3
Guam	0	0	0	0	0	0
Other	0	0	0	0	0	0
TOTAL	1,424	653	3,599	2,604	797	9,077

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

TABLE 5

Ethiopian and Near Eastern Refugee Arrivals by State of Initial Resettlement: FY 1986

State	Country of Citizenship				
	Ethiopia	Afghanistan	Iran	Iraq	Total
Alabama	0	0	4	0	4
Alaska	0	0	12	0	12
Arizona	62	19	51	1	133
Arkansas	0	1	1	0	2
California	313	887	1,772	94	3,066
Colorado	24	73	31	0	128
Connecticut	4	19	15	0	38
Delaware	0	4	2	0	6
District of Columbia	69	37	19	0	125
Florida	29	30	62	0	121
Georgia	42	61	16	1	120
Hawaii	0	0	0	0	0
Idaho	0	0	5	0	5
Illinois	49	37	61	92	239
Indiana	10	14	12	0	36
Iowa	3	0	3	0	6
Kansas	6	5	3	0	14
Kentucky	0	8	10	0	18
Louisiana	0	13	3	0	16
Maine	0	18	18	0	36
Maryland	84	88	143	2	317
Massachusetts	23	17	47	0	87
Michigan	29	9	23	81	142
Minnesota	56	11	15	0	82
Mississippi	0	0	1	0	1
Missouri	39	39	7	1	86
Montana	2	0	0	0	2
Nebraska	0	27	1	0	28
Nevada	22	13	62	3	100
New Hampshire	1	0	3	0	4
New Jersey	40	43	39	4	126
New Mexico	0	15	5	0	20
New York	65	404	257	3	729
North Carolina	7	17	7	0	31
North Dakota	4	0	2	1	7

State	Country of Citizenship				
	Ethiopia	Afghanistan	Iran	Iraq	
Ohio	32	18	31	0	81
Oklahoma	2	5	30	1	38
Oregon	4	12	22	0	38
Pennsylvania	14	24	40	1	79
Rhode Island	0	0	2	0	2
South Carolina	0	7	3	0	10
South Dakota	17	10	0	0	27
Tennessee	2	17	13	6	38
Texas	145	123	198	11	477
Utah	0	0	18	0	18
Vermont	0	0	4	0	4
Virginia	21	237	81	2	341
Washington	44	54	42	1	141
West Virginia	0	0	5	0	5
Wisconsin	4	6	7	0	17
Wyoming	0	1	0	0	1
Guam	0	0	0	0	0
Other	0	0	0	0	0
TOTAL	1,268	2,423	3,208	305	7,204

TABLE 6

Total Refugee Arrivals by State of Initial Resettlement: FY 1986

State	Total Arrivals	Percent
Alabama	285	0.5%
Alaska	65	0.1
Arizona	969	1.6
Arkansas	157	0.3
California	20,171	32.4
Colorado	717	1.2
Connecticut	799	1.3
Delaware	39	a/
District of Columbia	300	0.5
Florida	1,316	2.1
Georgia	1,032	1.7
Hawaii	261	0.4
Idaho	329	0.5
Illinois	2,660	4.3
Indiana	295	0.5
Iowa	795	1.3
Kansas	538	0.9
Kentucky	408	0.7
Louisiana	621	1.0
Maine	269	0.4
Maryland	1,008	1.6
Massachusetts	2,326	3.7
Michigan	1,149	1.8
Minnesota	2,093	3.4
Mississippi	142	0.2
Missouri	1,012	1.6
Montana	38	a/
Nebraska	195	0.3
Nevada	268	0.4
New Hampshire	65	0.1
New Jersey	990	1.6
New Mexico	155	0.2
New York	4,366	7.0
North Carolina	581	0.9
North Dakota	122	0.2

State	Total Arrivals	Percent
Ohio	834	1.3%
Oklahoma	452	0.7
Oregon	862	1.4
Pennsylvania	1,841	3.0
Rhode Island	431	0.7
South Carolina	84	0.1
South Dakota	123	0.2
Tennessee	926	1.5
Texas	4,362	7.0
Utah	721	1.2
Vermont	124	0.2
Virginia	1,567	2.5
Washington	2,538	4.1
West Virginia	24	a/
Wisconsin	799	1.3
Wyoming	13	a/
Guam	14	a/
Other	0	a/
TOTAL	62,251	100.0%

a/ Less than 0.1 percent.

TABLE 7

Applications for Refugee Status Granted by INS:
FY 1980 - FY 1986[a/]

Country of Chargeability	FY 1980-FY 1983	FY 1984	FY 1985	FY 1986	Total
Afghanistan	11,445	2,268	2,234	2,450	18,397
Albania	121	48	48	84	301
Angola	296	84	60	7	447
Bulgaria	454	140	136	154	884
Cambodia	76,134	21,444	11,380	2,084	111,042
China	1,093	30	20	13	1,156
Cuba	4,282	57	1,865	47	6,251
Cyprus	36	0	0	0	36
Czechoslovakia	3,861	859	984	1,461	7,165
Egypt	116	4	0	0	120
El Salvador	0	96	0	0	96
Ethiopia	11,063	2,536	1,771	1,285	16,655
Greece	421	0	0	0	421
Hong Kong	1,277	137	101	201	1,716
Hungary	1,696	548	534	662	3,440
India	3	7	0	0	10
Iran	1,489	2,969	3,496	3,231	11,185
Iraq	5,694	157	259	304	6,414
Laos	61,789	8,189	4,305	13,421	87,704
Lebanon	442	0	0	6	448
Lesotho	0	12	10	0	22
Libya	9	0	5	1	15
Macau	75	5	1	0	81
Malawi	19	14	6	4	43
Mozambique	34	27	9	2	72
Namibia	46	21	12	4	83
Nicaragua	0	3	3	0	6
Pakistan	1	9	0	0	10
Philippines	69	17	10	0	96
Poland	14,801	4,288	3,001	3,734	25,824
Romania	11,599	4,301	4,650	2,630	23,180
South Africa	38	12	31	12	93
Sudan	32	0	0	0	32
Syria	731	5	4	5	745
Taiwan	0	0	12	0	12
Turkey	720	0	1	0	721
USSR	23,514	721	639	789	25,663
Uganda	1	2	8	7	18
Vietnam	146,292	28,875	23,799	19,474	218,440
Yugoslavia	49	12	6	1	68
Zaire	35	34	31	8	108
Zimbabwe	0	0	5	0	5
All Others	266	1	0	0	267
TOTAL	380,043	77,932	59,436	52,081	569,492

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, published and unpublished tabulations.

TABLE 8

Asylum Applications (Cases) Approved by INS
FY 1980 - FY 1986[a/]

Country of Nationality	FY 1980-FY 1983	FY 1984	FY 1985	FY 1986	Total
Afghanistan	944	186	57	48	1,235
Angola	0	4	0	1	5
Argentina	29	1	0	0	30
Bangladesh	2	0	0	0	2
Belize	0	0	0	1	1
Brazil	0	0	1	0	1
Bulgaria	18	14	5	10	47
Burma	0	0	1	0	1
Burundi	2	0	0	0	2
Cambodia	5	4	3	6	18
Cape Verde	0	0	0	1	1
Chile	13	0	6	6	25
China	36	15	44	18	113
Colombia	0	5	0	0	5
Costa Rica	0	0	1	0	1
Cuba	91	16	61	17	185
Czechoslovakia	69	36	34	22	161
Dominican Republic	0	0	1	0	1
Ecuador	0	1	1	0	2
Egypt	40	1	0	0	41
El Salvador[b/]	243	328	74	55	700
Equatorial Guinea	0	0	0	1	1
Ethiopia	789	305	287	175	1,456
France	0	1	0	0	1
Germany (East)	2	8	6	5	21
Ghana	15	15	8	6	44
Guatemala	0	3	5	5	13
Guinea	0	0	1	0	1
Guyana	5	1	3	0	9
Haiti	27	23	4	2	56
Honduras	1	4	2	0	7
Hungary	119	62	46	22	249
India	0	0	1	0	1
Indonesia	0	2	0	1	3
Iran	7,889	5,017	2,779	1,172	16,857
Iraq	116	38	41	8	203
Israel	0	1	0	0	1
Italy	1	0	0	0	1
Japan	0	0	1	0	1
Jordan	2	1	1	0	4
Kenya	2	0	0	0	2
Korea	0	0	1	0	1
Laos	8	4	1	2	15

Country of Nationality	FY 1980-FY 1983	FY 1984	FY 1985	FY 1986	Total
Lebanon	27	16	13	4	60
Liberia	0	5	2	5	12
Libya	85	11	54	41	191
Malawi	4	0	1	0	5
Mexico	1	0	1	0	2
Namibia	0	3	0	0	3
Nicaragua	915	1,018	408	1,082	3,423
Pakistan	16	7	10	2	35
Peru	1	1	0	0	2
Philippines	40	36	29	9	114
Poland	1,163	721	451	373	2,708
Rhodesia	4	0	0	0	4
Romania	227	158	101	127	613
Seychelles	0	6	2	1	9
Sierra Leone	0	2	0	0	2
Singapore	0	1	0	0	1
Somalia	0	34	22	16	72
South Africa	49	7	5	10	71
Sri Lanka	0	0	0	1	1
Sudan	0	0	0	1	1
Syria	52	21	30	50	153
Taiwan	0	1	1	0	2
Thailand	0	2	1	0	3
Turkey	4	3	1	0	8
USSR	75	45	26	33	179
Uganda	69	49	15	6	139
Vietnam	56	19	13	8	96
Yemen (Aden)	0	0	1	0	1
Yemen (Sanaa)	0	0	6	2	8
Yugoslavia	23	12	8	4	47
Zaire	3	4	2	0	9
Zimbabwe	1	0	1	0	2
All Others	299	0	5	0	304
Total Cases	13,582	8,278	4,585	3,359	29,804
Total Persons	c/	11,627	6,514	4,284	c/

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, published and unpublished tabulations.

TABLE 9

Estimated Southeast Asian Refugee Population by State:
September 30, 1985 and September 30, 1986[a/]

State	9/30/85	9/30/86	Percent 9/30/86
Alabama	3,000	3,300	0.4%
Alaska	200	200	c/
Arizona	5,000	6,000	0.7
Arkansas	2,500	2,800	0.3
California	303,100	316,200	39.2
Colorado	10,500	11,100	1.4
Connecticut	7,000	7,200	0.9
Delaware	200	300	c/
District of Columbia	1,600	1,500	0.2
Florida	12,700	13,700	1.7
Georgia	9,700	10,300	1.3
Hawaii	6,600	7,000	0.9
Idaho	1,600	1,700	0.2
Illinois	25,300	26,600	3.3
Indiana	3,900	4,200	0.5
Iowa	8,800	9,200	1.1
Kansas	10,000	10,400	1.3
Kentucky	2,200	2,600	0.3
Louisiana	14,100	14,600	1.8
Maine	1,700	1,800	0.2
Maryland	9,300	9,900	1.2
Massachusetts	22,500	25,300	3.1
Michigan	10,400	10,900	1.4
Minnesota	24,100	26,500	3.3
Mississippi	1,800	1,900	0.2
Missouri	6,900	7,400	0.9
Montana	800	900	0.1
Nebraska	2,000	2,100	0.3
Nevada	2,000	2,200	0.3
New Hampshire	800	700	c/
New Jersey	6,800	7,100	0.9
New Mexico	2,000	2,100	0.3
New York	28,600	29,600	3.7
North Carolina	5,200	5,600	0.7
North Dakota	900	900	0.1
Ohio	10,300	11,200	1.4
Oklahoma	8,600	9,100	1.1
Oregon	17,400	18,600	2.3

State	9/30/85	9/30/86	9/30/86 Percent
Pennsylvania	25,400	26,600	3.3%
Rhode Island	5,800	6,600	0.8
South Carolina	2,100	2,300	0.3
South Dakota	1,000	1,000	0.1
Tennessee	4,900	5,600	0.7
Texas	57,200	61,100	7.6
Utah	7,900	8,600	1.1
Vermont	600	600	c/
Virginia	20,700	21,900	2.7
Washington	34,300	37,500	4.7
West Virginia	400	400	c/
Wisconsin	10,000	10,800	1.3
Wyoming	200	200	c/
Guam	300	300	c/
Other Territories	b/	b/	c/
TOTAL	760,900	806,200	100.0%

a/ The September 1985 estimates were constructed by taking the January 1981 INS alien registration, adjusting it for underregistration, adding persons who arrived from January 1981 through September 1985, and adjusting the totals so derived for secondary migration. The September 1986 estimates were constructed similarly by using the known distribution of the population in January 1981, adding arrivals from January 1981 through September 1986, 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, 1986 a/

