

Report to
the Congress

FY 1996



Refugee Resettlement Program

Office of
Refugee
Resettlement

U.S. DEPARTMENT OF
HEALTH AND HUMAN SERVICES
Administration for Children and Families
Office of Refugee Resettlement



Report to the Congress

FY 1996

Refugee Resettlement Program



**U.S. DEPARTMENT OF
HEALTH AND HUMAN SERVICES**
Administration for Children and Families
Office of Refugee Resettlement

TABLE OF CONTENTS

EXECUTIVE SUMMARY	1
1996 REPORT TO CONGRESS	1
Director's Message	1
I. INTRODUCTION	3
II. ORR'S REFUGEE RESETTLEMENT PROGRAM	5
Domestic Resettlement Program	7
Refugee Appropriations	7
Three Program Approaches to Domestic Resettlement	7
(1) State-Administered Program	7
(2) Wilson/Fish Alternative Program	13
(3) Voluntary Agency Matching Grant Program	15
Partnerships to Improve Employment and Self-Sufficiency Outcomes	16
Grant terminations were mainly RCA cases	24
The California Initiative	25
National Discretionary Projects	25
Preventive Health	27
Summary of Current Discretionary Grants	29
Microenterprise Development Initiative	34
Third Year Continuations:	34
Second Year Continuations:	35
Microenterprise (Targeted Assistance)	35
Community/Family Strengthening	36
ORR Standing Announcement	41
Ethnic Community Organization	43
Other	43
Program Monitoring	44
III. REFUGEES IN THE UNITED STATES	45
Population Profile	45
Nationality of U. S. Refugee Population	45
Geographic Location of Refugees	46
Secondary Migration	47
Economic Adjustment	49
Overview	49

APPENDIX A	1
TABLES	1
APPENDIX B	
FEDERAL AGENCY REPORTS	
Office of Refugee Health	4
APPENDIX C	
RESETTLEMENT AGENCY REPORTS	
Episcopal Migration Ministries	4
Ethiopian Community Development Council	7
Hebrew Immigrant Aid Society	10
Immigration and Refugee Services of America	12
International Rescue Committee, Inc.	14
Iowa Department of Human Services	16
Lutheran Immigration and Refugee Service	18
United States Catholic Conference	21
World Relief Corporation	24
APPENDIX D	
STATE REFUGEE COORDINATORS	
State Refugee Coordinators	1

Executive Summary

The Refugee Act of 1980 (section 413(a) of the Immigration and Nationality Act) requires the Secretary of Health and Human Services to submit an annual report to Congress on the Refugee Resettlement Program. This report covers refugee program developments in Fiscal Year 1996, from October 1, 1995 through September 30, 1996. It is the thirtieth in a series of reports to Congress on refugee resettlement in the U.S. since FY 1975 and the sixteenth to cover an entire year of activities carried out under the comprehensive authority of the Refugee Act of 1980.

Admissions

- Over 75,728 refugees and Amerasian immigrants were admitted to the United States in FY 1996. An additional 16,866 Cuban and 322 Haitian nationals were admitted as entrants.

Reception and Placement Activities

- In FY 1996, ten non-profit organizations were responsible for the reception and initial placement of refugees through cooperative agreements with the Department of State.

Domestic Resettlement Program

- **Refugee Appropriations:** The Office of Refugee Resettlement (ORR) obligated \$410.0 million in FY 1996 for the costs of assisting refugees and Cuban and Haitian entrants. Of this, States received about \$214.6 million for the costs of providing cash and medical assistance to eligible refugees and entrants.
- **Social Services:** In FY 1996, ORR provided States with \$67.7 million in formula grants for a broad range of services for refugees, such as English language and employment-related training.

- **Targeted Assistance:** ORR provided \$60.4 million in targeted assistance funds to supplement available services in areas with large concentrations of refugees and entrants.
- **Unaccompanied Minors:** Since FY 1979, a total of 11,554 minors have been cared for until they were reunited with relatives or reached the age of emancipation. The number remaining in the program as of September 30, 1996 was 538, a decrease of 541 from a year earlier.
- **Voluntary Agency Matching Grant Program:** Grants totaling \$25.1 million were awarded in FY 1996. Under this program, Federal funds are awarded on a matching basis to national voluntary resettlement agencies to provide assistance and services to refugees.
- **Refugee Health:** ORR provided funds directly to State and local health departments for refugee health assessments. Obligations for these activities amounted to about \$2.6 million.
- **Wilson/Fish Alternative Projects:** ORR provided \$14.4 million to fund alternative projects in Massachusetts, Oregon, Kentucky, Nevada, and California to help refugees find employment and reduce assistance costs.
- **National Discretionary Projects:** ORR approved projects totaling approximately \$12.1 million to improve refugee resettlement operations at the national, regional, State, and community levels. ORR awarded 56 grants totalling \$5.8 million to support projects to strengthen refugee communities and families. Other discretionary projects provided funds for business loans to refugee entrepreneurs.

Key Federal Activities

Operation Pacific Haven

- In response to a compelling set of circumstances that developed in Iraq in the fall of 1996, the U.S. government airlifted just over 6,600 Kurdish and Iraqi evacuees from a temporary safe-haven in Turkey to Guam for asylum processing at Andersen Air Force Base. The Secretary of Health and Human Services (HHS), under the authority contained in Section 412(b)(3) of the Immigration and Nationality Act, asked ORR to enter into Cooperative Agreements with nine voluntary agencies (VOLAGS) to provide Reception and Placement services to the evacuees. Cooperative Agreements were also undertaken with the Immigration and Refugee Services of America (IRSA) to act as the Joint Voluntary Agency on Guam (representing all nine VOLAGS); and the International Organization for Migration (IOM) to provide transportation for the evacuees from Guam to their resettlement sites throughout the U.S. An Interagency Agreement between HHS and the Department of Defense (DOD) was entered into to facilitate further HHS support of DOD activities on Guam.
- **Congressional Consultations for FY 1996 Admissions:** Following consultations with Congress, President Clinton set a world-wide refugee admissions ceiling at 90,000 for FY 1996.

Refugee Population Profile

- Southeast Asians remain the largest group admitted since 1975, with about 1.2 million refugees, including about 72,000 Amerasian immigrant arrivals. Nearly 450,000 refugees from the former Soviet Union arrived in the U.S. during this period.
- Other refugees who have arrived in substantial numbers since the enactment of the Refugee Act of 1980 include Romanians,

Iranians, Poles, Ethiopians, Afghans, and Iraqis.

- Seven States have Southeast Asian refugee populations of 25,000 or more and account for about 71 percent of the total Southeast Asian refugee population in the U.S. The States of California, Texas, and Washington continue to hold the top three positions.

Economic Adjustment

- The Fall 1996 annual survey of refugees who have been in the U.S. less than five years indicated that about 51 percent of refugees age 16 or over were employed as of September 1996, as compared with about 63 percent for the U.S. population.
- The labor force participation rate was about 57 percent for the sampled refugee population, compared with 67 percent for the U.S. The unemployment rate was 11 percent, compared with 5.4 percent for the U.S. population.
- Approximately 49 percent of all sampled households were entirely self-sufficient. About 23 percent received both public assistance and earned income; and another 24 percent received only public assistance.
- Approximately 22 percent of refugees in the five-year sample population received medical coverage through an employer, while 41 percent received benefits from Medicaid or Refugee Medical Assistance. About 20 percent of the sample population had no medical coverage in any of the previous 12 months.
- The average number of years of education was the highest for the former Soviet Union (12.0 years), while the lowest was for Southeast Asian countries other than Vietnam (3.0 years). About six percent of refugees reported spoke good English well or fluently upon arrival, but another 71 percent spoke no English at all.

- Approximately 46 percent of refugee households in the five-year sample population received some sort of cash assistance. The most common form of cash assistance was General Assistance, received by about 15 percent of refugee households. About 48 percent of refugee households received food stamps, and 12 percent lived in public housing.

1996 Report to Congress

Director's Message

FY 1996 was in many respects a new beginning for the domestic refugee resettlement program. Three key events occurred in FY 1996: 1) welfare reform; 2) full implementation in the State-administered programs of our response to the Government Performance and Results Act (GPRA); 3) the resettlement of over 6,500 asylees from Northern Iraq and the Office of Refugee Resettlement's role in this humanitarian effort.

We remained committed to the goal of helping refugees achieve early economic self-sufficiency and social adjustment through immediate access to refugee-specific services. In FY 1996, we earnestly began emphasizing our own accountability for results in this area. We began measuring performance in the State-administered programs using six indicators: entered employments, 90-day employment retentions, cash assistance terminations due to earnings, cash assistance reductions due to earnings, average hourly wage at placement and entered employments with health benefits available. New in this year's report is an entire section devoted to GPRA.