State	Non-Movers	Out-Migrants	In-Migrants	Net Migration
Alabama c/	197	145	287	142
Alaska b/	b/	50	b/	-50
Arizona c/	2,301	547	209	-338
Arkansas c/	293	85	105	20
California	33,118	1,440	9,326	7,886
Colorado c/	984	318	302	-16
Connecticut	367	363	29	-334
Delaware	11	10	0	-10
District of Columbia c/	55	508	48	-460
Florida	1,193	552	85	-467
Georgia c/	851	523	135	-388
Hawaii	450	94	22	-72
Idaho	139	293	12	-281
Illinois	2,520	1,304	262	-1,042
Indiana	238	174	0	-174
Iowa	742	362	33	-329
Kansas	693	409	160	-249
Kentucky	416	288	19	-269
Louisiana c/	287	514	278	-236
Maine	268	143	25	-118
Maryland c/	1,105	423	583	160
Massachusetts	4,878	515	1,685	1,170
Michigan c/	834	256	113	-143
Minnesota	2,728	613	735	122
Mississippi	98	122	22	-100
Missouri	479	415	91	-324
Montana	25	38	5	-33
Nebraska	112	135	8	-127
Nevada	118	211	16	-195
New Hampshire	47	89	0	-89
New Jersey	712	365	129	-236
New Mexico	76	247	19	-228
New York	4,196	1,038	708	-330
North Carolina	114	458	10	-448
North Dakota	159	97	1	-96
Ohio	1,200	452	189	-263
Oklahoma c/	1,200	588	602	14
Oregon	1,515	483	195	-288

State	Non-Movers	Out-Migrants	In-Migrants	Net Migration
Pennsylvania	1,948	628	453	-175
Rhode Island c/	1,493	176	568	392
South Carolina c/	51	49	21	-28
South Dakota	43	69	7	-62
Tennessee	487	368	8	-360
Texas c/	5,441	2,984	2,002	-982
Utah	678	616	45	-571
Vermont	49	107	2	-105
Virginia	1,261	920	299	-621
Washington c/	7,592	822	1,475	653
West Virginia	18	20	0	-20
Wisconsin	747	185	442	257
Wyoming	13	16	0	-16
Guam c/	18	0	1	1
Other b/	b/	144	b/	-144
TOTAL	84,558	21,771	21,771	0

---

a/ This table represents a compilation of unadjusted data reported by the States on Form ORR-11. The population base is refugees receiving State-administered services on 6/30/86. Persons without social security numbers or other information to document State of arrival, a total of 6,086, were dropped from the analysis. Secondary migration is defined as a change of residence across a State line at any time between initial arrival in the U.S. and the reporting date. With regard to any given State, out-migrants are persons initially placed there who were living elsewhere on the reporting date, and in-migrants are persons living there on the reporting date who were initially placed elsewhere.

b/ Not participating in the refugee program.

c/ Reporting base included refugees receiving social services without cash or medical assistance.

TABLE 11

Receipt of Cash Assistance by Refugee Nationality: June 30, 1986

State	Country of Nationality											
	Cambodia	Laos	Vietnam	USSR	Poland	Other East Europe	Cuba	Afghanistan	Iraq	Ethiopia	Other	Total
Alabama	53	21	180	0	0	1	0	0	0	1	0	256
Arizona	22	9	181	2	2	16	0	8	0	67	36	343
Arkansas	0	31	19	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	3	53
California	10,651	7,694	27,244	201	287	1,535	32	1,623	272	475	3,627	53,641
Colorado	134	60	418	1	7	0	0	89	0	7	39	755
Connecticut	257	29	129	4	6	52	0	9	0	1	6	493
Delaware	0	0	8	0	0	0	0	2	1	0	0	11
District of Columbia	0	0	13	0	0	1	0	0	0	14	11	39
Florida a/	0	0	854	0	0	0	738	0	0	0	78	1,670
Georgia	344	58	170	0	0	0	0	21	0	21	18	632
Hawaii	26	112	276	0	0	1	0	0	0	0	10	425
Idaho	41	34	42	0	18	30	0	0	0	0	0	165
Illinois	1,145	265	817	33	165	290	14	81	101	103	100	3,114
Indiana b/	79	23	109	0	5	7	0	2	0	4	3	232
Iowa	119	136	231	0	2	9	0	0	0	0	1	498
Kansas	299	177	727	0	1	0	0	0	0	0	0	1,204
Kentucky	129	25	222	0	0	3	0	11	0	0	1	391
Louisiana	32	17	351	0	0	0	0	0	0	1	7	408
Maine	221	12	16	0	12	0	0	20	0	0	12	293
Maryland	339	48	328	4	6	9	0	48	62	46	17	907
Massachusetts	3,824	197	1,719	51	0	105	1	24	0	40	194	6,155
Michigan	44	166	313	8	174	151	14	13	161	31	5	1,080
Minnesota	1,383	1,077	679	1	16	43	0	25	0	72	54	3,350
Mississippi	0	0	122	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	122
Missouri	126	26	121	2	7	24	0	5	0	40	25	376
Montana	0	19	15	0	0	3	0	0	0	2	0	39
Nebraska	17	28	43	0	1	4	0	15	0	0	2	110
Nevada	5	6	78	0	2	13	0	17	0	13	0	134
New Hampshire	31	1	2	0	0	2	0	0	0	0	0	36
New Jersey	57	19	525	4	49	22	14	107	1	15	24	837
New Mexico	24	4	69	0	0	0	0	4	0	0	0	101
New York b/	1,659	195	1,461	184	187	293	89	532	14	159	131	4,904
North Carolina	56	22	56	0	7	0	0	14	0	0	0	155
North Dakota	38	0	11	0	4	21	0	0	0	4	5	83
Ohio	759	130	271	4	17	68	0	6	0	81	209	1,545
Oklahoma	50	34	147	0	0	2	0	0	0	0	15	248
Oregon	218	370	628	10	17	81	0	24	0	30	33	1,411

State	Cambodia	Laos	Vietnam	USSR	Poland	Other East Europe	Cuba	Afghanistan	Iraq	Ethiopia	Other	Total
...nsylvania	1,012	59	554	7	17	18	1	33	0	38	711	2,450
...de Island	667	115	43	0	5	7	0	0	0	0	3	840
...th Carolina	17	5	15	0	0	0	0	2	0	0	0	39
...th Dakota	9	0	5	0	12	2	0	0	0	7	2	37
...nessee	159	65	127	0	2	0	0	18	5	2	17	395
...as a/	0	0	2,181	0	16	15	4	37	2	46	116	2,417
...h	372	9	83	3	4	24	0	1	0	0	11	507
...mont	28	0	4	0	0	13	0	0	0	0	6	51
...rginia	287	46	824	0	6	33	0	378	6	66	0	1,646
...shington	2,750	669	1,747	3	121	193	0	78	84	154	28	5,827
...st Virginia	0	4	3	0	0	2	0	0	0	0	0	9
...sconsin	142	1,018	77	0	0	0	0	3	0	0	100	1,340
...oming	0	13	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	13
...am	0	0	19	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	19
TOTAL	27,625	13,048	44,277	522	1,175	3,093	907	3,250	709	1,540	5,660	101,806
...ercent	27.1%	12.8%	43.5%	0.5%	1.2%	3.0%	0.9%	3.2%	0.7%	1.5%	5.6%	100.0%

a/ State reported Southeast Asians as one category; ORR recorded them as Vietnamese.

b/ Partially estimated.

TABLE 12

States with Largest School Enrollments of Refugee Children: May 1986 a/

State	Refugee Children	Percent
California	24,273	29.5%
Florida	7,487	9.1
Massachusetts	4,895	5.9
Texas	4,642	5.6
Illinois	3,430	4.2
New York	3,178	3.9
Washington	3,033	3.7
Virginia	2,903	3.5
Pennsylvania	2,199	2.7
Ohio	2,104	2.6
Rhode Island	2,004	2.4
Minnesota	1,885	2.3
All Others	20,323	24.6
TOTAL	82,356	100.0%

	Refugee Children	Percent
By Levels		
Elementary	39,432	47.9%
Secondary	42,924	52.1%
By Groups		
Southeast Asian children	60,324	73.2%
All other Children	22,032	26.8%

a/ Elementary school children are counted if they have been in the U.S. for less than two years; secondary school children if they have been in the U.S. for less than three years.

Source: State reports to the U.S. Department of Education.

TABLE 13

Placement and Status of Southeast Asian Unaccompanied Minor Refugees by State and Sponsoring Agency: a/ September 1986 b/

State	Total Placed				Remaining in Program				Left Program	
	USCC	LIRS	Other	Total	USCC	LIRS	Other	Total	Reunited	Emancipated or Independent Living or Other
Alabama	21	0	0	21	19	0	0	19	0	2
Arizona	79	0	0	79	77	0	0	77	0	2
California	0	0	775	775	0	0	424	424	139	212
Colorado	42	46	4	92	2	1	1	4	27	61
Connecticut	1	28	0	29	1	27	0	28	1	0
District of Columbia	80	60	0	140	15	35	0	50	22	68
Florida	0	0	70 c/	70	0	0	20	20	13 c/	37 c/
Georgia	0	0	4	4	0	0	4	4	0	0
Guam	0	0	1	1	0	0	1	1	0	0
Hawaii	0	0	30	30	0	0	1	1	7	22
Illinois	535	24	93	652	190	24	89	303	119	230
Indiana	0	0	8	8	0	0	5	5	0	3
Iowa	128	355	14	497	58	120	4	182	28	286+ 1 died
Kansas	12	57	0	69	3	25	0	28	10	31
Louisiana	72	0	0	72	16	0	0	16	18	38
Maine	0	0	14	14	0	0	14	14	0	0
Maryland	0	0	26	26	0	0	18	18	0	8
Massachusetts	29	114	0	143	23	84	0	107	3	32+1 died
Michigan	55	123	112	290	26	67	60	153	25	112
Minnesota	152	551	29	732	66	235	20	321	79	332
Mississippi	87	0	0	87	52	0	0	52	10	24+1 suicide
Missouri	11	0	1	12	7	0	1	8	1	3
Montana	0	55	0	55	0	14	0	14	8	33
New Hampshire	0	77	0	77	0	34	0	34	2	41
New Jersey	165	53	0	218	114	29	0	143	5	70
New Mexico	0	0	1	1	0	0	0	0	0	1
New York	1,167	356	0	1,523	668	212	4	884	162	477
North Carolina	2	55	0	57	0	38	0	38	5	14
North Dakota	0	49	0	49	0	34	0	34	2	13
Ohio	5	49	4	58	2	38	1	41	5	12
Oklahoma	0	0	1	1	0	0	1	1	0	0
Oregon	258	195	21	474	51	67	10	128	98	248
Pennsylvania	19	308	4	331	5	150	0	155	62	114
Rhode Island	19	0	0	19	6	0	0	6	0	13
South Carolina	0	0	32	32	0	0	16	16	6	10
Texas	17	0	0	17	17	0	0	17	0	0
Utah	112	0	0	112	57	0	0	57	10	45
Vermont	37	0	0	37	20	0	0	20	2	15
Virginia	268	0	0	268	182	0	0	182	26	60
Washington State	255	138	0	393	126	62	0	188	62	143
Wisconsin	0	0	72	72	0	0	19	19	7	46
TOTAL	3,628	2,693	1,316	7,637	1,803	1,296	713	3,812	964	2,861

a/ USCC = United States Catholic Conference.
LIRS = Lutheran Immigration and Refugee Service.

b/ All data based on State reports received by ORR as of September 1986.

c/ Includes entrant minors.

APPENDIX B

FEDERAL AGENCY REPORTS

OFFICE OF THE UNITED STATES COORDINATOR FOR REFUGEE AFFAIRS

The Office of the U.S. Coordinator for Refugee Affairs was established by Presidential directive in February of 1979 and has its statutory basis in title III of the Refugee Act of 1980. The Coordinator is appointed by the President and confirmed by the Senate.

The Office was created out of the need to coordinate both the foreign and domestic policy implications of refugee relief and resettlement. The Ambassador-at-Large/U.S. Coordinator for Refugee Affairs is responsible to the President for the development of overall refugee policy.

Specifically, the Coordinator is charged with:

(1) Development of overall United States refugee admission and resettlement policy;

(2) Coordination of all United States domestic and international refugee admission and resettlement programs;

(3) Design of an overall budget strategy;

(4) Presentation to the Congress of the Administration's overall refugee policy and the relationship of individual agency refugee budgets to that overall policy;

(5) Advising the President, Secretary of State, Attorney General, and Secretary of Health and Human Services on the relationship of overall United States refugee policy to the admission of refugees to the United States;

(6) Under the direction of the Secretary of State, representation and negotiation on behalf of the United States with foreign governments and international organizations; and

(7) Development of effective liaison between the Federal Government and voluntary organizations, governors, and mayors, and others involved in refugee relief and resettlement work.

BUREAU FOR REFUGEE PROGRAMS

Department of State

General

The Bureau for Refugee Programs is charged with both support for refugee relief efforts abroad and the admission and initial resettlement of refugees in the United States. It is U.S. policy to contribute our fair share to international relief programs for refugees in countries of first asylum and to encourage refugees, where possible, to return to their homelands once the situation which caused them to flee improves. When safe voluntary repatriation cannot take place, the U.S. promotes the resettlement of refugees in the country of first asylum or elsewhere in the region. The United States accepts for admission certain refugees of special concern who suffer persecution at the hands of tyrannical governments and for whom the aforementioned alternatives do not exist; this has generally been the case in Southeast Asia during the last ten years.

In recent years, the Bureau has increasingly focused on assistance to refugees abroad as admissions have decreased. Total admissions to the U.S. in fiscal year 1986 were 62,440; approximately 45,000 of these refugees came from Southeast Asia.

During fiscal year 1986, refugee problems remained acute and widespread; millions of persons continued to live in uncertain and often precarious circumstances. Adding to the critical situation were thousands of new refugees who fled homelands besieged by civil strife, foreign intervention, and social and political persecution, seeking refuge across international borders.

U.S. Program Worldwide

In fiscal year 1986, the United States again provided the largest share of financial support for the Office of the United Nations High Commissioner for Refugees (approximately 30 percent of its budget -- or $93 million), as well as for other international relief organizations such as the International Committee of the Red Cross (over $3.4 million) and the United Nations Relief and Works Agency in the Near East ($67 million). The United States played a major role in the international effort to provide emergency assistance to refugees and others suffering from the effects of drought and civil conflict in Africa. Of the $324.3 million obligated by the Bureau for Refugee Programs in fiscal year 1986, approximately $204.4 million went to refugee assistance and relief activities.

Approximately $105 million was spent for activities relating to the admission of refugees to the United States. Included in this sum are the costs of refugee processing and documentation (including agreements with the Joint Voluntary Agency Representatives in Southeast Asia, Pakistan, and Sudan, and individual voluntary agencies in Europe), overseas English language and cultural orientation training, transportation arranged through the Intergovernmental Committee for Migration, and the reception and placement grants to U.S. voluntary agencies for support of initial resettlement activities. Of the total fiscal year 1986 admissions program budget, approximately $82 million covered the costs for Southeast Asian refugee admissions, while $23 million funded the admission of refugees from the Soviet Union, Eastern Europe, Africa, the Near East, South Asia, and Latin America.

REFUGEE ARRIVALS IN THE UNITED STATES
FY 1986

Department of State
Bureau for Refugee Programs

Report Date : October 29, 1986

A R E A	OCT	NOV	DEC	JAN	FEB	MAR	APR	MAY	JUN	JUL	AUG	SEP	TOTAL	CEILINGS
AFRICA	35	97	41	14	32	95	131	69	49	121	237	394	1,315*	3,000
EAST ASIA:														
1. 1st Asylum	3,378	2,418	3,177	3,480	1,722	3,563	3,308	2,362	2,962	3,098	2,299	5,187	36,954	37,000
2. O.D.P	841	747	685	665	520	778	734	983	557	690	688	612	8,500	8,500
EASTERN EUROPE AND SOVIET UNION	377	593	890	658	904	1,107	727	632	1,109	606	619	1,278	9,500	9,500
LATIN AMERICA AND CARIBBEAN	1	16	1	0	3	0	0	0	29	0	1	122	173+	3,000
NEAR EAST AND SOUTH ASIA	227	741	517	556	651	667	472	457	573	522	316	299	5,998**	6,000
TOTAL	4,859	4,612	5,311	5,373	3,832	6,210	5,372	4,503	5,279	5,037	4,160	7,892	62,440	67,000

19072

* AFRICA

	SEP	YEAR TO DATE
Processed in Europe:		
Ethiopians	38	399
Others	0	4
Processed in Africa:		
Angolans	0	3
Basotho	0	0
Botswana	0	2
Ethiopians	341	869
Malawians	0	4
Mozambicans	1	1
Namibians	1	5
South Africans	1	12
Ugandans	12	12
Zaireans	0	4
Zimbabwians	0	0
	394	1,315

** NEAR EAST & SOUTH ASIA

	SEP	YEAR TO DATE
Processed in Europe:		
Afghans	9	207
Iranians	123	2,846
Iraqis	23	306
Lebanese	0	3
Syrians	0	5
Processed in Africa:		
Afghans	0	0
Iranians	0	5
Iraqis	0	1
Processed in South Asia:		
Afghans	102	2,328
Iranians	42	297
T O T A L :	299	5,998

\+ LATIN AMERICA & CARIBBEAN:

	SEP	YEAR TO DATE
Processed in Europe:		
Cubans	1	52
Processed in Latin America:		
Cubans	121	121
Salvadorians	0	0
T O T A L :	122	173

++ EAST ASIA :

	SEP	YEAR TO DATE
1st ASYLUM :	5,187	36,954
O.D.P. :	612	8,500
T O T A L :	5,799	45,454

DETAILED REPORT OF
REFUGEE ARRIVALS IN THE UNITED STATES
FROM THE SOVIET UNION AND EASTERN EUROPE
FY 1986

Report Date : October 29, 1986

AREA	OCT	NOV	DEC	JAN	FEB	MARCH	APRIL	MAY	JUNE	JULY	AUG	SEPT	TOTAL	CEILINGS
SOVIET UNION TCP	23	25	20	13	4	3	11	1	5	8	32	47	192	-
SOVIET UNION NON-TCP	41	50	42	91	86	71	31	44	30	47	26	36	595	-
SUB TOTAL SOVIET UNION	64	75	62	104	90	74	42	45	35	55	58	83	787	-
ROMANIAN TCP	12	10	89	39	24	50	79	62	38	23	40	96	562	-
ROMANIAN NON-TCP	30	91	116	131	151	200	140	117	176	133	133	393	1,811	-
POLES	197	225	343	186	411	434	274	216	444	274	239	492	3,735	-
OTHER EAST EUR.	74	192	280	198	228	349	192	192	416	121	149	214	2,605*	-
SUB TOTAL EASTERN EUROPE	313	518	828	554	814	1,033	685	587	1,074	551	561	1,195	8,713	-
T O T A L	377	593	890	658	904	1,107	727	632	1,109	606	619	1,278	9,500	9,500

19072

		SEP	YEAR TO DATE
(*)	Albanians	23	84
	Bulgarians	24	173
	Czechs	92	1,589
	Hungarians	75	754
	Yugoslavs	0	4
	E. Germans	0	1
	TOTAL :	214	2,605

S U M M A R Y

REFUGEE ARRIVALS IN THE UNITED STATES

Report Date : October 29, 1986

A R E A	FY-75	FY-76	FY-77	FY-78	FY-79	FY-80	FY-81	FY-82	FY-83	FY-84	FY-85	FY-86	TOTAL	R E M A R K S
AFRICA	-	-	-	-	-	955	2,119	3,326	2,648	2,747	1,953	1,315	15,063	
ASIA	135,000	15,000	7,000	20,574	76,521	163,799	131,139	73,522	39,408	51,960	49,970	45,454	809,347	
EASTERN EUROPE	1,947	1,756	1,755	2,245	3,393	5,025	6,704	10,780	12,083	10,285	9,350	8,713	74,036	
SOVIET UNION	6,211	7,450	8,191	10,688	24,449	28,444	13,444	2,756	1,409	715	640	787	105,184	
LATIN AMERICA	3,000	3,000	3,000	3,000	7,000	6,662	2,017	602	668	160	138	173	29,420	
NEAR EAST	-	-	-	-	-	2,231	3,829	6,369	5,465	5,246	5,994	5,998	35,132	
TOTAL	146,158	27,206	19,946	36,507	111,363	207,116	159,252	97,355	61,681	71,113	68,045	62,440	1,068,182	

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 authorizes waivers of grounds of excludability that pertain to refugees. Additionally, INS approves affidavits of relationship filed on behalf of aliens abroad seeking admission to the United States as refugees. INS inspects and admits persons arriving in refugee status at United States ports-of-entry and approves 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 United Nations High Commissioner for Refugees, Intergovernmental Committee for Migration, United States governmental agencies, foreign governments, and all voluntary agencies with offices or representation abroad.

In fiscal year 1986, immigration officers assigned to INS overseas offices conducted over 65,142 refugee determination interviews, and approved for admission 52,081 persons of 31 different nationalities. The overall approval rate for the United States refugee program applicants was 84 percent.

To enhance the processing of refugees, INS decided to open an office in New Delhi, India, to process refugees in India and Pakistan. This office will be operational in fiscal year 1987. INS is also expanding circuit rider visits in Africa and is reviewing additional nationalities which may be processed in Central and South America.

Final revisions to the 1983 INS Worldwide Guidelines for Overseas Processing were made, and will be released to the overseas offices.

Planning work was completed on several projects to standardize refugee processing procedures, data collection, and data sharing.

A new Form I-730 was adopted for use in filing for Visa 92/93 cases (spouse or child of asylee/refugee). The form clearly states which factors may create ineligibility for benefits, and clarifies the procedure for filing. INS also implemented a series of training programs for both voluntary agencies and mutual assistance associations to acquaint them with immigration processing and the eligibility criteria.

During fiscal year 1986, INS continued liaison with other governmental and private agencies involved in the United States refugee program, and implemented programs to provide substantive information to INS domestic and overseas offices on the refugee program and conditions in refugee-generating countries.

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 1986-1987, $15.9 million was made available to States to provide educational services to refugee children. These funds served 82,356 refugee children nationwide.

TRANSITION PROGRAM FOR REFUGEE CHILDREN

School Year 1986-1987

State	Refugee Children	Amount of Award
Alabama	328	$ 51,880
Alaska		Not Eligible
Arizona	552	113,480
Arkansas	204	34,620
California	24,273	4,517,720
Colorado	545	105,250
Connecticut	851	157,600
Delaware	120	21,560
District of Columbia	118	28,150
Florida	7,487	1,551,170
Georgia	956	174,600
Hawaii	114	25,770
Idaho	347	69,450
Illinois	3,430	669,310
Indiana	248	50,010
Iowa	913	158,760
Kansas	1,619	322,810
Kentucky	352	94,770
Louisiana	1,464	261,680
Maine	364	71,740
Maryland	643	122,320
Massachusetts	4,895	986,400
Michigan	1,203	230,490
Minnesota	1,885	353,220
Mississippi	555	94,990
Missouri	722	141,370
Montana	54	12,150
Nebraska	199	38,600
Nevada	211	42,490
New Hampshire	172	29,130
New Jersey	1,724	340,450
New Mexico		Did not apply
New York	3,178	627,130
North Carolina	763	154,330
North Dakota	294	62,580
Ohio	2,104	428,970
Oklahoma	907	147,680
Oregon	788	148,150
Pennsylvania	2,199	421,720
Rhode Island	2,004	402,740
South Carolina	203	44,500
South Dakota	101	17,360

State	Refugee Children	Amount of Award
Tennessee	929	185,120
Texas	4,642	883,260
Utah	773	129,420
Vermont	64	12,180
Virginia	2,903	555,090
Washington	3,033	624,490
West Virginia		Did not apply
Wisconsin	923	160,700
Wyoming		Did not apply
TOTAL	82,356	$15,882,360

Transition Program for Refugee Children
FY 1986

	Indochinese Children	Other Refugee Children	Total
Elementary	27,985	11,447	39,432
Secondary	32,339	10,585	42,924
	60,324	22,032	82,356

U.S. PUBLIC HEALTH SERVICE

Department of Health and Human Services

The United States 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 of the health screening of U.S.-bound refugees in Southeast Asia and in Europe, the inspection of these refugees at U.S. ports-of-entry, the notification of the appropriate State and local health departments of those new arrivals requiring followup care, and the 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 and processing centers overseas.

ORH, in conjunction with the United Nations High Commission on Refugees and the Government of the Philippines, conducted an extensive tripartite assessment of refugee health services at the Philippine Refugee Processing Center.

ORH obtained funding again from ORR for an expanded hepatitis B screening and immunization program in the U.S. and for the continuation of surveillance on Sudden Unexplained Death Syndrome.

The PHS agencies with refugee activities in FY 1986 continued to be the Centers for Disease Control; the Health Resources and Services Administration; and the Alcohol, Drug Abuse, and Mental Health Administration. Their activities are discussed below.

CENTERS FOR DISEASE CONTROL

During FY 1986, 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 continued working in Frankfurt, West Germany, to perform similar duties related to refugees coming to the United States from Europe, Africa, the Near East, and South Asia.

CDC and the American Consulate General, Frankfurt, sponsored a three-day conference in Bad Nauheim, West Germany, on the medical processing of refugees in FY 1986. The purpose of the meeting was to discuss the operational and technical aspects of medical examination and documentation procedures and to review differences in the medical processing of immigrants and refugees. Participants included physicians, Immigration and Naturalization Service officers, and Department of State consular officials.

During FY 1986, CDC quarantine officers at major U.S. ports-of-entry inspected all of the arriving refugees (approximately 45,000 from Southeast Asia and 17,000 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. Mini-computers and printers at U.S. ports-of-entry were used to compile refugee health data and to print more than 2,000 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 tne appropriate local health departments by telephone within 24 hours of the refugees' arrival in the United States.

A computerized disease surveillance database of demographic and arrival data on refugees was continued in FY 1986. In addition to documentation of excludable conditions, data collected include the number of Indochinese refugees who (a) completed tuberculosis chemotherapy before departure for the United States, (b) received tuberculin skin tests and were started on preventive therapy, (c) were screened for hepatitis B surface antigenicity, (d) received hepatitis B vaccine, and (e) were placed on prophylaxis for Hansen's disease.

The CDC database on refugee arrivals was also used by ORR as the primary source of arrival and destination statistics. CDC has computerized the demographic, medical screening, and immunization records of about 770,000 Southeast Asian refugees who have entered this country since 1975. Demographic and medical screening results also have been computerized for non-Indochinese refugees, with records on about 72,000 of these refugees now in the CDC database.

CDC continued to review the medical screening examinations provided in Vietnam to refugees bound for the United States under the Orderly Departure Program. Refugees arriving in Bangkok under this program were given a new medical examination by the Intergovernmental Committee for Migration (ICM) within 24 hours after arrival. This rescreening program insured that current medical information was available before those refugees proceeded either to a refugee processing center or directly to the United States.