We look forward to implementing GPRA in the Voluntary Agency Matching Grant program, the Wilson/Fish alternative programs and the discretionary programs in FY 1997.

In FY 1996, our new regulation became effective, and with it our emphasis on serving the newly arrived became more firmly established. This regulation, for the first time, limited services funded by our main formula-driven programs, Social Services and Targeted Assistance, to refugees and entrants who have been in the U.S. for less than five years.

Refugees retained their eligibility for mainstream aid programs under the welfare reform legislation enacted in FY 1996. While we are only just beginning to see the legislation's effects on refugees, we know that it will have an impact. For this reason, I continue to be pleased with the partnerships we have established among all the sectors involved in resettlement. There is no single approach to resettlement that will be appropriate in all circumstances, and we must all work together to ensure the many programs that serve refugees are producing our desired results.

One result of such partnerships is the California Initiative. As this year's report illustrates, this Federal/State/County team is producing outcomes far exceeding our expectations. For example, in Merced County, 30 program changes have been implemented. One measurement is telling: there was a 52 percent increase in the number of 90-day job retentions in FY 1996 as compared to FY 1995.

At the State and local level, there has been a good deal of activity around creating alternative programs using the "Fish/Wilson" authority. Some projects were established when the State government decided not to continue administering the program, such as in Kentucky; and some projects are being established on a huge scale as refugee specific alternatives to mainstream aid programs, such as in Massachusetts.

Our discretionary programs continue to fill needed gaps, and the number of grants we administer continues to increase accordingly. From microenterprise development to providing funding to voluntary agencies to encourage them to place refugees in preferred communities, the discretionary initiatives continue to play critical roles in resettlement. I encourage the reader to

take time to read through the section devoted to discretionary grants in order to appreciate more fully the types of programs we encourage and help fund.

Just at the end of the fiscal year, the program once again demonstrated the need to be able to respond quickly to international crises. The situation in northern Iraq deteriorated to such an extent that the U.S. decided to evacuate over 6,500 people who had special ties to our country.

Because these evacuees were to be brought almost directly to U.S. territory (Andersen Air Force Base in Guam), their processing and resettlement were handled differently from those of refugees. They were processed as asylees and, as such, ORR was responsible for the Joint Voluntary Agency, assisting in the Defense Department's costs associated with their care and maintenance. ORR staff were detailed to the base. ORR funded transportation from Guam to the continental U.S. through the International Organization for Migration, and ORR was responsible for reception and placement.

In conclusion, the domestic refugee resettlement program is in a position to meet the needs of refugees today and to meet the future challenges facing the program. Refugee resettlement represents the very best in America's tradition of rescuing the persecuted and welcoming them to the land of the free.

Lavinia Limon
Director, Office of Refugee Resettlement

I. INTRODUCTION

Section 413(a) of the Immigration and Nationality Act “the Act”) requires the Secretary of Health and Human Services to submit a report to Congress on the Refugee Resettlement Program not later than January 31 following the end of each fiscal year. The Act requires that the report contain the following:

- An updated profile of the employment and labor force statistics for refugees who have entered the U.S. under the Immigration and Nationality Act within the period of five fiscal years 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 47-50 of the report);
- A description of the extent to which refugees received the forms of assistance or services under Title IV, Chapter 2 (entitled “Refugee Assistance”) of the Act (Part II, pages 7-25);
- A description of the geographic location of refugees (Part II, pages 5-7 and Part III, pages 47-50);
- A summary of the results of the monitoring and evaluation of the programs administered by the Department of Health and Human Services (Part II, page 45) during the fiscal year for which the report is submitted;
- 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 7-25 and Appendix C);
- ORR’s plans for improvement of refugee resettlement (Pages 1-2);
- 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 III, pages 51-67);
- Any fraud, abuse, or mismanagement which has been reported in the provision of services or assistance (Part II, page 45);
- A description of assistance provided by the Director of ORR pursuant to section 412(e)(5) (Part II, page 11);
- A summary of the location and status of unaccompanied refugee children admitted to the U.S. (Part II, pages 12-13); and

In response to the reporting requirements listed above, refugee program developments from October 1, 1995 until September 30, 1996 are described in Parts II and III.

II. ORR'S REFUGEE RESETTLEMENT PROGRAM

Admissions

To be admitted to the United States, refugees must be determined by an officer of the Immigration and Naturalization Service to meet the definition of refugee as defined in the Refugee Act of 1980. They also must be determined to be of special humanitarian concern to the U.S., be admissible under U.S. law, and not be firmly resettled in another country. Special humanitarian concern generally applies to refugees with relatives residing in the U.S., refugees whose status as refugees has occurred as a result of their association with the U.S., refugees who have a close tie to the U.S. due to education here or employment by the U.S. government. In addition, the U.S. admits a share of refugees determined by the United Nations High Commission for Refugees to be in need of resettlement in a third country outside the region from which they have fled.

The ceiling for the number of refugees to be admitted each year is determined by the President after consultation between the Executive Branch and the Congress. The President has authority to respond beyond the ceiling in cases of refugee emergencies. The table below shows the arrivals versus the ceilings in FYs 1983-1996.

For FY 1996 the refugee ceiling was 90,000.¹ During FY 1996, 74,822 refugees and 906

Year	Ceiling	Admissions	% Admitted
1996	90,000	75,728	84.1
1995	112,000	99,553	88.8
1994	121,000	112,065	92.6
1993	132,000	119,050	90.2
1992	142,000	131,749	92.8
1991	131,000	113,980	87.0
1990	125,000	122,935	98.3
1989	116,500	106,932	91.8
1988	60,500	76,930	127.2
1987	70,000	58,863	84.1
1986	67,000	60,559	90.4
1985	70,000	67,166	96.0
1984	72,000	70,604	98.1
1983	90,000	60,040	66.7

Source: Reallocated ceilings from Department of State (except for FY 1989 in which the reallocated ceiling was revised from 94,000 to 116,500). Admissions based on ORR data system, as of March 1997. Includes Private Sector Initiative admissions and Amerasians.

Amerasians were admitted to the U.S. In addition, 16,866 Cuban and 322 Haitian entrants and humanitarian parolees were admitted to the U.S. The Population Profile section and associated tables in Appendix A of this report provide refugee (including Amerasian) and entrant arrival numbers by country of origin and State of initial resettlement for the period FY 1983 through FY 1996.

¹ In this report, unless otherwise noted, the term "refugee" refers to persons admitted as refugees or as Amerasian immigrants, but not to Cuban or Haitian nationals designated as entrants.

Also considered entrants for the purposes of ORR-funded assistance and services are Cuban and Haitian nationals who are (a) paroled into the U.S., or (b) subject to exclusion or deportation proceedings under the Act, or (c) applicants for asylum.

Public interest and humanitarian parolees arriving from nations other than Cuba or Haiti are not considered entrants and not eligible for ORR-funded assistance. Similarly, individuals from nations other than Cuba or Haiti who apply for asylum are not eligible for ORR-funded assistance until asylum is granted.

Reception and Placement

Most persons eligible for ORR's refugee program benefits are the refugees resettled through the Department of State's refugee allocations system under the annual ceiling for refugee admissions. Upon arrival, refugees are provided initial services through a program of grants, called Cooperative Agreements, made by the Department of State to qualifying agencies. In FY 1996 the following agencies participated: Church World Service, Episcopal Migration Ministries, Ethiopian Community Development Council, Hebrew Immigrant Aid Society, Iowa Refugee Service Center, International Rescue Committee, Immigration and Refugee Services of America, Lutheran Immigration and Refugee Service, United States Catholic Conference, and World Relief Refugee Service.

These grantee agencies are responsible to provide initial "nesting" services covering basic food, clothing, shelter, orientation, and referral for the first 30 days. In FY 1996, the agencies received a per capita amount of \$700 for this purpose. After this period, needy refugees are eligible for the assistance provided under ORR's program of domestic assistance.

ORR Assistance and Services

All persons admitted as refugees or granted asylum while in the U.S. are eligible for refugee benefits described in this report. Certain other persons admitted to the United States under other immigration statuses are also eligible for refugee benefits. Amerasians from Vietnam and their accompanying family members, though admitted to the U.S. as immigrants, are entitled to the same social services and assistance benefits as refugees. Certain nationals of Cuba and Haiti, such as public interest parolees and asylum applicants, may also receive benefits in the same manner and to the same extent as refugees if they

reside in States with an approved Cuban/Haitian Entrant Program.