In FY 1986, a short-course chemotherapy (SCC) regimen for tuberculosis was continued in Southeast Asia for U.S.-bound Indochinese refugees. During the first nine months of FY 1986, 488 Indochinese refugees completed SCC before arrival, which resulted in less than 0.25 percent of Indochinese arriving with active tuberculosis and continued the large reduction from previous years. In addition, 747 close family contacts to cases of active disease were started on isoniazid preventive therapy during the first nine months of FY 1986. These measures have greatly reduced the workload of local health departments in the United States in providing tuberculosis treatment and followup services to Indochinese refugees.

The overseas hepatitis B surface antigen screening (HBsAG) program for pregnant females and unaccompanied minors also continued in Southeast Asia. During the first nine months of the fiscal year, 2,151 persons were tested, with almost 15 percent identified as positive. CDC continued to notify State and local health departments and refugee sponsors of those refugees with positive tests.

Newborns of carrier refugees continued to be given hepatitis B vaccine as recommended by the Immunization Practices Advisory Committee (ACIP) in mid-1985. During the first three quarters of FY 1986, 162 newborns and children were started on the series of three injections of hepatitis B vaccine.

Laboratory testing of sera for HBsAG continued in laboratories in Southeast Asia. Previously, sera were sent to CDC in Atlanta for testing which resulted in 29 percent of those tested in Southeast Asia departing before test results were made known. Currently, only nine percent depart before results are available and CDC public health advisors in Bangkok directly notify health departments, refugees, and sponsors as soon as results are returned from the laboratory. Consultants from the Hepatitis Branch, Center for Infectious Diseases, CDC, monitored laboratory performance by performing comparison testing of specimens in Atlanta and by making site visits to the facilities 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 HBsAG carriers. During FY 1986, the hepatitis B screening and vaccination program for pregnant refugee women, their newborns, and susceptible household contacts was continued with $596,000 available for award to State and local health departments. In cooperation with the Georgia Refugee Health

Program, Department of Human Resources, CDC printed and distributed to all State and local refugee health assessment project areas a notebook on Hepatitis B: Information for Southeast Asian Refugees. This notebook contained cassette recordings in four Indochinese languages (and English) which were used in conjunction with slides so that, in clinic waiting rooms and other settings, audio/visual information could be provided to refugees and others about hepatitis B.

CDC also continued surveillance on Sudden Unexplained Death Syndrome (SUDS) among Indochinese refugees in the United States. During FY 1986, ORR again provided $86,000 to CDC for this surveillance program. Since SUDS was first recognized as a phenomenon among Indochinese refugees, 109 confirmed cases have been reported. Because the number reported during FY 1986 was considerably lower than the projected 50-100 cases, CDC is undertaking vigorous quality assurance activities to determine if the decline in incidence was actual or if cases were occurring that had not been reported.

Domestic Health Assessments

Health assessment services again were provided to newly arrived refugees in FY 1986. 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 refugees with such problems for appropriate diagnosis and treatment. During FY 1986, continued emphasis was given to identifying refugees eligible for preventive treatment for tuberculous infection.

In FY 1986, grants were awarded to 40 States, the District of Columbia; the City of Philadelphia; Maricopa County, Arizona; Missoula County, Montana; the Barren River (Kentucky) District Health Department; and the New York City Department of Health. The 10 States which did not participate in FY 1986 were Alaska, Arizona, Arkansas, 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 69.6 percent of all arriving refugees in FY 1986, received 64.8 percent of the $5,489,000 in grant funds awarded. Four CDC public health advisors continued assignments in Texas (1), California (2), and New York City (1) to assist in tuberculosis preventive therapy activities.

In FY 1986, CDC personnel made 52 site visits to project areas for technical assistance, consultation, and program support discussions and also attended numerous local workshops, discussion sessions, and meetings.

Approximately 72 percent of grantees voluntarily shared usable data that were helpful in assessing the status of the health assessment program. An estimated 81 percent of all arriving refugees in these reporting areas received health assessments. Of the refugees who arrived in specific parts of States in which grant funds permit the development of a coordinated program, approximately 97 percent of the refugees were contacted and 82 percent of them received health assessments. Among those refugees who received health assessments, approximately 73 percent had one or more medical or dental health conditions identified that required treatment and/or referral for specialized diagnosis and care. Limited data and site review observations indicated that nearly 100 percent of refugee children seen received required immunizations against the vaccine-preventable childhood diseases.

Among those States receiving special hepatitis B screening and vaccination funds, systems were being developed to monitor and track the number of pregnant women screened, the number who were HBsAG positive, and the number of newborns and susceptible household contacts who started and completed vaccination. Hepatitis B demonstration projects in California identified 919 pregnant refugee women and screened 863 (93.9 percent) for hepatitis B carrier status between July 1, 1985, and June 30, 1986. Of those screened, 240 (27.8 percent) had a positive HBsAG positive result. Of the 126 newborns from this group, 125 (99.2 percent) received hepatitis B immune globulin (HBIG) and the first hepatitis B vaccination. There were 891 identified household contacts to HBsAG positive women. Of these, 595 (66.8 percent) were screened and 230

(38.7 percent) were determined to be susceptible to hepatitis B. Of the 225 susceptible contacts medically recommended to receive hepatitis B vaccine, 177 (78.7 percent) received the first dose. Other States, such as Georgia, Ohio, Texas, and Utah, were reporting success in administering hepatitis B vaccine to susceptibles.

The identification of secondary migrants continued to be a major problem. Grantee data showed that approximately 30 percent of all health assessments performed are for secondary migrants.

CDC continued to encourage project areas to develop systems to permit effective tracking and reporting on the health assessments of all new refugee arrivals. Significant progress has been made in achieving routine notification by States of out-migrating refugees.

HEALTH RESOURCES AND SERVICES ADMINISTRATION

Refugees diagnosed in Southeast Asia as having Hansen's disease were referred to the Regional Hansens'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 to the physicians who provide case management on a continual 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. The 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 1986, 18 new refugees were admitted to the Gillis W. Long Hansen's Disease Center in Carville, Louisiana, because of complications in their treatment. In addition, eight refugees were readmitted for care; there are currently 27 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 (CHC) and Migrant Health Center Programs (MHCP) in the Bureau of Health Care Delivery and Assistance (BHCDA) do not collect or maintain specific data on health services provided to refugees. Refugees are provided services at any CHC; there is refugee activity in all regions. Those regions serving geographic areas with the highest concentrations of refugees employ translators and use bilingual signs and notices to assist in health care delivery.

Regions III, V, IX, and X reported the greatest activity.

Region III - Large populations of Vietnamese and Cambodian refugees are served in the Philadelphia area. CHCs provide medical screening and primary care.

Region V - Two cities, Minneapolis and St. Paul, Minnesota, have a large population of Southeast Asian refugees. As the population has peaked, the demand for services has stabilized. The demand for services for Hmong has also stabilized in Milwaukee.

Region IX - There are 11 centers providing primary care to Southeast Asian refugees in Region IX. The regional office staff stated that over the past year 10,000 refugees had been seen in clinics under their program jurisdiction.

Region X - The highest concentrations of refugees are in Seattle, Salem, and Portland. The International Community Clinic in Seattle and La Clinica Migrant Health Center in Pasco, Washington, provide care to a large number of refugees. The Portland Clinic has a language support program as part of its clinic operations.

Maternal and Child Health Activities

The Division of Maternal and Child Health (DMCH) in HRSA initiated several activities to address the special health care needs of Southeast Asian refugees. Through the SPRANS (Special Projects of Regional and National Significance) grant mechanism, the DMCH supported several genetic and other programs that provided services to the Southeast Asian refugees. The Southeast Asian Genetics Program at the University of California, Irvine, was initiated to identify the special needs and concerns of the Southeast Asian communities regarding genetic disorders common to that population; determine the prevalence of such disorders; provide screening, diagnosis, followup, and counseling services to affected and at-risk families; increase the use of community resources by the refugee population; and educate health care providers on the need for culturally sensitive services. The Southeast Asian Developmental Disabilities Program administered by the San Diego-Imperial County Developmental Services, Inc., provided outreach, identification, intervention, and education services to the Southeast Asian communities with infants at risk for developmental disabilities. It also developed printed health educational materials in Asian languages. A related project in the same area targeted the Southeast Asian population for outreach genetic services. It would also attempt to demonstrate the use of innovative mechanisms in increasing access to and utilization of genetic services by that underserved minority and in increasing the knowledge of genetic disorders and resources among health professionals serving the population.

The New York Cooley's Anemia Program provided prenatal thalassemia screening and counseling to Southeast Asian refugees and other at-risk Asian Americans in New York City. The New England Thalassemia Project held a conference on "Thalassemia in Southeast Asian Refugees" in Boston to stimulate interest and promote exchange of information among health workers serving those refugees. The Comprehensive Hereditary Anemia Program in Hawaii provided a comprehensive program of identification, education, counseling, and support services designed specifically to address the high prevalence of alpha and beta thalassemia, hemoglobin E, and glucose-6-phosphate dehydrogenase deficiency in Southeast Asian refugees and other Asian Pacific Americans in Hawaii. The program developed educational materials in Asian languages and trained Southeast Asian paraprofessionals in its effort to overcome the ethnocultural barriers to health care and meet the refugees' special needs.

The National Center for Education in Maternal and Child Health provided a subcontract to the Association of Asian-Pacific Community Health Organizations (AAPCHO) to develop an inventory of MCH related health educational materials in various Asian languages.

ALCOHOL, DRUG ABUSE, AND MENTAL HEALTH ADMINISTRATION

NATIONAL INSTITUTE OF MENTAL HEALTH

During fiscal year 1986, the National Institute of Mental Health (NIMH) in the Alcohol, Drug Abuse, and Mental Health Administration participated in an increased number of refugee mental health activities.

NIMH continued to administer the Refugee Assistance Program-Mental Health (RAP-MH), which is funded by ORR. The objectives of the program are: (1) to ensure a system of mental health services for refugees, (2) to promote mental health and support linkages with appropriate services, and (3) to incorporate refugee mental health services within the State system of care and promote refugee self-sufficiency.

Awards were made to 12 States (California, Colorado, Hawaii, Illinois, Massachusetts, Minnesota, New York, Rhode Island, Texas, Virginia, Washington, and Wisconsin) containing nearly three-quarters of the refugees who have entered the United States since 1975. Fiscal year 1986 represented the first year of a 3-year project, with ORR providing $1.7 million through an interagency agreement to fund the projects. The first year got under way slowly, primarily because States experienced difficulty in recruiting staff. With few exceptions, however, all States made significant progress in initiating formal assessment of refugee mental health needs, in establishing liaison with a variety of institutions of higher learning for the purpose of encouraging culturally relevant training programs in the mental health disciplines, and in involving a wide variety of provider organizations and mutual assistance associations. The second and third years of RAP-MH funding should lead to the design and implementation of culturally sensitive mental health programs of prevention, diagnosis, and treatment.

In addition to the RAP-MH projects, a Technical Assistance Center (TAC) was funded through a contract with the University of Minnesota. Among the accomplishments achieved during the first year was the development of an annotated bibliography containing over 650 references on refugee mental health issues. In addition, NIMH has agreed to publish and distribute 5,000 copies of the bibliography nationwide, an action beyond that specified in the interagency agreement. An initiative was also under way that would assist State mental health professionals and paraprofessionals who were available for consultation and employment. A last accomplishment during the first year of operations was the identification of successful and culturally sensitive mental health models of prevention, diagnosis, and treatment of refugee populations. This task also included identifying culturally sensitive instruments for psychological and neurological assessment of refugee populations.

In addition to the RAP-MH and TAC activities, NIMH implemented a number of activities in the refugee mental health area. The Extramural Research Support Programs Announcement, published in July 1986 and distributed nationwide, describes the research priorities and programs of NIMH. Many of the research program descriptions specifically identify refugees as an appropriate target population for study. This is a result of the Refugee Mental Health Program's (RMHP) request that refugees be identified as target populations. Other programs identify minorities and victims of assault and rape as appropriate topics of study. Contact made with the Director in the NIMH Division of Extramural Activities resulted in six additional extramural research programs identified as appropriate sources of funding for research on refugee affairs.

During fiscal year 1986, NIMH also funded a research project to investigate the health utilization behavior of Cubans and Haitians who have mental health problems.

In February a new NIMH announcement entitled Research and Development (R&D) Grants for the Improvement of Mental Health Services Training was distributed throughout the country. The improvement of mental health services for refugees was identified as a priority concern. NIMH has had a longstanding concern with professional educational and training issues as they relate to prevention of mental illness and to the mental health needs of the chronically mentally ill, children and youth, and more recently, of refugee populations. This announcement offered opportunities for educational and training institutions to seek grant support for R&D activities designed to lead to improved preventive interventions, and for service to these populations. At the request of RMHP, refugees were included as having priority. Projects were to address the following priorities: (1) preventive intervention with high-risk populations; and (2) improving services to the chronically mentally ill, including those who are homeless; children and youth, with major emphasis on those who are at risk for serious mental or emotional disability; and refugee populations. Within these priority areas, emphasis was placed on training for service in underserved geographic areas and to underserved populations -- e.g., rural and inner city populations, ethnic minorities, and women -- and training for effective community-based services, including psychosocial rehabilitation.