Cuban and Haitian Arrivals in FY 1995 and FY 1996

In FY 1996, 17,188 Cuban and Haitian entrants arrived in the United States. Seventy-four percent initially resettled in Florida. In FY 1995, 32,001 arrived in the United States with 82 percent initially resettling in Florida. This was the largest wave of Cuban and Haitian refugees/entrants who arrived since the 1980 Mariel boat lift.

Under the terms of a Bilateral Agreement between the U.S. and Cuba, a maximum 20,000 Cuban immigrants were initially allowed into the U.S. annually. This number was reduced to a maximum of 15,000 Cuban immigrants for the next four years (offsetting the number of Cubans resettled from Guantanamo).

Domestic Resettlement Program

Refugee Appropriations

In FY 1996, the refugee and entrant assistance program was funded under the Departments of Labor, Health and Human Services, Education, and Related Agencies, and the Foreign Operations Appropriations Acts. The total HHS funding obligated to States and other grantees through the refugee program was approximately \$410.0 million. This compares with \$396.2 million obligated the prior year.

Approximately \$214.6 million was obligated for the State-administered programs of Refugee Cash Assistance (RCA) and Refugee Medical Assistance (RMA). Another \$67.7 million was awarded in formula grants for social services to help States provide refugees with employment services, English language training, vocational training, and other support services to promote economic self-sufficiency and reduce refugee dependence on public assistance programs. An additional \$12.1 million in social services funds was obligated for the national discretionary funds program. Among these awards were grants for Community and Family Strengthening projects and micro-enterprise loan programs. These and other discretionary grant programs are discussed in greater detail, beginning on page 27.

Also in FY 1996, ORR provided \$60.4 million for its targeted assistance program. The objective of this program is to assist refugee and entrant populations in heavily concentrated areas of resettlement where State, local, and private resources have proved insufficient. Almost \$25.3 million was allocated to States according to formula; \$19 million was awarded to Florida, New Mexico, and New York to serve communities affected by recent Cuban and Haitian entrant arrivals; and another \$16.1 million was awarded as part of the discretionary grant program.

Under the Matching Grant program, voluntary resettlement agencies were awarded nearly \$25.1 million in FY 1996 matching funds for assistance and services to resettle refugees from the former Soviet Union and other refugees. Funds were provided for this activity in lieu of regular

State-administered cash assistance, case management, and employment services.

Obligations for health screening and follow-up medical services for refugees amounted to about \$5.1 million in FY 1996. Funds were used by ORR to award grants to State and local health agencies for refugee health assessment services.

Three Program Approaches to Domestic Resettlement

The domestic refugee program consists of three resettlement approaches: (1) The State-administered program; (2) the Wilson/Fish program; and (3) the Matching Grant program.

(1) State-Administered Program

Overview

Federal resettlement assistance to refugees is provided by ORR primarily through a State-administered refugee resettlement program. States administer the provision of transitional 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. States participating in the refugee program are required to submit a plan which describes the nature and scope of the State refugee program and gives assurances that the program will be administered in conformity with the Refugee Act.

ORR Obligations: FY 1996
(Amounts in \$000)

A. State-administered program:	
Cash assistance, medical assistance, unaccompanied minors, and State administration	\$214,614
Social Services (State formula allocation)	67,745
Targeted Assistance (State formula allocation)	44,318
Subtotal, State-administered program	326,676
B. Discretionary Allocations:	
Targeted Assistance (Ten Percent)	11,079
Targeted Assistance (Supplemental)	5,000
Social Services	12,120
Subtotal, Discretionary Allocations	28,200
C. Alternative Programs:	
Voluntary Agency Matching Grant Program	25,132
Privately-administered Wilson/Fish projects*	4,513
Subtotal, Alternative Programs	29,645
D. Preventive Health: Screening and Health Services	5,077
E. Other	
Kurdish emergency assistance	19,800
Data Collection	554
Subtotal, Other	20,354
Total, Refugee Program Obligations	\$409,953

*Includes \$936,887 in formula social service funds earmarked for privately administered Wilson/Fish demonstration programs.

Note: Sums do not total due to rounding.

Cash and Medical Assistance

Needy refugees who meet the eligibility requirements for the Aid to Families with Dependent Children (AFDC) program¹, the Supplemental Security Income (SSI) program, and the Medicaid program receive benefits under these programs on the same basis as citizens.

Needy refugees who do not qualify for the AFDC (now Temporary Assistance for Needy Families, (TANF), SSI, or Medicaid programs, but who meet the income and resource eligibility standards of these programs, are eligible to receive special refugee cash assistance (RCA) and refugee medical assistance (RMA) through the refugee program during their first eight months in the U.S.

The Federal refugee program reimburses States for their full costs for the RCA and RMA programs and associated State administrative costs. Refugee program reimbursement for the State costs of the AFDC, SSI, and Medicaid programs is no longer provided due to insufficient funding.

Cash and medical assistance allocations for each State are presented in the table on pages 10-11.

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, for the purpose of helping refugees to obtain employment and achieve economic self-sufficiency and social adjustment as quickly as possible. During FY 1996, as in previous fiscal years, ORR allocated 85 percent of the social service funds on a formula basis.

Under this formula, \$67,745,700 in social service funds were allocated directly to States according to their proportion of all refugees who arrived in the U.S. during the previous three fiscal years. States with small refugee populations received a minimum of \$75,000 in social service funds. An additional \$936,887 in social service funds was awarded to privately administered Wilson/Fish

demonstration projects in Kentucky, Nevada, and California. Social service allocations for each State are presented in the table on pages 10-11.

Targeted Assistance

The targeted assistance program funds employment and other services 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 entrant populations, high refugee or entrant concentrations in relation to the overall population, and high use of public assistance, there exists a need for supplementation of other available service resources to help the local refugee or entrant population obtain employment with less than one year's participation in the program.

In FY 1996, ORR obligated \$60,397,000 for targeted assistance activities for refugees and entrants. Of this, \$25,317,600 was awarded by formula to 21 states on behalf of the 39 counties eligible for targeted assistance grants. Another \$19 million was specially earmarked by Congress and awarded to four counties in Florida, the New York metropolitan area, and Bernadillo County, New Mexico for the impact of Cuban/Haitian entrants. Florida received \$18,110,585; New Mexico received \$438,808; and New York received \$450,607. The remaining \$16.1 million was awarded as discretionary grants under the targeted assistance ten percent program. A discussion of these discretionary awards may be found beginning on page 29.

The table on pages 10-11 presents the amount of funds awarded to each State under the formula allocation program. The amounts for individual counties are provided in the following tables.

¹ In FY 1997, the Temporary Assistance for Needy Families (TANF) program will replace the AFDC program.

CMA (a/), Social Services (b/), and Targeted Assistance (c/) Obligations by State: FY 1996

State	CMA	Social Services	Targeted Assistance	Total
Alabama	\$87,552	\$124,525		\$212,077
Arizona	4,623,738	731,428		5,355,166
Arkansas	13,620	98,774		112,394
California	34,751,528	13,972,177	7,570,043	56,293,748
Colorado	2,165,017	683,012	197,296	3,045,325
Connecticut	2,564,189	566,705		3,130,894
Delaware	33,605	75,000		108,605
Dist.Columbia	2,951,268	314,082	257,333	3,522,683
Florida	61,019,132	9,892,687	21,650,673	92,562,492
Georgia	4,830,000	1,795,877	713,865	7,339,742
Hawaii	177,308	135,423		312,731
Idaho	792,605	195,631		988,236
Illinois	7,583,032	2,318,632	1,098,135	10,999,799
Indiana	113,026	206,351		319,377
Iowa	2,169,584	619,231	160,559	2,949,374
Kansas	556,420	379,828		936,248
Kentucky d/	0	0		0
Louisiana	207,986	413,773		621,759
Maine	184,273	129,528		313,801
Maryland	1,950,195	1,165,926	205,774	3,321,895
Massachusetts	8,170,917	1,824,819	366,622	10,362,358
Michigan	4,756,500	1,422,123	236,571	6,415,194
Minnesota	3,033,054	1,763,540	584,795	5,381,389
Mississippi	568,581	75,000		643,581
Missouri	2,436,000	898,474	313,852	3,648,326
Montana	42,203	75,000		117,203
Nebraska	1,310,260	331,233	166,961	1,808,454
Nevada e/	0	0		0
New Hampshire	400,647	122,738		523,385
New Jersey	6,061,885	1,402,828		7,464,713
New Mexico	1,759,906	376,612	612,747	2,749,265
New York	17,391,139	11,003,229	5,975,251	34,369,619
North Carolina	1,365,000	580,105		1,945,105
North Dakota	1,063,710	187,413		1,251,123
Ohio	3,328,366	914,554		4,242,920
Oklahoma	389,137	244,226		633,363
Oregon	4,465,158	981,193	664,671	6,111,022
Pennsylvania	4,495,683	1,774,795	499,152	6,769,630
Rhode Island	209,288	117,915		327,203
South Carolina	87,642	100,000		187,642

**CMA (a), Social Services (b), and Targeted
Assistance (c) Obligations by State: FY 1996**

State	CMA	Social Services	Targeted Assistance	Total
South Dakota	388,872	117,557		506,429
Tennessee	644,048	623,340	190,779	1,458,167
Texas	7,223,221	3,047,738	1,430,961	11,701,920
Utah	1,785,000	316,940		2,101,940
Vermont	631,522	128,634		760,156
Virginia	3,138,243	1,094,284	405,377	4,637,904
Washington	11,195,629	3,413,809	1,016,183	15,625,621
West Virginia	2,339	75,000		77,339
Wisconsin	1,495,916	913,124		2,409,040
Total	\$214,613,944	\$67,744,813	\$44,317,600	\$326,676,357

- a/ Cash/Medical/Administrative, including Refugee Cash Assistance (RCA), Refugee Medical Assistance (RMA), aid to unaccompanied minors, and State administrative expenses. Does not include funds for privately administered Wilson/Fish programs in California (\$299,934), Kentucky (\$2,319,260), and Nevada (\$956,619), but includes funds for State-administered programs in Massachusetts (\$8,170,917) and Oregon (\$1,675,237).
- b/ Does not include funds for privately administered Wilson/Fish programs in California (\$184,198), Kentucky (\$448,255), and Nevada (\$304,434). Services for participants in State-administered programs in Oregon and Massachusetts are funded from their State allocations.
- c/ Formula grant only. Includes funds for communities affected by recent Cuban and Haitian entrants: Florida (\$18,110,585), New Mexico (\$438,808), and New York (\$450,607). Does not include Targeted Assistance Ten Percent funding.
- d/ Kentucky has not participated in the State-administered program since FY 1994. A privately administered Wilson/Fish program has since replaced the State-administered program.
- e/ Nevada ended its participation in the State-administered program April 30, 1994. A privately-administered Wilson/Fish alternative program has since replaced the State-administered program.

Targeted Assistance Allocations by County, FY 1996		
Alameda	CA	\$341,304
Fresno	CA	395,400
Los Angeles	CA	1,759,519
Merced	CA	108,712
Orange	CA	1,512,394
Sacramento	CA	747,892
San Diego	CA	787,224
San Francisco	CA	682,434
San Joaquin	CA	174,170
Santa Clara	CA	1,060,994
Denver	CO	197,296
District of Columbia	DC	257,333
Dade	FL	3,136,556
Duval	FL	189,280
Palm Beach	FL	214,252
DeKalb	GA	332,537
Fulton	GA	381,328
Cook/Kane	IL	1,098,135
Polk	IA	160,559
Baltimore	MD	205,774
Suffolk	MA	366,622
Oakland	MI	236,571
Hennepin	MN	307,046
Ramsey	MN	277,749
St. Louis	MO	313,852
Lancaster	NE	166,961
Bernadillo	NM	173,939
Broome	NY	124,572
Monroe	NY	205,947
New York	NY	5,061,479
Oneida	NY	132,646
Multnomah	OR	132,646
Philadelphia	PA	499,152
Davidson	TN	664,671
Dallas/Tarrant	TX	776,036
Harris	TX	654,925
Fairfax	VA	279,652
Richmond	VA	125,725
King/Snohomish	WA	1,016,183
Total		\$25,317,600

Targeted Assistance Allocations for Communities Affected by Recent Cuban and Haitian Arrivals		
FY 1996		
Broward	FL	\$930,346
Dade	FL	15,737,705
Hillsborough	FL	352,890
Palm Beach	FL	1,089,644
Bernadillo	NM	438,808
New York	NY	450,607
Total		\$19,000,000

Unaccompanied Minors

ORR continued its support of care for unaccompanied minor refugees in the U.S. These children, who are identified in countries of first asylum as requiring foster care upon their arrival in this country, are sponsored through two national voluntary agencies—United States Catholic Conference (USCC) and Lutheran Immigration and Refugee Service (LIRS)—and placed in licensed child welfare programs operated by their local affiliates, Catholic Charities and Lutheran Social Services, respectively.

Legal responsibility is established under laws of the State of resettlement 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 minor refugees are placed in home 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 eighteenth birthday or such higher age as is permitted under the State's Plan under title IV-B of the Social Security Act.

Since January, 1979, a total of 11,554 children have entered the program. Of these, 1,383 subsequently were reunited with family and 9,633 have reached the age of emancipation. Based on reports received from the States, the number in the

program as of September 30, 1996, was 538. The minors are placed in the licensed child welfare programs operated by the local affiliates of USCC and LIRS in areas with their ethnic community concentration. The number leaving the program by reaching the age of majority continues to accelerate. As a result, programs in some States have been phased out.

In progress reports on 537 children from 17 States, caseworkers rated children's progress in four categories—English language, general education, social adjustment, and health—on three levels: unsatisfactory, satisfactory, and superior. The sample analysis shows that 33 of the 537 attended school at the elementary level, 360 at the secondary level, 81 at the post-secondary level, while 63 are not in school.

Caseworker ratings by percentage were as follows:

	Superior	Satisfactory	Unsatisfactory
English language	24.0%	59.4%	16.6%
General education	21.0	58.1	20.9
Social adjustment	28.1	60.7	11.2
Health	34.3	61.5	3.7

(2) Wilson/Fish Alternative Program

An alternative approach to the State-administered program is the Wilson/Fish program. The Wilson/Fish amendment to the Immigration and Nationality Act, contained in the FY 1985 Continuing Resolution on Appropriations, directed the Secretary of the Department of Health and Human Services to develop alternatives to the regular State-administered program for the purpose of: (a) increasing refugee self-sufficiency, (b) avoiding welfare dependency, and (c) increasing coordination among service providers and resettlement agencies.

The Wilson/Fish authority provides 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. No separate

funding is appropriated; funds are drawn instead from regular cash and medical assistance grants and social services allocations. For this reason, projects are considered "budget neutral." Wilson/Fish alternative projects typically emphasize one or more of the following elements:

- Preclusion of otherwise eligible refugees from public assistance, with cash and/or medical assistance provided instead through specially designed alternative projects.
- Creation of a "front-loaded" service system which provides intensive services to refugees in the early months after arrival, with an emphasis on early employment.
- Integration of case management, cash assistance, and employment services generally under a single private agency that is equipped to work with refugees.
- Development of mechanisms for closer monitoring of refugee progress, including a more effective sanctioning system.

In FY 1996, ORR provided \$14,358,854 to fund three privately administered projects (Kentucky, Nevada, and San Diego) and two State-administered projects (Massachusetts and Oregon).

Kentucky

In FY 1996, the United States Catholic Conference (USCC) concluded its fifth year administering the Kentucky Wilson/Fish project. With Catholic Charities of Louisville as the lead agency, a consortium of six local affiliates of four voluntary agencies resettled 1,271 refugees and entrants. Enrollment was 30 percent greater than anticipated due to a large number of Cuban arrivals.

In addition to administering the social services and cash assistance component, the Kentucky Wilson/Fish contracts for private medical coverage.

During FY 1996, USCC and its affiliates provided employment services to 736 employable adults. Ninety-one percent (675) entered employment.

Massachusetts

The Massachusetts Office for Refugees and Immigrants completed its first year of administering a State-wide Wilson/Fish alternative project. The project restructures the delivery of cash assistance and services and creates a case management and tracking system that provides each refugee family with a single case manager who works with them for their entire eligibility period. New arrivals for the year numbered 2,309. Of these, 1,807 clients received employment services, and 1,230 (68 percent) entered employment.

Nevada

In FY 1996, ORR awarded USCC and its local affiliate Catholic Community Services of Nevada (CCSN), a fourth-year grant to administer a State-wide project in Nevada. Operating principally in the Las Vegas area, the project provides interim cash assistance, medical coverage through a private health plan, and social services including language, employment, and social adjustment services. The project enrolled a total of 1,148 refugee clients during FY 1996—a 240 percent increase over the number resettled in the previous year. This increase was due to the arrival of large numbers of Cubans from the Guantanamo Naval Base safe haven.

During FY 1996, CCSN provided employment services to 728 clients, with 466 (64 percent) finding employment.

Oregon

The Refugee Early Employment Program (REEP) completed its twelfth year of operation in 1996. The first Wilson/Fish project approved by ORR, REEP is a State-administered project serving a tri-county area comprised of Multnomah, Clackamas, and Washington counties. Affiliates of three voluntary agencies—USCC, Church World Service (CWS) and Lutheran Immigration and Refugee Services (LIRS)—determine eligibility and provide cash assistance and case management

services. The Oregon Health Plan, a health care reform demonstration project approved by the Health Care Financing Administration, provides medical services to each participant family.