The State Planning and Human Resource Development Branch, NIMH, encouraged the 37 State awardees, recipients of Human Resource Development (HRD) grants, to explore the feasibility of using HRD grant funds to meet the education and training needs of State personnel to work with refugee populations.

AMERICAN COUNCIL FOR NATIONALITIES SERVICE

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 descendants for sixty years. The United States Committee for Refugees (USCR) is the public education and information program of ACNS. In addition, ACNS administers the American Branch of International Social Services (ISS), which provides intercountry casework for families and children. ACNS is dedicated to assisting immigrants and refugees in their adjustment to a productive life in the United States; to developing mutual understanding between the foreign born and the general population; and to promoting the humane and fair treatment of refugees through its educational and informational programs.

ACNS is the national office for a network of 31 member agencies and affiliates across the country. All member agencies and affiliates of the ACNS network provide services to refugees in their local communities. Twenty-seven are active in direct resettlement of refugees from overseas. These agencies and affiliates provide refugees with reception and placement services. In addition to initial resettlement, many member agencies provide ongoing services including job placement, casework and counseling, assistance on immigration matters, educational services, and a range of community awareness activities.

Since 1975, the ACNS network has directly assisted over 76,500 refugees from Southeast Asia, Eastern Europe, the Near East, South Asia, Africa, and Latin America to become productive members of American society. In addition to serving refugees directly resettled by ACNS, many member agencies provide the services mentioned above to the general refugee population in their communities.

Resettlement Program

During fiscal year 1986 ACNS and its member agencies resettled the following numbers of refugees:

Afghan	213
African	134
European	111
Hmong	935
Khmer	1,125
Laotian	1,080
Latin American	0
Vietnamese	1,815
	5,413

The ACNS national office promotes the effective resettlement activities of the agencies by providing a variety of refugee-related services and resources to member agencies and affiliates. Program development initiatives, technical assistance, monitoring, centralized information systems, and allocations and processing of refugees are some examples of these.

ACNS member agencies serve as sponsors for all refugees they resettle. While, in many cases, relatives or interested groups assist in providing some resettlement services for new arrivals, member agencies are responsible for the delivery of all pre- and post-reception and placement services.

Utilizing a case management approach, agencies assign a case manager to each newly arrived refugee. The case manager works with the refugee on an ongoing basis to assess needs and to develop and implement a resettlement plan leading to self-sufficiency. If the case manager does not speak the refugee's language, interpreter services, either from agency staff or volunteers, are used. Although a combination of services such as English language training or counseling may be needed by the individual, the focus is on appropriate job placement 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. Job counselors discuss types of work available, job placement policies, the value of work over public assistance, job upgrading, and other matters, to encourage labor market participation. Refugees are helped to put together a realistic plan for employment, and to find and retain appropriate jobs. The staff plans individually with each employable new arrival and closely monitors progress toward achievement of mutually agreed-upon objectives directed toward early and lasting employment.

Related Activities

1. The United States Committee for Refugees (USCR) is the public information and education program of ACNS. USCR publishes the authoritative yearly summary of the global refugee situation, the World Refugee Survey; Refugee Reports, a bi-weekly publication; and timely "Issue Papers" on a variety of subjects by authorities in the refugee field. Reports and papers have addressed the problems of refugee groups such as Cambodians, Afghans, Tamils, and Vietnamese "boat people."

Recent site visits to areas such as Thailand, Hong Kong, Pakistan, Uganda, South Africa, and countries in Central America allow USCR to learn first-hand the condition of refugees. Published reports on the findings and other research are provided to governments and the public.

Increasingly looked to by the media and others as an authoritative source on refugee matters, USCR has been invited on numerous occasions to testify before congressional committees regarding solutions to refugee situations; and it encourages U.S. and international policymakers and the American public to participate actively in efforts to find humanitarian and lasting solutions to the problems of the world's refugees.

2. Volunteerism is an important aspect of the ACNS programs. Thousands of hours of service are provided each year to member agencies. 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.

3. In FY 1986 ACNS received a grant award from the Office of Refugee Resettlement to conduct the "Preventive Mental Health in the English as a Second Language Project." The purpose of this project was to improve the capacity of ESL teachers to utilize classroom strategies and curriculum that will help refugees cope with mental health stresses. Training of ESL teachers was conducted in 5 sites in ORR Region I. A Handbook for use with diverse ESL programs and refugee populations has been produced. This initiative has been well received by refugee service providers and resettlement staff.

4. Encouraging refugee employment is central to ACNS resettlement programs. In FY 1986 ACNS convened a national conference on employment for its member agencies, and redesigned its employment program and reporting requirements, as a part of its effort to promote early employment of refugees.

5. In August 1986, ACNS submitted a Fish/Wilson pre-application to ORR, the culmination of almost two years of planning. The proposed project seeks to demonstrate that an integrated approach to services to refugees, which is adaptable to a variety of local circumstances, will result in early employment and lower welfare utilization.

6. As community-based organizations, all member agencies involved in the refugee program are active in local and State refugee networks, often providing the leadership 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 improve coordination of services.

AMERICAN FUND FOR CZECHOSLOVAK REFUGEES, INC.

The American Fund for Czechoslovak Refugees, Inc., with headquarters at 1776 Broadway, Suite 2105, New York, N.Y. 10019, has European offices in Munich, W. Germany; Vienna, Austria; Paris, France; Rome, Italy; and a special cooperation organization in Oslo, Norway. The officers and staff of these branch offices register the refugees from Czechoslovakia, Poland, Hungary, Romania, and Bulgaria when they apply to the American Fund for Czechoslovak Refugees, Inc., see that they are housed, give them pocket money, explain the daily routines, offer basic orientation as to how to provide themselves with necessities for living, and answer questions about emigration possibilities and the procedures necessary to undertake, regarding whether to remain in the country of first asylum or emigrate to another country. They are advised to attend language classes to learn English if they plan to go to a country where English is spoken, or any other as the case may be. They are helped to get employment if they wish to work, while they wait for their turn to pass health and other examinations, in order to be accepted for emigration and for their eventual transportation to their new homes.

In addition to serving refugees from Central and Eastern Europe, the AFCR also services others who happen to apply in Vienna, Munich, or Paris and continues to service refugees from Vietnam, Cambodia, and Laos that it began doing in 1975 when the U.S. Indochinese refugee program was initiated.

With the exception of Rome, these refugees are registered and processed not only for admission to the United States, but also to Canada, Australia, New Zealand, and other countries of the free world.

In the United States in FY 1986, the AFCR had regional offices in New York, Boston, San Francisco, Salt Lake City, and Boise. Each regional office is organized in the standardized manner, maintaining a regional director with a supportive staff necessary to carry out regional responsibilities and provide comprehensive delivery of quality core services.

Since these services are required by different ethnic groups, the regional as well as headquarters offices have personnel speaking the languages to serve refugees from Europe as well as those from Indochina.

In FY 1987, the AFCR will not maintain offices in San Francisco and Boise. It has arranged a cooperative agreement with the ACNS in those areas to provide the comprehensive services for new AFCR arrivals.

The Chicago "Nghia Sinh International, Inc.," an organization of some 50 volunteers involved in the resettlement of Vietnamese refugees exclusively, will also cease its operations for AFCR in FY 1987.

The AFCR has cooperated over the years with other refugee servicing agencies in particular cases where it does not have offices and will continue to do so.

The AFCR also maintains cooperating resettlement operations in Bowling Green, Kentucky, predominantly for Cambodian refugees and Lincoln, Nebraska, for Eastern Europeans. In Burlington, Vermont, and Minneapolis, Minnesota, local churches, the YMCA, YWCA, ethnic organizations, and private sponsors resettled Lao, Khmer, and Vietnamese as well as East Europeans.

Abiding by the policy of restricting resettlement of refugees to the localitites adjacent to their regional offices or affiliates, refugees were resettled in the vicinity of New York City, Boston, San Francisco, Boise, Bowling Green, Minneapolis, and Burlington. Those with private sponsors, relatives, and friends were resettled in Arizona, Colorado, Connecticut, Florida, Illinois, Michigan, Minnesota, Missouri, Nevada, New Jersey, New Mexico, North Dakota, Ohio, Oregon, Pennsylvania, Texas, Virginia, and Washington. Ethnic Czechoslovak organizations provide orientation and integration to new East European arrivals.

As heretofore, the AFCR utilizes the casework mode prescribed in the resettlement services program and required in the Cooperative Agreement with the Department of State providing the necessary pre-arrival, reception, counseling, and referral services to their clients. The AFCR holds itself as the ultimate sponsor of its refugees, regardless of other sponsorship arrangements.

From its inception the AFCR has emphasized the urgency of immediate or early employment and attendance at English language classes for arriving refugees, in order to make the developing of skills easier and enable refugees to advancement toward self-sufficiency as soon as possible.

The Indochinese refugees serviced by AFCR came from Thailand, Vietnam, Galang in Indonesia, and Bataan in the Philippines.

During fiscal year 1986, AFCR resettled 1,984 refugees. Of these, 1,276 came from East Asia (including 82 refugees resettled through the Orderly Departure Program) and 708 came from Eastern Europe.

CHURCH WORLD SERVICE IMMIGRATION AND REFUGEE PROGRAM

Church World Service (CWS) 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 32 Protestant and Orthodox Christian communions. In fiscal year 1986, the Church World Service Immigration and Refugee Program resettled 5,580 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. This commitment manifests itself in the strong constitutency for refugee concerns within the local and national church community. It provides an atmosphere of acceptance for refugees in churches across the land which generously contribute time, materials, and funds to help refugees meet their needs until they become self-supporting. The church community has a strong commitment to early employment as they help refugees help themselves to become self-sufficient members of their adoptive communities.

Last year Church World Service resettled the following refugees:

OCTOBER 1985 - SEPTEMBER 1986

AFRICA	Ethiopia	232	
	South Africa	3	
	Namibia	1	
	Sub-total		236
EASTERN EUROPE	Albania	8	
	Bulgaria	19	
	Czechoslovakia	36	
	Hungary	80	
	Poland	476	
	Romania	750	
	Soviet Union	19	
	Sub-total		1,388
SOUTHEAST ASIA	Cambodia	711	
	Laos	1,180	
	Vietnam	720	
	Thailand	2	
	Sub-total		2,613
NEAR EAST	Afghanistan	299	
	Iran	557	
	Iraq	160	
	Sub-total		1,016
ORDERLY DEPARTURE PROGRAM	Vietnam	327	
	Sub-total		327
	GRAND TOTAL		5,580

Church World Service assists the work of the 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, (3) local congregations. CWS also maintains branch offices in Miami and San Francisco.

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.

Church World Service has a commitment to nationwide involvement of all congregations who are interested in resettling refugees and who have been evaluated as capable of doing so with the necessary training and monitoring. This grassroots church involvement guarantees community-based participation and ensures private contributions to refugees in the first 90 days of resettlement and longer. A recent study by the Church World Service Immigration and Refugee Program entitled Making It On Their Own: From Sponsorship to Self-Sufficiency (December 1983) estimated that CWS congregations contributed $133 million in cash, goods, and services to resettle refugees during the period FY 1980 to the first half of FY 1983.

Our sponsors are assisted by the Ecumenical Refugee Resettlement and Sponsorship Services (ERRSS) projects, which operate in areas of major CWS resettlement activity. These projects in partnership with denominational offices help find sponsors, provide information on refugees and act as advocates, provide document case management, and conduct a variety of post-arrival services such as English-as-a-Second-Language training, job development, referrals, and counseling services. As they are structurally linked to local ecumenical councils, the ERRSS projects are accountable to the church community. Twenty-one of these projects were provided funding through CWS in FY 1986 to provide professional services to local churches involved with refugees.

Following are some of the highlights of our work in FY 1986:

- The Olesiaks, a Polish family sponsored by Church World Service, were part of the official celebration of the centennial of the Statue of Liberty as they sailed into the New York harbor on July 3 aboard the Queen Elizabeth 2.

- CWS hosted a Workshop on Refugee Transportation Loans held at The Interchurch Center in New York on July 11 which was convened by the U.S. Department of State in conjunction with the Intergovernmental Committee for Migration.

- CWS also hosted the semi-annual meeting of the International Council of Voluntary Agencies at The Interchurch Center in New York, its first in North America in more than two decades.

- Church World Service is in the process of celebrating its 40th anniversary. Since its founding in 1946, CWS has resettled over a third of a million refugees and works in countries all over the world.

- CWS hosted a World Council of Churches Refugee Resettlement Network Consultation September 15-19 in Miami. The meeting brought together some 440 persons involved in refugee resettlement with churches around the world.

- The Church World Service Immigration and Refugee Program also participated and helped plan a meeting in Zurich, Switzerland, which brought together Catholics and Protestants from April 27 to May 2 to discuss refugee asylum and protection issues.

- Three new ERRSS projects were formally brought into our CWS resettlement network -- Tucson Ecumenical Council in Tucson, Arizona; Ecumenical Commitment to Refugees (part of PRIME) in Clifton Heights, Pennsylvania; and Grand Rapids Area Refugee Resettlement (part of the Freedom Flight Task Force) in Grand Rapids, Michigan.

- In an effort to better meet refugee needs overseas, the Church World Service Immigration and Refugee Program began an international programs office.

- A staff member was detailed to the Sudan Council of Churches through the World Council of Churches to work with refugees there.

- The Immigration and Refugee Program works with the other offices of Church World Service which work in refugee camps around the world. We maintain a close tie to our local partner churches around the world in their work with refugees as they address the root causes which force refugees to flee.

- A follow-up to our study Making It on Their Own is being worked on and will be published in 1987.

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 the 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
FY 1986	2,180

In the following table, refugees resettled in the U.S. by HIAS during FY 1986 are listed by country or region of origin:

USSR	558
Eastern Europe	62
Africa	14
Southeast Asia	907
Near East	639
TOTAL	2,180

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 overriding 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 caseworkers, 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 are 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 counseled 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 resettlement 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, San Jose, and Stockton 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 1986, the International Rescue Committee resettled the following number of refugees:

Vietnamese	2,279
Loatians	1,469
Cambodians	1,149
Poles	477
Czechoslovaks	272
Romanians	227
Hungarians	175
Soviets	47
Bulgarians	30
Albanians	28
Iranians	470
Iraqis	3
Afghans	319
Ethiopians	240
Other Africans	8
Cubans	23
Total:	7,216

IOWA DEPARTMENT OF HUMAN SERVICES

BUREAU OF REFUGEE PROGRAMS

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, and the agency is now known as the Iowa Department of Human Services' Bureau of Refugee Programs, 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 and the leadership of Human Services Commissioner Michael V. Reagen the Bureau's employment-oriented approach to refugee services has been further strengthened.

9,500 Refugees in Iowa

The Bureau of Refugee Programs has resettled about half of the 9,500 refugees living in Iowa. The other refugees have been resettled by other reception and placement agencies represented in the State or have moved here as secondary migrants.

Organization

In January 1986, in a State reorganization, the former Iowa Refugee Service Center became administratively part of the Iowa Department of Human Services and was renamed the Bureau of Refugee Programs. Human Services Commissioner Michael V. Reagen serves as the

State Coordinator for Refugee Affairs. Marvin A. Weidner, Chief of the Bureau of Refugee programs, is Deputy State Coordinator. The Bureau of Refugee Programs is a reception and placement agency for refugees, and within the Department of Human Services, serves as the "single state agency" for U.S. Department of Health and Human Services funds. The Bureau is the major refugee service provider in Iowa.

Employment-Oriented Services

The Bureau of Refugee Programs operates an employment-oriented refugee program utilizing a sophisticated case management system that emphasizes job development and helping refugees become self-sufficient as soon as possible after arrival. In FY 1986, the Bureau made a total of 1,058 job placements for refugees, an average of 88 per month. This was an increase of 8 percent over FY 1985.

As part of the core services provided to refugees during their first ninety days in the State, the Bureau focuses on helping refugees develop the skills and knowledge they need to find and maintain employment. Case managers work with the new arrivals to make employability plans and place them in beginning jobs.

The Bureau case managers' other focus is on refugees listed as cash assistance recipients, with the goal of placing all employable refugees in jobs. The Bureau has recently initiated a monthly analysis which shows how many clients have gone off assistance, for what reasons, and at what monthly savings to the program. The analysis so far has

shown that the predominant reason for refugees going off assistance is because the Bureau has placed them in jobs. Time expiration and sanctions have not been significant factors.

The Bureau cooperates with other employment and job-training programs, including the Iowa Department of Employment Services and Iowa Comprehensive Manpower Services, to place refugees in the appropriate job or training situation.

Coordination

The Iowa Joint Voluntary Agencies (IJVA), convened by the Bureau of Refugee Programs, continue to meet on a monthly basis. All voluntary resettlement agencies have agreed to provide the Bureau with a quarterly Future Resettlement Plans report; each agency's information is then shared with the other agencies resettling refugees in the State.

Welfare Usage Low

Through the years, Iowa has maintained a very low welfare usage rate among its refugees. In September 1986, only 822, or 8.6 percent of the 9,500 refugees in Iowa were receiving cash or medical assistance. Iowa has no general assistance program. Of that number, 166 (1.7 percent) were unaccompanied minor children, 263 (or 2.7 percent) were receiving Refugee Cash Assistance, 265 (2.8 percent) were receiving Aid to Families with Dependent Children, and 33 (0.3 percent) were on medical assistance.

BUREAU OF REFUGEE PROGRAMS FY 1986

Ethnic Resettlement Totals

Cambodian	49
Hmong	13
Laotian	153
Tai Dam	26
Vietnamese	109
Total	350

BUREAU OF REFUGEE PROGRAMS

Resettlement Totals by Federal 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
FY 1986	350
TOTAL	4,920

LUTHERAN IMMIGRATION AND REFUGEE SERVICE

Refugee resettlement is an integral part of the Lutheran church's work in service to human need. Since 1975, the Lutheran network has effectively resettled more than 80,000 refugees.

The foundation of the LIRS resettlement system is the local congregational or community group sponsor, supported and backed up by professional resettlement staff in Lutheran Social Service agencies. These sponsors are able to provide the material and social support necessary for refugees to achieve early employment and self-sufficiency. They also play a valuable role in fostering community acceptance of newcomers, and in speeding the refugees' adjustment to their new life in America.

Self-sufficient refugee relatives are also used as sponsors when congregational or group sponsors are not available or needed. In any case, every LIRS sponsorship involves sponsors' and refugees' clarifying expectations early on and setting goals toward long-term self-sufficiency. LIRS cases are monitored and tracked through a system designed to (1) meet individual refugee needs, (2) emphasize early refugee employment, (3) coordinate with community resources, and (4) prevent duplication of services.

The 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 provide the material and emotional support that refugees need. These sponsors arrange for initial housing, food, clothing, job placement, health care, enrollment of minors into school, and orientation to American life. The services are most heavily concentrated during the first six months after arrival.

Regional support comes from staff at 25 offices related to accredited Lutheran Social Service agencies. They recruit and train local sponsors, and then ensure and document that all core services have been provided. These regional offices also provide other professional support services--such as translation and bilingual counseling--and work cooperatively in consultation with State and local government officials.

The national office in New York City is the coordinating center that supports and monitors regional and local case management. Regional offices are monitored through on-site visits and quarterly reports. Reception services are coordinated at ports of entry and final destination. Tracking and monitoring requirements are fulfilled. Travel loans are collected. The resettlement of unaccompanied minors is coordinated. Liaison work is done with InterAction, the Refugee Data Center, government agencies, and overseas counterparts. Printed and audiovisual resources are prepared and distributed. Planning and development is carried out to extend resources systemwide, to help as many people as possible.

As a matter of policy, LIRS believes that public cash assistance should be used by refugees only in emergency or unusual situations, or as a temporary means of support until the newcomer learns a marketable trade or skill. LIRS policy also involves placing refugees where there are existing refugee support groups such as MAAs. However, open cases with 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 California. The placement of open cases is restricted to areas where refugees will have the greatest opportunity to find early employment.

In fiscal year 1986:

- LIRS resettled 4,825 refugees.
- LIRS has always supported the adoption of standards of resettlement based on desirable outcomes. In connection with proposed changes in the Department of State's Cooperative Agreement, LIRS helped to develop new resettlement guidelines in conjunction with the Department and other voluntary agencies which will go into effect January 1.
- The Chicago Project, launched by LIRS and four other volags with government funds to demonstrate refugee self-sufficiency with decreased recourse to public assistance, was documented as a successful and cost-effective venture. However, funding was discontinued in April 1986. The State Department is commissioning a professional evaluation of the project.

o Considerable staff time and effort went into developing a joint proposal, with other volags, for a Fish/Wilson project. If a project is to be implemented, State welfare regulations must be considered, State and local authorities involved, MAAs included, and numerous other factors considered. These make any project tremendously complex to design. Sites that have been considered are San Diego, Minneapolis/St. Paul, Chicago, and Washington, D.C. A pre-application for a San Diego project was submitted to ORR in July, but was rejected. However, LIRS believes that the project is still timely and worthwhile, and intends to continue efforts to develop one.

o In cooperation with 22 child welfare agencies in 19 States and the District of Columbia, LIRS continues to place unaccompanied minors into foster homes. While most are Vietnamese, four Iranian minors from India and an African minor were also placed this year. LIRS staff members of ORR's Unaccompanied Minors Workgroup have also been implementing plans for reduction of the minors program nationally in response to fewer admissions.

o Preparations are also underway for the arrival of 200 Montagnard refugees, to be resettled in Greensboro, Raleigh, and Charlotte, North Carolina, in early FY 1987 through the Lutheran Family Services in Greensboro. LIRS was chosen by the State Department from among several agencies to resettle the group--a "first" in U.S. immigration history, because there is at present no sizable Montagnard community in the United States. LIRS chose North Carolina because of the availability of jobs, affordable housing, a pleasant climate and an enthusiastic network of church sponsors.

Also noteworthy in the choice of North Carolina is the fact that less than 4 percent of all the refugees resettled by Lutheran Family Services are on public assistance.

The attached table shows LIRS arrivals by month and nationality for the fiscal year.

LUTHERAN IMMIGRATION AND REFUGEE SERVICE

ARRIVALS FOR FISCAL YEAR 1986 BY MONTH AND NATIONALITY

Month	Vietnam	Laos	Cambodia	Europe	Africa	Near East	Latin America	TOTAL ARRIVALS	NON-REFUGEE ARRIVALS*	TOTAL REFUGEE ARRIVALS
OCT 85	191	84	111	12	0	7	0	405	20	385
NOV 85	131	20	77	34	6	54	0	322	19	303
DEC 85	146	15	228	73	5	44	0	511	27	484
JAN 86	124	7	177	62	1	28	0	399	30	369
FEB 86	145	4	88	75	1	49	0	362	40	322
MAR 86	222	119	64	76	9	33	0	523	46	477
APR 86	178	135	29	101	17	31	0	491	50	441
MAY 86	169	39	21	31	8	32	0	300	23	277
JUN 86	156	158	10	84	1	32	0	441	31	410
JUL 86	122	221	24	46	5	28	0	446	34	412
AUG 86	151	135	5	37	20	16	0	364	23	341
SEP 86	130	286	31	107	42	14	0	610	6	604
TOTAL	1865	1223	865	738	115	368	0	5174	349*	4825

* = 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) 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, PAIRC assists the refugees financially as well.

After settling the refugees, PAIRC continues to provide information and counseling and to follow up on each case in order to help refugees 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.

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 1986 PAIRC resettled 440 Polish refugees. Thanks to the 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.

PRESIDING BISHOP'S FUND FOR WORLD RELIEF

I. MISSION OF THE PBFWR/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 $299,945 of Church monies contributed by the Fund on an average of $230 per arriving refugee. In addition, many thousands of private dollars have been given

---

* 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.

regionally and locally, to provide assistance for 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 1986, 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 follow up 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 1,278 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 two regional field offices with officers located in New York City, New York; and Fort Worth, Texas; and a national field officer 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 $208,500 were awarded in FY 1986. The Fund provided over $20,000 in Church monies for enabling grants for individuals in need of emergency assistance. Many additional grants were awarded by individual dioceses and parishes. Also granted was $29,945 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 1986

A major thrust of the FY 1986 program was the continued training of Diocesan Refugee Coordinators to better equip them to assist refugees and sponsors to meet the stated goals of resettlement. This training process was refined to provide increased emphasis on the national goals of resettlement including achieving early employment, providing English language training, and fulfilling the "core services" as outlined in the Fund's Cooperative Agreement with BRP/DOS. This year brought an increased emphasis on raising and organizing private resources of both time taken and treasure from parishes and communities.

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 on and the requirements of sponsorship, sponsor training, language and cultural orientation resources, and financial reporting and program monitoring procedures. The manual was updated to include additional information on:

1. Core service requirements
2. Sponsorship development
3. Processing procedures
4. Casefile documentation

An additional focus of the FY 1986 program was continued support of diocesan programs so that the Fund's network was fully equipped to ensure the provision of core services. Emphasis was placed on developing ideas and programs, drawing upon local and national level resources that would better enable refugees to achieve early employment and meet acculturation needs.

During FY 1986 several dioceses initiated or greatly enhanced existing services to which the Fund has contributed.

Diocese of Oregon

The PBFWR/EC awarded a grant to provide training in the area of therapeutic methods to help refugees who have suffered pirate attacks and torture while escaping to countries of first asylum. A second aspect of the training will support the needs of Amerasian and other mixed race children who have been traumatized by their experiences.

Diocese of New York

The Fund has supported the efforts of community action agencies to assist approximately 700 low income refugees in New York City with survival skills for functioning in a complex urban setting. Issues addressed include housing, tenants' rights, personal safety and crime problems, and community relations.

Diocese of California

To further develop a center of support for the Cambodian community in the Diocese, the PBFWR/EC awarded a grant to provide instruction on acculturation issues, accessing community resources, and the building of economic independence.

Diocese of Ohio

The PBFWR/EC continues to support a project focusing on the self-sufficiency needs of the Lao, Hmong, and Vietnamese refugees in the Diocese. The project utilizes Church and community resources to foster an understanding of economic development, health care, and the legal, political, and governmental process. The native skills and abilities of refugees are upheld to increase employability.

Diocese of San Joaquin (California)

The Diocese of San Joaquin and a number of funding bodies within the Episcopal Church continue to support agricultural marketing and sewing cooperatives for Lao and Hmong refugees. Employment services are provided to both primary and secondary wage earners to enable greater

self-sufficiency. This effort provides training in the area of industrial sewing and supports a sewing cooperative staffed by refugees. The PBFWR/EC enabled the cooperative to secure a major contract for garment production.