Of the 1,637 refugees who arrived in Oregon during the fiscal year, 1,184 received REEP employment services, and 1,136 (96 percent) entered employment.

San Diego

Since 1990 the USCC has operated an alternative project for refugees which it resettles in San Diego. This project uses a one-stop shopping approach to provide comprehensive services and cash assistance to participants. In FY 1996, it received a proportional share of California's social services formula allocation. The project enrolled 274 new clients; 190 (69 percent) entered employment during the year.

Wilson/Fish 1996 Awards

	CMA	Social Services	Total
Private			
Kentucky	\$2,319,260	\$448,255	\$2,767,515
Nevada	\$956,619	\$304,434	\$1,261,053
San Diego	\$299,934	\$184,198	\$484,132
Subtotal	\$3,575,813	\$936,887	\$4,512,700
State			
Oregon	\$1,675,237	0	\$1,675,237
Massachusetts	\$8,170,917	0	\$8,170,917
Subtotal:	\$9,846,154	0	\$9,846,154
Total:	\$13,421,967	\$936,887	\$14,358,854

Note: The States of Oregon and Massachusetts received social service funds through the normal allocation process. Both States received their CMA funds through the formula allocation process.

*Does not include discretionary funds of \$22,000.

**Does not include prior year funds.

(3) Voluntary Agency Matching Grant Program

The Matching Grant program, funded by Congress since 1979, provides an alternative approach to State-administered resettlement assistance. The program's goal is to help refugees attain self-sufficiency within four months after arrival without access to public cash assistance. Participating agencies agree to match the ORR grant with cash and in-kind contributions; twenty percent of their match must be in cash.

Since its inception, participating voluntary agencies have received matching grants of up to \$1,000 for each refugee for whom they provided equivalent cash or in-kind services. In mid-1996, ORR replaced the dollar-for-dollar match with a \$1.40-for-dollar match. Participating agencies then applied for supplements to their 1996 grants calculated at the new match level. The new match level enabled ORR to award matching grants of up to \$1,400 per refugee.

The Matching Grant program is characterized by a strong emphasis on early employment and intensive services during the first four months after arrival. ORR requires participating agencies to provide maintenance (food and housing), case management, and employment services in-house. Additional services, such as language training and medical assistance, may be provided in-house or arranged through referral to other programs. Refugees in the Matching Grant program may use publicly funded medical assistance.

Refugees from the Soviet Union and its successor republics have been the primary beneficiaries of the program since its commencement in 1979. About 61 percent of current participants are from the former Soviet Union. Southeast Asians, Bosnians, Ethiopians, Somalis, and Iraqis comprise most of the balance. Nine voluntary agencies operated programs in 185 locations last year and provided resettlement services to about one-fourth of all refugee arrivals. Altogether, 24,268 individuals completed four months of participation during 1996.

Church World Service (CWS) was awarded \$445,270 to enroll 467 refugees in 11 sites. CWS actually enrolled 320 refugees at eight sites and served a total of 367 refugees during 1996,

including 47 refugees who arrived at the end of 1995. The primary groups were Bosnian, Vietnamese, and Somali. The largest sites were Houston, Texas; Bristol, Tennessee; Denver, Colorado; and Greensboro, North Carolina.

Episcopal Migration Ministries (EMM) received \$360,495 to serve 389 refugees in the Matching Grant program. EMM enrolled 360 refugees at 11 sites and served a total of 505 refugees during 1996, including 145 refugees who arrived at the end of 1995. The largest ethnic groups served were Bosnian, Somali (Benadir), and Vietnamese. The largest sites were Denver, Colorado; Bristol, Tennessee; New Haven, Connecticut; and Fargo, North Dakota.

Ethiopian Community Development Council (ECDC) received \$231,000 in 1996 to serve 165 Matching Grant clients; they ultimately served 108 new enrollees. Their network was comprised of three sites in 1996: Houston, Texas (69 clients); Arlington, Virginia (31 clients); and Chicago, Illinois (8 clients). The major ethnic groups served in 1996 were Africans, Bosnians, Iraqis, and Kurds.

Hebrew Immigrant Aid Society (HIAS) received \$25,102,600 in FY 1996 funds. They resettled 14,423 newly arriving refugees, the vast majority from the successor republics of the former Soviet Union. They served 20,965 refugees, including 6,542 who continued services begun in 1995. Eighty-nine communities participated in the program during 1996. The six largest were New York City (7,053), Chicago (828), San Francisco (942), Los Angeles (753), Philadelphia (409), and Boston (399).

Immigration and Refugee Services of America (IRSA) was awarded \$1,502,400 to resettle 1,140 refugees at eight sites. IRSA served 1,431 refugees during 1996, including 291 who arrived at the end of 1995. Bosnian, Vietnamese, Somali, and Iraqi refugees were the largest client groups. Its largest sites were Kansas City and St. Louis, Missouri; Houston, Texas; and Erie, Pennsylvania.

International Rescue Committee (IRC) received an initial grant award of \$410,443 for its 1996 program to serve 400 clients. IRC served 314 new

arrivals and 73 clients who continued in the program from 1995, for a total of 387 clients served at five sites. The largest site was San Francisco, California. The largest ethnic groups served were Bosnians and Cubans.

Lutheran Immigration and Refugee Services (LIRS) was awarded \$1,795,490 in 1996 to serve 1,392 clients. They ultimately served 1,410, a 13 percent increase over the 1,247 clients served the year before. LIRS' major sites were Detroit, Michigan and Greensboro, North Carolina. The LIRS network added an eleventh site in 1996--Lutheran Social Services of Kansas/Oklahoma located in Wichita, Kansas. The major ethnic groups served in 1996 were Bosnians and Vietnamese.

United States Catholic Conference (USCC) received an initial grant of \$6,179,000 to serve 4,831 refugees. By the end of the year, USCC had served 4,411 arriving refugees at 41 sites in 24 States, plus 26 refugees who had continued in the program from 1995. The largest ethnic groups served were Vietnamese and Cubans. Its largest sites were Atlanta, Georgia; Grand Rapids, Michigan; and Hartford, Connecticut.

World Relief Corporation (WRC) received \$539,200 to resettle 400 refugees in five sites, which expanded their program four-fold over 1995. WRC enrolled 389 refugees and served 433 refugees during the year, including 44 refugees who enrolled at the end of 1995. The largest ethnic groups served were Vietnamese, Bosnians, and Cubans. Fort Worth was its largest site.

Except for HIAS, which places almost all eligible refugees into the program, grantees generally use the following criteria to select refugees for program participation: family size, resettlement site, motivation for employment, and willingness to participate in the program.

Participating agencies reported the following outcomes during the calendar year. For CWS, 78 percent of refugees were self-sufficient after four months; for EMM, 81 percent; for ECDC, 86 percent; for HIAS, 24 percent; for IRSA, 88 percent; for IRC, 69 percent; for LIRS, 85 percent; for USCC, 81 percent; and for WRC, 91 percent.

Partnerships to Improve Employment and Self-Sufficiency Outcomes

State Outcome Goal Plans

In FY 1996, the Office of Refugee Resettlement undertook a joint effort with States to place a priority on improving State performance regarding refugee employment and self-sufficiency outcomes. States and California counties were required to establish in FY 1996 annual outcome goals aimed at continuous improvement of performance along the following six outcome measures:

- **Entered Employments**, defined as the entry of a refugee into unsubsidized employment.
- **Terminations Due to Earnings**, defined as the termination of a cash assistance case (RCA, AFDC, general assistance) due to earned income.
- **Reductions Due to Earnings**, defined as a reduction in the amount of cash assistance that a case receives as a result of earned income.
- **Average Wage at Placement**, calculated as the sum of the hourly wages for the full-time placements divided by the total number of individuals placed in employment.
- **Job Retentions**, defined as the number of persons working for wages (in any unsubsidized job) on the 90th day after placement. This is a measure of continued participation in the labor market, not retention of a specific job.
- **Entered Employments with Health Benefits**, defined as a job placement with health benefits offered within six months of employment, regardless of whether the refugee actually avails himself of the insurance offered.

ORR tracked State and county performance throughout the year.

- **Entered Employments** totaled 49,373, a four percent rise from the number recorded in the baseline year of FY 1995 (47,344).
- **Terminations due to Earnings** totaled 11,517. These data were not collected in the baseline year.
- **Reductions due to Earnings** totaled 6,196. These data were not collected in the baseline year.
- **Average Wage At Placement** (\$5.92) rose five percent from the FY 1995 baseline wage of \$5.65 per hour.
- **Employment Retentions** (30,870) fell below the baseline FY 1995 total (31,848) by three percent.
- **Entered Employments with Health Benefits** reached 23,707. These data were not collected in the baseline year.

Overall, 27 States met or exceeded their goals for entered employments, with Illinois, Louisiana, Michigan, Missouri, and New Hampshire exceeding their estimated number of entered employments by sizable numbers. South Dakota and North Dakota were able to place their entire caseload into employment. Texas and Illinois did well among the larger States. Eight California counties met or exceeded their goals, with Los Angeles and Santa Clara counties exceeding their goals handily.

Twenty-three States met or exceeded their goals for terminations of cash assistance due to earnings. Kentucky, Nebraska, New Hampshire, Nevada and Rhode Island reported the highest rates of termination. Among the larger States, Texas and Minnesota reported the highest rates of termination. Eight California counties exceeded their goals, with San Francisco recording the highest rate of termination.

Seventeen States met their goals for reduction of cash assistance due to earnings, with New York reporting the highest rate of reduction in cash assistance due to earnings. Two California

counties met this goal, with San Joaquin County reporting the highest rate.

Twenty-eight States met or exceeded their goals for average wage at placement. New York, Delaware, New Jersey, and Rhode Island recorded the highest average wage at placement. Contra Costa and San Joaquin counties exceeded their goals by the largest amounts.

Job retention rates were highest in the District of Columbia, Kansas, Nebraska, and North Carolina. Overall, 24 States and 4 California counties met or exceeded this goal. Among the larger States, Texas and Pennsylvania reported the highest retention rates.

Thirty-one States met or exceeded their established goals for the availability of health insurance. All Entered Employments in Arkansas included health benefits. In six other States—Colorado, Hawaii, Idaho, North Carolina, South Carolina, and South Dakota—90 percent of placements were offered health benefits. Among the larger States, Washington, Georgia, Pennsylvania, and Massachusetts reported high rates of placement with health benefits. Five California counties met their goals.

ORR also tracked the overall cost per placement. This measure is the ratio of the total employment service funds used by the State for employment services divided by the number of refugees placed in employment with those funds during the year. The range for States was quite wide, from a low of \$204 per placement to a high of \$3,429 per placement. In California counties, unit costs ranged from \$1,025 to \$7,929 per placement.

Several States met a large proportion of their goals at a low cost per placement. Vermont exceeded each of its goals during the past year. Its cost per placement (\$490) was less than half the average cost per placement of all States for FY 1996 (\$1,079). Other States with good outcomes and low costs per placement were South Carolina, Idaho, Louisiana, and Georgia.

Shown below is a summary of the goals for FY 1996 set by each State in collaboration with ORR and the subsequent performance through the end of the fiscal year. For terminations, reductions, retentions, and health benefits, each goal and

described as a percentage of entered employments. Some States opted to express terminations and reductions as a percentage of cash assistance recipients, rather than entered employments. For health benefits, each is described as a percentage of full-time entered employments.

Alabama	Goal		Actual	
Caseload	160		160	
Entered Employments	120		139	
Terminations	15	13 %	6	4 %
Reductions	5	4 %	20	14 %
Average Wage	\$5.2		\$5.00	
Retentions	60	50 %	117	84 %
Health Benefits	25	21 %	37	27 %

In Alabama, arriving refugees seldom go on assistance. Its entered employments thus produced few cash assistance terminations and reductions.

Arizona	Goal		Actual	
Caseload	1,927		1,699	
Entered Employments	578		849	
Terminations	347	60 %	342	40 %
Reductions	6	1 %	9	1 %
Average Wage	\$4.87		\$5.19	
Retentions	405	70 %	442	52 %
Health Benefits	347	60 %	306	36 %

The caseload includes large numbers of refugees who sought only referral services. The State claims that its automated reporting system suffers from chronic under-reporting of placement and post-placement outcomes and is working to improve its reporting accuracy.

Arkansas	Goal		Actual	
Caseload	85		71	
Entered Employments	72		62	
Terminations	17	24 %	10	48 %
Reductions	0	0 %	0	0 %
Average Wage	\$5.90		\$5.90	
Retentions	61	85 %	58	94 %
Health Benefits	61	85 %	62	100 %

Only 21 of the 71 refugees in the caseload accessed RCA. The percentage for terminations reflects these refugees only. All refugees who entered employment earned enough income to terminate assistance.

Colorado	Goal		Actual	
Caseload	810		1,142	
Entered Employments	557		575	
Terminations	200	36 %	207	43 %
Reductions	55	10 %	38	8 %
Average Wage	\$5.87		\$6.48	
Retentions	482	87 %	323	56 %
Health Benefits	470	84 %	463	92 %

Colorado expresses cash assistance terminations and reductions as a percentage of cash assistance recipients who entered employment, rather than all refugees who entered employment.

Connecticut	Goal		Actual	
Caseload	735		818	
Entered Employments	391		531	
Terminations	89	22 %	132	25 %
Reductions	61	15 %	82	15 %
Average Wage	\$6.10		\$6.62	
Retentions	305	78 %	329	76 %
Health Benefits	205	52 %	201	38 %

Delaware	Goal		Actual	
Caseload	27		19	
Entered Employments	12		8	
Terminations	8	67 %	5	63 %
Reductions	1	8 %	0	0 %
Average Wage	\$7.73		\$7.16	
Retentions	11	92 %	4	67 %
Health Benefits	5	42 %	4	57 %

No reductions were reported because all refugees on cash assistance at placement were terminated from cash assistance.

Dist. of Columbia	Goal		Actual	
Caseload	1,000		678	
Entered Employments	650		304	
Terminations	66	10 %	35	12 %
Reductions	17	3 %	--	--
Average Wage	\$6.50		\$6.32	
Retentions	437	67 %	269	88 %
Health Benefits	514	79 %	209	77 %

The District cannot yet track terminations and reductions through its management information system. These figures are computed manually by providers and suffer from under-reporting problems.

Florida	Goal		Actual	
Caseload	11,426		18,569	
Entered Employments	6,766		7,097	
Terminations	2,841	42 %	130	2 %
Reductions	--	--	--	--
Average Wage	\$5.10		\$5.22	
Retentions	4,060	60 %	4,871	69 %
Health Benefits	2,165	32 %	3,174	46 %

As a result of an unexpected increase in Cuban arrivals, the 1996 caseload was approximately 7,000 more than anticipated. The State's data collection system under-reports the number of terminations due to coding and administrative errors. Due to low assistance payment levels, almost all refugees who enter employment terminate assistance.

Georgia	Goal		Actual	
Caseload	1,345		2,207	
Entered Employments	941		1,214	
Terminations	520	55 %	116	10 %
Reductions	0	0 %	0	0 %
Average Wage	\$5.90		\$6.02	
Retentions	672	71 %	847	70 %
Health Benefits	376	40 %	829	68 %

The State of Georgia is not currently able to identify refugees whose cash assistance is reduced due to earnings. The number of terminations is low because many refugees find work before applying for assistance.

Hawaii	Goal		Actual	
Caseload	114		117	
Entered Employments	79		100	
Terminations	71	90 %	64	64 %
Reductions	8	10 %	28	28 %
Average Wage	\$5.86		\$5.55	
Retentions	43	54 %	50	50 %
Health Benefits	79	100 %	75	93 %

Idaho	Goal		Actual	
Caseload	375		375	
Entered Employments	195		211	
Terminations	109	56 %	142	67 %
Reductions	--	--	3	1 %
Average Wage	\$5.46		\$5.63	
Retentions	147	75 %	173	82 %
Health Benefits	98	50 %	158	92 %

Idaho's benefit amount is very low; therefore, most full-time placements result in termination, rather than in a reduction of benefits.

Illinois	Goal		Actual	
Caseload	7,205		6,822	
Entered Employments	2,404		2,797	
Terminations	817	34 %	580	43 %
Reductions	525	14 %	468	35 %
Average Wage	\$7.05		\$6.93	
Retentions	1,805	75 %	1,286	48 %
Health Benefits	914	38 %	808	30 %

The shortfall in retentions and health benefits resulted largely from a growing trend toward use of temporary agency hires by Illinois employers. Illinois has presented its data on reductions and terminations as a percentage of cash assistance recipients who entered employment.

Indiana	Goal		Actual	
Caseload	200		428	
Entered Employments	156		250	
Terminations	39	25 %	68	57 %
Reductions	32	20 %	4	--
Average Wage	\$6.83		\$6.27	
Retentions	86	55 %	192	77 %
Health Benefits	47	30 %	191	84 %

Although its goals were established based on unduplicated data, Indiana's outcome data for FY 1996 includes duplicated data reported by quarter. Unduplicated totals will be available in FY 1997. The number of cash assistance reductions is under-reported for FY 1996 because the State did not begin to gather these data until late in the fiscal year.