Diocese of Olympia (Washington)

The Diocese of Olympia received two PBFWR/EC Board grant awards to provide job development services to increase the participation of volunteers in job readiness and intensive ESL services. To date, 96 volunteers have been recruited and are providing individual and private ESL instruction to refugees; 10 volunteers help lead job readiness classes which have placed 54 PBFWR refugees in jobs. The recently hired job developer secured 14 jobs for refugees within the first month of operation.

THE PRESIDING BISHOP'S FUND FOR WORLD RELIEF
REFUGEE ARRIVALS FOR FISCAL YEAR 1986

REGION	ETHNIC GROUP	INDIVIDUALS
AFRICAN:	Ethiopian	45
	Namibian	02
	South African	01
Sub-total		48
EUROPEAN:	Bulgarian	01
	Czechoslovakian	32
	Hungarian	12
	Polish	80
	Romanian	121
	Russian	21
Sub-total		267
INDOCHINESE:	Khmer	363
	Laotian	132
	Vietnamese	283
Sub-total		778
NEAR EAST:	Afghan	46
	Iraqi	03
	Iranian	136
Sub-total		185
TOTAL FISCAL YEAR 1986 REFUGEE ARRIVALS:		1,278

TOLSTOY FOUNDATION

The Tolstoy Foundation is a non-profit, non-political, and non-sectarian international agency which counsels and provides services to refugees from all over the world. Since its founding in 1939 by Alexandra Tolstoy, youngest daughter of the renowned author and humanitarian, Leo Tolstoy, the Foundation has, among others, assisted Afghans, Armenians, Bulgarians, Cambodians, Circassians, Czechs, Ethiopians, Hungarians, Iranians, Iraqis, Laotians, Poles, Russians, Rumanians, Tibetans, and Ugandan Asians. The Foundation has provided assistance to over 100,000 refugees and immigrants. This number does not include the many refugees who were assisted in their resettlement in Canada, Australia, New Zealand, and South America. The Foundation has a European Headquarters in Munich, West Germany, as well as offices in five other European countries which arrange for the resettlement of refugees and provide aid and integration services for elderly and needy exiles.

The basic approach to any Tolstoy Foundation sponsored activity is governed by an awareness that assistance should recognize human dignity and work to build a sense of self-reliance as opposed to charitable support, so that refugees can be an asset to their new environments, contributing culturally and economically to communities in which they live.

The Foundation currently participates in the resettlement of Southeast Asian, Soviet, Near Eastern, African, and East European refugees. Resettlement services are provided through regional offices which work with local individual and group sponsors as well as private and public agencies involved in assisting refugees.

Services provided start prior to the arrival of the refugee in the United States, beginning with a search for private sponsors or relatives and their orientation. They continue with the verification of medical records and reception of the refugees at points of entry and final destinations in the United States. Initial support is provided for food and clothing, housing, and basic household goods and furnishings, depending on individual needs.

Orientation, training, employment counseling and placement, English language referral, school placement for children, health and other services that help integrate the refugee into his local community are arranged for or provided by regional offices.

To implement its resettlement program the Tolstoy Foundation has six offices throughout the United States. Each office is staffed according to the needs of the Tolstoy Foundation sponsored refugees in the area. Although decreasing refugee arrivals have necessitated staff reductions in the Foundation's New York and regional offices, the various staffs still maintain the capacity to provide services in the native language of their non-English speaking constituencies. This need is currently being met by part-time interpreter-counselors and volunteers in those offices where the caseload is too small to warrant a full-time employee. Tolstoy Foundation offices are located in New York City (headquarters); Los Angeles, California; Phoenix, Arizona; Salt Lake City, Utah; Ferndale, Michigan; and Woonsocket, Rhode Island.

The Tolstoy Foundation regional offices operate under resettlement procedures and guidelines set by the national headquarters. Every office provides program and status reports on a monthly basis to headquarters. At least once a year, executive staff in New York City headquarters visit offices to monitor and advise on the resettlement efforts. Special workshops are usually held once a year for staff professional development.

Each regional office is provided with funds from which expenditures for food, rent, household items, bedding, some medical and other refugee expenses as well as office expenses are made. Accounting takes place by the utilization of monthly reports. Complete records with receipts are kept of all expenditures and are on file with the original at headquarters accounting office and copies in each appropriate regional office. Expenditures for each refugee are also noted in his/her file with running account records for each. Direct contact by phone is maintained for consultation and/or decision on matters for which the Regional Representative needs advice or approval.

Through its regional offices, the Tolstoy Foundation is able to maintain direct contact with each refugee and sponsor through each stage of the resettlement process. Often this contact is maintained for many months or even years after the refugee has arrived in this country.

A significant portion of the costs of resettlement are borne by the private funds of the Tolstoy Foundation for arriving refugees. These

funds come from foundations, bequests, and contributions from individual donors. The Foundation regularly sends fund-raising mailings to past and prospective donors. The Foundation hopes to continue previous levels of support for its resettlement programs.

In addition to the above-described direct financial assistance, each Tolstoy regional office relies to a varying extent on volunteer services and "in-kind" contributions. The work of the Foundation would not be possible without this generous volunteer and community support.

During FY 1986, the Tolstoy Foundation resettled 2,064 refugees from the following regions.

East Asia	358*
Africa	65
Near East	724
Eastern Europe	917
TOTAL	2,064

* Includes 22 resettled through the Orderly Departure Program.

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 26,862 refugees in FY 1986. By area of regional origin, this number breaks down to:

	FY 1986
East Asia	21,865
Soviet Union and Eastern Europe	2,814
Near East and South Asia	1,702
Latin America	105
Africa	376
TOTAL	26,862

One hundred eighty-three resettlement offices within 164 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, D.C. 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 58 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. This project expanded to include other voluntary agencies in 1984 and 1985. Goals of these projects 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 1986, World Relief, the emergency aid, development assistance, and refugee service arm of the National Association of Evangelicals, resettled 4,564 of the 62,400 refugees admitted to the United States. The primary mission of the U.S.A. Ministries Division 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. World Relief has staff in Hong Kong serving refugees in two closed camps through vocational training and spiritual ministries. Other programs include El Salvador, where it is currently working with the United States Agency for International Development to resettle displaced persons to safe areas designated by the government and to rebuild communities and farmland. In Pakistan, it has developed public health and ESL programs in Afghan refugee camps. World Relief was a lead and coordinating agency for the Chicago Resettlement and Demonstration Project. It cooperated with six other voluntary agencies in an enhanced resettlement model to provide reception and placement services, employment, case management, income and medical support. World Relief achieved a 78 percent placement rate for employable adults during the project.

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 Evangelicals, which represents 49 denominations, a plethora of other religious organizations, and approximately 20,000 missionaries throughout the world.

The U.S. Resettlement Division of World Relief is administered from its national office near New York City in Congers, New York. Under the supervision of a senior management team, resettlement activities are carried out through a nationwide network of thirteen professional offices located in metropolitan Boston, New York, Miami, Atlanta, Chicago (2), Dallas, Los Angeles, San Fransisco, San Jose, San Diego, Stockton, and Seattle.

From the inception of its refugee resettlement program in 1979, World Relief regional offices have generated a large 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 1986, 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 sponsorships, 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.

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 early employment leading to economic self-sufficiency. A constant goal is to place refugees in areas that are conducive to early employment. During FY 1986 World Relief achieved a 25 percent employment rate for all cases. Regional offices have designed many programs in which public and private resources are combined to reach this goal.

REFUGEES RESETTLED DURING FY 1986

Region of Origin	Cases	People
Africa	42	87
Europe	93	370
Indochina	1,003	3,839
Near East	103	268
Latin America	0	0
Total	1,241	4,564

APPENDIX D

STATE REFUGEE COORDINATORS

STATE REFUGEE COORDINATORS
REGION I

CONNECTICUT
Mr. Joseph Freyre
State Refugee Coordinator
Department of Human Resources
1049 Asylum Street
Hartford, Connecticut 06115 — Tel. (203) 566-4329

MAINE
Mr. David Stauffer
State Refugee Coordinator
Bureau of Resource Development
Department of Human Services
Augusta, Maine 04330 — Tel. (207) 289-5060

MASSACHUSETTS
Dr. Daniel M. Lam
State Refugee Coordinator
Director, MORR
600 Washington Street - Room 405 — Tel. (617) 727-8190
Boston, Massachusetts 02111 — Tel. (617) 727-7888

NEW HAMPSHIRE
Ms. Patricia Garvin
State Refugee Coordinator
Division of Human Resources
11 Depot Street
Concord, New Hampshire 03301 — Tel. (603) 271-2611

RHODE ISLAND
Ms. Lynn August
State Refugee Coordinator
Department of Human Services
275 Westminster Mall, 5th Floor
Providence, Rhode Island 02903 — Tel. (401) 277-2551

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

STATE REFUGEE COORDINATORS
REGION II

NEW JERSEY

Ms. Audrea Dunham
State Refugee Coordinator
Commissioner's Office
(CN 700)
Department of Human Services
Trenton, New Jersey 08625
Tel. (609) 292-8420

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

NEW YORK

Mr. Bruce Bushart
State Refugee Coordinator
Department of Social Services
40 North Pearl Street
Albany, New York 12243

Tel. (518) 474-9629

STATE REFUGEE COORDINATORS
REGION III

DELAWARE
Mr. Thomas P. Eichler
Refugee Coordinator
Division of Economic Services
Department of Health & Social Services
P.O. Box 906, CP Building
New Castle, Delaware 19720

Contact Person:
Ms. Jane Loper
Tel. (302) 421-6153

DISTRICT OF COLUMBIA
Mr. Wallace Lumpkin
Director, Refugee Resettlement Program
Department of Human Services
801 North Capitol Street, N.E., Room 336
Washington, D.C. 20002

Contact Person:
Mr. Byron C. Marshall
Tel. (202) 727-5588

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

Tel. (301) 659-1863

PENNSYLVANIA
Mr. John F. White Jr.
Secretary
Department of Public Welfare
P.O. Box 2675
Harrisburg, Pennsylvania 17120

Contact Person:
Mr. Ron Kirby
Tel. (717) 783-7535

VIRGINIA
Ms. Anne H. Hamrick
State Refugee Coordinator
Virginia Department of Social Services
Blair Building
8007 Discovery Drive
Richmond, Virginia 23288

Tel. (804) 281-9029

WEST VIRGINIA
Mrs. Cheryl Posey
Refugee Coordinator
West Virginia Department of Human Services
1900 Washington Street, East
Charleston, West Virginia 25305

Tel. (304) 885-8290

STATE REFUGEE COORDINATORS
REGION IV

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

GEORGIA
Ms. Winifred S. Horton
Refugee State Coordinator
DFCS - Special Programs Unit
Department of Human Resources
878 Peachtree Street, N.E., Room 403
Atlanta, Georgia 30309 Tel. (404) 894-7618

KENTUCKY
Ms. Janie A. Miller
State Refugee Coordinator
Department of Human Resources
Bureau for Social Insurance
275 East Main Street
Frankfort, Kentucky 40621 Tel. (502) 564-3556

MISSISSIPPI
Ms. Carmel Lopez-Lampton
State Refugee Coordinator
Department of Public Welfare
P.O. Box 352
Jackson, Mississippi 39205 Tel. (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, N. Carolina 27611 Tel. (919) 733-4650

SOUTH CAROLINA
Mr. Tri Huu Tran
State Refugee Coordinator
Agency for Refugee Resettlement
Division of Social Services
P.O. Box 1520
1520 Confederate Avenue
Columbia, S. Carolina 29202-9988 Tel. (803) 758-2996

TENNESSEE
Ms. Martha Roupas
State Refugee Coordinator
Department of Human Services
400 Deaderick Street
Nashville, Tennessee 37219 Tel. (615) 741-2587

STATE REFUGEE COORDINATORS
ORR FLORIDA OFFICE

Ms. Nancy Wittenberg
Refugee Programs Administrator
Department of Health and
Rehabilitative Services
1317 Winewood Blvd., Building 1, Room 420
Tallahassee, Florida 32301 Tel. (904) 488-3791

STATE REFUGEE COORDINATORS
REGION V

ILLINOIS
Mr. Edwin Silverman
Refugee Resettlement Program
Department of Public Aid
Bureau of Social Services
624 S. Michigan Ave., 10th Floor
Chicago, Illinois 60605
Tel. (312) 793-7120

INDIANA
Mr. Robert Igney
Policy and Program Development
Department of Welfare
238 S. Meridian Street, 4th floor
Indianapolis, Indiana 46204
Tel. (317) 232-2021

MICHIGAN
Ms. Paula Stark
State Refugee Coordinator
Department of Social Services
300 S. Capitol Avenue, Suite 711
Lansing, Michigan 48926
Tel. (517) 373-7382

Ms. Joyce Savale
Program Manager
Department of Social Services
Michigan Plaza Bldg., Suite 462
1200 Sixth Street
Detroit, Michigan 48226
Tel. (313) 256-1081

MINNESOTA
Ms. Jane Kretzmann
Coordinator of Refugee Programs
Department of Human Services
Space Center Building, 2nd Floor
444 Lafayette Road
St. Paul, Minnesota 55101
Tel. (612) 296-2754