Iowa	Goal		Actual	
Caseload	1,103		1,569	
Entered Employments	740		741	
Terminations	280	40 %	349	47 %
Reductions	140	20 %	62	8 %
Average Wage	\$6.45		\$5.86	
Retentions	666	90 %	669	87 %
Health Benefits	703	95 %	438	75 %

The caseload total for FY 1996 represents duplicated data. In Iowa, welfare recipients may receive an unreduced check for up to four months after employment begins. As a consequence, the State recorded relatively few reductions and terminations.

Kansas	Goal		Actual	
Caseload	898		898	
Entered Employments	614		689	
Terminations	262	43 %	217	31 %
Reductions	138	22 %	16	2 %
Average Wage	\$5.34		\$6.65	
Retentions	550	90 %	644	93 %
Health Benefits	444	72 %	464	81 %

Kentucky	Goal		Actual	
Caseload	820		984	
Entered Employments	739		618	
Terminations	739	80 %	281	87 %
Reductions	0	0 %	0	0 %
Average Wage	\$5.75		\$5.91	
Retentions	696	85 %	508	87 %
Health Benefits	522	60 %	383	62 %

The numbers recorded above for the Kentucky Wilson/Fish alternative project reflect only nine months of actual data. The reductions and terminations are presented as a percentage of entered employments of cash assistance recipients.

Louisiana	Goal		Actual	
Caseload	613		794	
Entered Employments	405		508	
Terminations	95	23 %	85	17 %
Reductions	0	0 %	0	0 %
Average Wage	\$4.82		\$4.93	
Retentions	299	74 %	321	74 %
Health Benefits	146	36 %	132	28 %

The number of terminations was lower than anticipated because many clients did not access cash assistance, but were placed directly into employment. No reductions were reported because Louisiana pays cash assistance at a level where any income from employment makes the client wholly ineligible for cash assistance.

Maine	Goal		Actual	
Caseload	203		190	
Entered Employments	112		104	
Terminations	35	31 %	34	33 %
Reductions	30	27 %	31	30 %
Average Wage	\$5.90		\$5.80	
Retentions	80	71 %	76	73 %
Health Benefits	60	54 %	48	77 %

Many jobs are of a temporary and seasonal nature and therefore do not result in cash assistance terminations.

Maryland	Goal		Actual	
Caseload	992		1,324	
Entered Employments	651		596	
Terminations	160	25 %	118	20 %
Reductions	0	0 %	0	0 %
Average Wage	\$5.60		\$6.14	
Retentions	520	80 %	506	85 %
Health Benefits	310	48 %	434	84 %

The State's cash assistance information system is not yet able to identify refugee reductions in cash assistance due to earnings.

Massachusetts	Goal		Actual	
Caseload	1,807		1,748	
Entered Employments	1,230		930	
Terminations	584	47 %	411	44 %
Reductions	366	29 %	129	14 %
Average Wage	\$5.70		\$6.87	
Retentions	622	51 %	558	60 %
Health Benefits	817	66 %	588	63 %

Michigan	Goal		Actual	
Caseload	2,354		1,989	
Entered Employments	1,153		1,269	
Terminations	219	41 %	241	45 %
Reductions	311	59 %	153	29 %
Average Wage	\$6.35		\$6.24	
Retentions	934	81 %	780	78 %
Health Benefits	807	70 %	873	87 %

Cash assistance termination and reduction rates are based on entered employments of refugees actually receiving assistance.

Minnesota	Goal		Actual	
Caseload	1,057		1,344	
Entered Employments	591		649	
Terminations	370	35 %	417	64 %
Reductions	63	6 %	59	9 %
Average Wage	\$6.78		\$6.98	
Retentions	391	37 %	530	61 %
Health Benefits	391	37 %	339	52 %

Mississippi	Goal		Actual	
Caseload	200		193	
Entered Employments	95		69	
Terminations	--	--	--	--
Reductions	--	--	--	--
Average Wage	\$4.90		\$4.98	
Retentions	95	49 %	46	67 %
Health Benefits	48	51 %	19	31 %

Cash assistance terminations and reductions were minimal in FY 1996 because most refugees begin work almost immediately after arrival without accessing cash assistance.

Missouri	Goal		Actual	
Caseload	1,077		2,096	
Entered Employments	905		1,301	
Terminations	492	82 %	552	42 %
Reductions	0	0 %	0	0 %
Average Wage	\$5.60		\$6.12	
Retentions	742	82 %	792	78 %
Health Benefits	633	70 %	898	77 %

Due to Missouri's low payment standards, minimum wage employment generally results in a termination of benefits, rather than a reduction in assistance.

Montana	Goal		Actual	
Caseload	188		202	
Entered Employments	89		77	
Terminations	0	0 %	14	18 %
Reductions	16	9 %	10	13 %
Average Wage	\$5.40		\$6.00	
Retentions	47	53 %	27	35 %
Health Benefits	20	22 %	3	6 %

In Montana, health benefits are rarely provided for jobs paying less than \$12.00 per hour. Most new arrivals are large families eligible for AFDC-UP.

Nebraska	Goal		Actual	
Caseload	487		421	
Entered Employments	300		278	
Terminations	290	97 %	278	100 %
Reductions	10	3 %	0	0 %
Average Wage	\$7.10		\$6.09	
Retentions	255	85 %	263	95 %
Health Benefits	270	90 %	182	66 %

All placements were full-time. Placement at entry level wages results in termination of benefits due to Nebraska's low benefit rate.

Nevada	Goal		Actual	
Caseload	520		891	
Entered Employments	520		363	
Terminations	390	75 %	326	90 %
Reductions	130	25 %	111	30 %
Average Wage	\$7.05		\$6.16	
Retentions	444	95 %	343	95 %
Health Benefits	442	85 %	288	80 %

The Wilson/Fish alternative program in Nevada received substantially more refugees than anticipated due to a large influx of Cuban entrants.

New Hampshire	Goal		Actual	
Caseload	145		200	
Entered Employments	115		173	
Terminations	88	77 %	173	100 %
Reductions	0	0 %	0	0 %
Average Wage	\$6.00		\$6.55	
Retentions	103	90 %	132	76 %
Health Benefits	52	54 %	132	76 %

No reductions in assistance due to earnings were recorded because the New Hampshire formula will terminate any full-time employee except in the case of very large families.

New Jersey	Goal		Actual	
Caseload	1,663		1,856	
Entered Employments	945		864	
Terminations	226	24 %	153	46 %
Reductions	47	5 %	30	9 %
Average Wage	\$6.61		\$7.04	
Retentions	660	70 %	583	67 %
Health Benefits	377	40 %	332	38 %

New Jersey's reductions and terminations are presented as a percentage of cash assistance recipients who entered employment.

New Mexico	Goal		Actual	
Caseload	505		347	
Entered Employments	404		279	
Terminations	101	25 %	36	13 %
Reductions	12	3 %	0	0 %
Average Wage	\$5.28		\$5.16	
Retentions	101	25 %	167	60 %
Health Benefits	40	10 %	232	83 %

Most refugees never access cash assistance; therefore, terminations and reductions are low.

New York	Goal		Actual	
Caseload	5,976		5,831	
Entered Employments	3,600		3,376	
Terminations	1,600	44 %	762	23 %
Reductions	540	15 %	2,614	77 %
Average Wage	\$7.00		\$7.59	
Retentions	2,260	63 %	1,687	50 %
Health Benefits	1,750	49 %	1,380	52 %

North Carolina	Goal		Actual	
Caseload	700		598	
Entered Employments	560		437	
Terminations	250	45 %	153	35 %
Reductions	5	1 %	6	1 %
Average Wage	\$5.60		\$5.86	
Retentions	448	80 %	425	97 %
Health Benefits	476	85 %	415	95 %

The number of reductions was small because more than half of the refugees placed in jobs went to work before receiving cash assistance.

North Dakota	Goal		Actual	
Caseload	250		268	
Entered Employments	250		268	
Terminations	210	84 %	0	0 %
Reductions	15	6 %	0	0 %
Average Wage	\$5.98		\$5.62	
Retentions	207	83 %	230	86 %
Health Benefits	191	76 %	212	82 %

North Dakota's welfare information management system is not yet able to track welfare utilization for refugees.