OHIO
Mr. Michael M. Seidemann
Department of Human Services
Program Development Division
State Office Tower, 32nd Floor
30 E. Broad Street
Columbus, Ohio 43215
Tel. (614) 466-5848

WISCONSIN
Mr. Jules F. Bader, Director
Wisconsin Refugee Assistance Office
Dept. of Health & Social Services
Bureau of Management & Budget
P.O. Box 7851
Madison, WI 53707
Tel. (608) 266-8354

STATE REFUGEE COORDINATORS
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
Tel. (501) 371-2434

LOUISIANA
Ms. Sybil Willis
State Refugee Coordinator
Office of Human Development
Department of Health and Human Services
1755 Florida Street
P.O. Box 44367
Baton Rouge, Louisiana 70804

Tel. (504) 342-4017

NEW MEXICO
Ms. Charmaine Espinosa
State Coordinator of Refugee Resettlement
Program Services Bureau
P.O. Box 2348 PERA, Room 518
Santa Fe, New Mexico 87504

Tel. (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
Tel. (405) 521-3431

TEXAS
Ms. Lee Russell
State Refugee Resettlement Coordinator
P.O. Box 2960
701 W. 51st Street
Austin, Texas 78751

Tel. (512) 450-3448

STATE REFUGEE COORDINATORS
REGION VII

IOWA
Ms. Nancy Norman
Director
Iowa Department of Human Services
1200 University Ave., Suite D
Des Moines, Iowa 50314-2330

Chief Bureau of
Refugee Programs:
Mr. Marvin Weidner
Tel. (515) 281-3119

KANSAS
Mr. Phil Gutierrez
Refugee Resettlement Coordinator
Department of Social and
Rehabilitation Services
State Office Building
Topeka, Kansas 66612

Tel. (913) 296-2970

MISSOURI
Ms. Patricia Harris
Division of Family Services
Refugee Assistance Program
P.O. Box 88
Broadway State Office Building
Jefferson City, Missouri 65103

Tel. (314) 751-2456

NEBRASKA
Ms. Maria Diaz
Coordinator of Refugee Affairs
Department of Social Services
301 Centennial Mall South
Lincoln, Nebraska 68509

Tel. (402) 471-9200

STATE REFUGEE COORDINATORS
REGION VIII

COLORADO
Ms. Laurie Bagan
State Refugee Coordinator
Department of Social Services
Colorado Refugee Services Program
190 East Ninth Avenue, Suite 200
Denver, Colorado 80203
Tel. (303) 863-8211

MONTANA
Ms. Norma Harris
Refugee Resettlement Coordinator
Department of Social and
Rehabilitation Services
111 Sanders
Helena, Montana 59601

Program Manager:
Mr. Boyce Fowler
Tel. (406) 444-3865

NORTH DAKOTA
Mr. Donald L. Schmid
Refugee Resettlement Coordinator
Dept. of Human Services
State Capitol, 3rd floor
New Office Wing
Bismarck, North Dakota 58505
Tel. (701) 224-4809

Admin. Refugee Services:
Mr. Barry Nelson
P.O. Box 389
Fargo, North Dakota 58107
Tel. (701) 235-7341

SOUTH DAKOTA
Mr. Vern Guericke
Refugee Resettlement Coordinator
Department of Social Services
Kneip Building
700 N. Governors Drive
Pierre, South Dakota 57501
Tel. (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
Tel. (801) 533-5094

WYOMING
Mr. Steve Vajda
Refugee Relocation Coordinator
Department of Health and Social Services
390 Hathaway Building
Cheyenne, Wyoming 82002
Tel. (307) 777-6081

STATE REFUGEE COORDINATORS
REGION IX

ARIZONA
Ms. Linda A. Bacon
Refugee Program Coordinator
Arizona Department of Economic Security
1140 E. Washington, Suite 105
Phoenix, Arizona 85034
Tel. (602) 229-2743

CALIFORNIA
Ms. Linda McMahon
Director
Dept. of Social Services Services
744 P Street
Sacramento, CA 95814
Tel. (916) 445-2077

Program Manager:
Mr. Walter Barnes
Tel. (916) 324-1576

GUAM
Leticia V. Espalden, M.D.
Acting State Refugee Coordinator
Department of Public
Health & Social Services
P.O. Box 2816
Government of Guam
Agana, Guam 96910

Contact Person:
Ms. Julita Lifoifoi
Tel. 011-671-472-6649

HAWAII
Mr. Walter W. F. Choy
Executive Director
Office of Community Services
State of Hawaii
335 Merchant Street, Room 101
Honolulu, Hawaii 96813
Tel. (808) 548-2130

Assistant Coordinator:
Mr. Dwight Ovitt
Tel. (808) 548-5803

NEVADA
Mr. Michael Willden
Deputy Administrator
for Program & Field Operations
Nevada State Welfare Division
Department of Social Services
2527 North Carson
Carson City, Nevada 89710

Contact Person:
Ms. Rota Rosaschi
Tel. (702) 885-3023

STATE REFUGEE COORDINATORS
REGION X

IDAHO
Mr. David L. Humphrey
Administrator
Division of Field Operations
Dept. of Health and Welfare
450 W. State St.
Boise, Idaho 83720

Contact Person:
Ms. Molly Trimming
Tel. (208) 334-2693

OREGON
Mr. Ron Spendal
State Refugee Coordinator
Department of Human Resources
100 Public Service Building
Salem, Oregon 97310

Tel. (503) 373-7177

WASHINGTON
Dr. Thuy Vu
State Refugee Coordinator
Bureau of Refugee Assistance
Dept. of Social and Health Services
Mail Stop 31-B
Olympia, Washington 98504

Tel. (206) 753-3086

APPENDIX E

REFUGEE HEALTH PROJECT GRANTS

CDC HEALTH PROGRAM FOR REFUGEES
PROJECT GRANT AWARDS AND PROJECT DIRECTORS
FY 1986*

REGION I

Connecticut ($79,456)	Douglas Lloyd, M.D. Connecticut Department of Human Services 79 Elm Street Hartford, CT 06115
Maine ($15,864)	William S. Nersesian, M.D. Maine Department of Human Services Bureau of Health State House, Station 11 Augusta, ME 04333
Massachusetts ($263,752)	Bailus Walker, Jr., Ph.D., M.P.H. Commissioner, Massachusetts Department of Public Health 600 Washington Street Boston, MA 02111
New Hampshire ($6,249)	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 ($65,026)	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 if Health 115 Colchester Avenue Burlington, VT 05401

REGION II

New Jersey ($128,000)	William E. Parkin, D.V.M. State Epidemiologist New Jersey State Department of Health C N 360 John Fitch Plaza Trenton, NJ 08625

---

* Amounts include both health assessment and hepatitis B screening and vaccination funds.

New York ($172,398)	Dale L. Morse, M.D. New York State Department of Health Tower Building, Empire State Plaza Albany, NY 12237
New York City ($183,045)	Stephen Friedman, M.D. 125 Worth Street, Room 630 New York, NY 10013

REGION III[1]

District of Columbia ($77,137)	Mr. Richard H. Hollenkamp 1875 Connecticut Avenue, N.W. Room 815 Washington, D.C. 20009
Maryland ($111,592)	Ms. Jeannette Rose Department of Health and Mental Hygiene 201 W. Preston Street, Room 307-A Baltimore, MD 21201
Pennsylvania ($76,829)	Ms. Patricia Tyson Pennsylvania Department of Health P.O. Box 90 Harrisburg, PA 17120
Philadelphia ($108,729)	Mr. Barry Savitz Philadelphia Health Department 500 South Broad Street Philadelphia, PA 19146
Virginia ($99,754)	Mr. Herbert W. Oglesby Office of Management for Community Health Services 109 Governor Street Richmond, VA 23219

REGION IV[2]

Alabama ($21,933)	Mr. H. E. Harrison Director, Bureau of Area Health Services Alabama Department of Public Health State Office Building, Room 305 Montgomery, AL 36130

[1]Delaware and West Virginia did not apply for FY 86 funds.
[2]Mississippi did not apply for FY 86 funds.

Florida ($103,485)	Mr. Gary Clarke Department of Health and Rehabilitative Services 1323 Winewood Boulevard Tallahassee, FL 32301
Georgia ($138,558)	Keith Sikes, D.V.M. Georgia Department of Human Resources 878 Peachtree Street, N.E. Atlanta, GA 30309
Kentucky ($42,864)	Mr. Charles D. Bunch Barren River District Health Center 1133 Adams Street Bowling Green, KY 42101
North Carolina ($67,161)	Ms. Dara L. Murphy Refugee and Migrant Health Office North Carolina Division of Health Services P.O. Box 2091 Raleigh, NC 27602
South Carolina ($33,981)	Richard Parker, D.V.M. Bureau of Disease Control South Carolina Department of Health and Environmental Control 2600 Bull Street Columbia, SC 29101
Tennessee ($81,996)	Mr. W. Dick Achuff Refugee Health Program Tennessee Department of Public Health/Environment 100 9th Ave. N. Ben Allen Road Nashville, TN 37219-5405

REGION V

Illinois ($229,565)	Mr. Benard Turnoch Illinois Department of Public Health 535 Jefferson Street Springfield, IL 62761
Indiana ($55,092)	Charles L. Barrett, M.D. Director, Communicable Disease Control Indiana State Board of Health 1330 West Michigan Indianapolis, IN 46206

Michigan ($81,717)	Mr. Douglas Paterson Michigan Department of Public Health 3500 North Logan Street P.O. Box 30035 Lansing, MI 48909
Minnesota ($191,271)	Mr. Michael Moen, Chief Communicable Disease Section Minnesota Department of Health 717 Delaware Street, S.E. Minneapolis, MN 55440
Ohio ($164,234)	Thomas J. Halpin, M.D. Chief, Bureau of Preventive Medicine Ohio Department of Health 246 North High Street Columbus, OH 43216
Wisconsin ($46,105)	Mr. Ivan E. Imm Director, Bureau of Prevention Wisconsin Department of Health One West Wilson Street Madison, WI 53701

REGION VI[3]

Louisiana ($71,302)	Mr. Sam Householder Louisiana Department of Health and Human Services P.O. Box 60630 New Orleans, LA 70160
New Mexico ($48,000)	Ms. Mary Lou Martinez New Mexico Health and Environmental Department P.O. Box 968 Santa Fe, NM 87503
Oklahoma ($53,766)	Mr. Stephen W. Ronck Director, Refugee Health Program Oklahoma State Department of Health P.O. Box 53551 Oklahoma City, OK 73152
Texas ($397,448)	Ms. Eleanor R. Eisenberg Texas Department of Health 1100 West 49th Street Austin, TX 78756

REGION VII[4]

Iowa ($119,742)	Mr. Paul Carlson Iowa State Department of Health Lucas State Office Building Des Moines, IA 50319
Kansas ($63,815)	Dr. Azzie Young, Manager Bureau of Family Health Kansas Department of Health and Environment Forbes AFB, Building 740 Topeka, KS 66620
Missouri ($44,202)	H. Denny Donnell, Jr., M.D. Missouri Department of Social Services P.O. Box 570 Jefferson City, MO 65102

REGION VIII[5]

Colorado ($79,659)	Carol Salas Colorado Department of Health 4120 East 11th Avenue Denver, CO 80220
Montana ($3,571)	Mr. Dennis Lang Missoula City-County Health Department 301 Alder Missoula, MT 59802
North Dakota ($11,220)	Mr. Fred F. Heer North Dakota State Department of Health State Capitol Bismarck, ND 58505
South Dakota ($14,025)	Mr. Kenneth Senger South Dakota State Department of Health Joe Foss Building Pierre, SD 57501
Utah ($81,525)	Ms. Judi Alder, R.N. Utah State Department of Health Community Health Services Bureau of Chronic Diseases P.O. Box 16700/288 North 1460 West Salt Lake City, UT 84116-0700

[3]Arkansas did not apply for FY 86 funds.
[4]Nebraska did not apply for FY 86 funds
[5]Wyoming did not apply for FY 86 funds.

REGION IX

Arizona ($73,543)	Mr. Michael A. Nolin Acting Director, Community Health Services Maricopa County Health Department 1825/1845 East Roosevelt Phoenix, AZ 85006
California ($1,903,238)	James Chin, M.D. State of California Department of Health 2151 Berkeley Way Berkeley, CA 94704
Hawaii ($69,789)	Mr. Leslie Matsubara State of Hawaii Department of Health Director's Office P.O. Box 3378 Honolulu, HI 96801
Nevada ($35,000)	Mr. William C. Schneider Acting, Health Division Administrator Nevada State Department of Human Resources Division of Health 505 E. King Street, Room 200 Carson City, NV 89710

REGION X[6]

Idaho ($28,348)	Ms. Rosemary Shaber, R.N. North Central District Health Department 1221 F. Street Lewiston, ID 83501
Oregon ($97,637)	Mr. David M. Gurule Office of Community Health Services Oregon State Health Division P.O. Box 231 Portland, OR 97207
Washington ($233,377)	Ms. Diane Weeden Refugee Health Program DSHS - Division of Health Mail Stop LP-12 Olympia, WA 98504

[6]Alaska did not apply for FY 86 funds.

☆U.S. GOVERNMENT PRINTING OFFICE: 1987-720-712/60169