Ohio	Goal		Actual	
Caseload	2,535		2,342	
Entered Employments	700		646	
Terminations	114	16 %	104	16 %
Reductions	12	2 %	16	2 %
Average Wage	\$7.25		\$6.49	
Retentions	468	67 %	455	70 %
Health Benefits	529	76 %	549	85 %

Oklahoma	Goal		Actual	
Caseload	314		366	
Entered Employments	276		265	
Terminations	99	50 %	37	13 %
Reductions	0	0 %	0	0 %
Average Wage	\$5.15		\$4.94	
Retentions	214	66 %	162	67 %
Health Benefits	115	46 %	141	49 %

The majority of clients never access cash assistance; therefore, terminations are low and reductions almost non-existent.

Oregon	Goal		Actual	
Caseload	2,527		3,069	
Entered Employments	1,813		1,964	
Terminations	997	55 %	881	45 %
Reductions	816	45 %	334	17 %
Average Wage	\$6.08		\$6.04	
Retentions	1,396	77 %	1,584	71 %
Health Benefits	453	25 %	994	58 %

The number of reductions was smaller than its goal because many of the refugees who found jobs were no longer receiving cash assistance.

Pennsylvania	Goal		Actual	
Caseload	1,709		1,710	
Entered Employments	1,111		1,088	
Terminations	556	50 %	449	41 %
Reductions	165	15 %	101	9 %
Average Wage	\$6.50		\$6.31	
Retentions	890	80 %	797	73 %
Health Benefits	712	64 %	655	73 %

Rhode Island	Goal		Actual	
Caseload	270		155	
Entered Employments	203		127	
Terminations	162	80 %	127	100 %
Reductions	0	0 %	0	0 %
Average Wage	\$6.70		\$7.00	
Retentions	182	90 %	78	80 %
Health Benefits	152	75 %	75	59 %

South Carolina	Goal		Actual	
Caseload	165		155	
Entered Employments	124		113	
Terminations	64	52 %	53	47 %
Reductions	6	5 %	0	0 %
Average Wage	\$6.25		\$6.03	
Retentions	124	10 %	75	79 %
Health Benefits	124	100 %	105	93 %

Last year saw no recorded reductions due to earnings because all refugees on cash assistance who went to work received enough income to terminate their cash assistance.

South Dakota	Goal		Actual	
Caseload	350		269	
Entered Employments	275		269	
Terminations	200	73 %	--	--
Reductions	50	18 %	--	--
Average Wage	\$6.50		\$6.70	
Retentions	175	64 %	208	77 %
Health Benefits	100	36 %	224	94 %

South Dakota's management information system is not yet able to track welfare utilization of refugees.

Tennessee	Goal		Actual	
Caseload	927		1,537	
Entered Employments	556		607	
Terminations	55	10 %	316	52 %
Reductions	--	--	--	--
Average Wage	\$6.00		\$5.76	
Retentions	361	65 %	309	60 %
Health Benefits	139	25 %	248	42 %

Cash assistance reductions are not applicable in Tennessee because jobs result in cash assistance terminations.

Texas	Goal		Actual	
Caseload	4,800		4,837	
Entered Employments	2,680		2,988	
Terminations	252	22 %	510	87 %
Reductions	--	--	--	--
Average Wage	\$5.25		\$5.33	
Retentions	1,688	63 %	1,712	77 %
Health Benefits	1,126	42 %	1,810	65 %

The FY 1996 goals were based on duplicated outcomes recorded across quarters. Cash assistance terminations are presented as a percentage of RCA recipients who entered employment.

Utah	Goal		Actual	
Caseload	706		780	
Entered Employments	450		319	
Terminations	173	38 %	63	20 %
Reductions	37	8 %	32	10 %
Average Wage	\$6.00		\$6.10	
Retentions	412	92 %	260	82 %
Health Benefits	216	48 %	160	50 %

Vermont	Goal		Actual	
Caseload	140		208	
Entered Employments	129		194	
Terminations	83	64 %	154	79 %
Reductions	4	2 %	15	7 %
Average Wage	\$6.00		\$6.05	
Retentions	94	72 %	201	97 %
Health Benefits	102	79 %	138	72 %

Virginia	Goal		Actual	
Caseload	2,500		2,500	
Entered Employments	700		857	
Terminations	147	21 %	27	3 %
Reductions	20	3 %	5	1 %
Average Wage	\$5.60		\$5.87	
Retentions	357	51 %	720	84 %
Health Benefits	539	77 %	486	57 %

The Virginia information management system is not yet able to collect reduction and termination data on refugees.

Washington	Goal		Actual	
Caseload	3,000		3,700	
Entered Employments	1,950		2,280	
Terminations	900	46 %	1,154	51 %
Reductions	200	10 %	171	8 %
Average Wage	\$6.60		\$6.85	
Retentions	1,750	90 %	1,345	59 %
Health Benefits	976	50 %	1,880	76 %

West Virginia	Goal		Actual	
Caseload	27		14	
Entered Employments	23		11	
Terminations	10	43 %	3	27 %
Reductions	3	13 %	6	55 %
Average Wage	\$4.25		\$5.17	
Retentions	20	87 %	7	64 %
Health Benefits	7	30 %	1	33 %

Wisconsin	Goal		Actual	
Caseload	1,999		2,369	
Entered Employments	1,268		1,351	
Terminations	312	25 %	388	29 %
Reductions	145	11 %	149	11 %
Average Wage	\$6.27		\$6.52	
Retentions	900	71 %	935	76 %
Health Benefits	824	65 %	785	73 %

Wisconsin increased the number of long-term dependent cases in its caseload for FY 1996. Wisconsin records a grant termination only if it lasts three months and a grant reduction if it lasts six months. In FY 1996, Wisconsin reduced its cost per self-sufficiency from \$4,600 to \$3,900.

California Counties

Alameda	Goal		Actual	
Caseload	579		579	
Entered Employments	362		435	
Terminations	120	33 %	81	19 %
Reductions	24	7 %	24	6 %
Average Wage	\$5.50		\$5.00	
Retentions	300	83 %	288	66 %
Health Benefits	116	32 %	218	50 %

Contra Costa	Goal		Actual	
Caseload	206		305	
Entered Employments	135		155	
Terminations	39	29 %	64	41 %
Reductions	68	50 %	34	22 %
Average Wage	\$5.41		\$5.83	
Retentions	123	91 %	112	72 %
Health Benefits	13	10 %	27	30 %

Fresno	Goal		Actual	
Caseload	3,875		3,875	
Entered Employments	890		881	
Terminations	88	10 %	81	9 %
Reductions	645	73 %	383	43 %
Average Wage	\$5.00		\$4.95	
Retentions	662	74 %	532	60 %
Health Benefits	22	3 %	114	21 %

Los Angeles	Goal		Actual	
Caseload	2,716		5,695	
Entered Employments	1,250		2,458	
Terminations	388	31 %	--	--
Reductions	325	26 %	--	--
Average Wage	\$5.10		\$4.75	
Retentions	763	61 %	1,887	77 %
Health Benefits	489	50 %	--	--

During FY 1996, data on health benefits, terminations, and reductions were not collected.

Merced	Goal		Actual	
Caseload	255		512	
Entered Employments	96		209	
Terminations	9	9 %	14	7 %
Reductions	33	34 %	23	11 %
Average Wage	\$5.00		\$5.02	
Retentions	67	70 %	187	89 %
Health Benefits	32	33 %	9	4 %

The Merced County unemployment rate remained above 16 percent during FY 1996.

Orange	Goal		Actual	
Caseload	5,773		5,638	
Entered Employments	1,872		2,355	
Terminations	208	11 %	301	13 %
Reductions	500	27 %	316	13 %
Average Wage	\$4.90		\$4.81	
Retentions	1,225	65 %	1,157	49 %
Health Benefits	936	50 %	399	25 %

Cash assistance terminations and reductions are presented as a percentage of refugees who received cash assistance when they entered employment.

Sacramento	Goal		Actual	
Caseload	1,517		2,060	
Entered Employments	1,001		1,504	
Terminations	300	30 %	215	14 %
Reductions	200	20 %	223	15 %
Average Wage	\$5.10		\$5.33	
Retentions	514	51 %	725	48 %
Health Benefits	700	70 %	978	65 %

San Diego	Goal		Actual	
Caseload	923		923	
Entered Employments	572		575	
Terminations	141	25 %	204	36 %
Reductions	282	49 %	196	34 %
Average Wage	\$4.25		\$4.25	
Retentions	334	58 %	356	62 %
Health Benefits	10	2 %	52	9 %

San Francisco	Goal		Actual	
Caseload	347		331	
Entered Employments	276		118	
Terminations	174	63 %	99	84 %
Reductions	102	37 %	18	15 %
Average Wage	\$7.60		\$7.62	
Retentions	209	76 %	86	73 %
Health Benefits	174	63 %	18	15 %

San Francisco	Goal		Actual	
Caseload	347		331	
Entered Employments	276		118	
Terminations	174	63 %	99	84 %
Reductions	102	37 %	18	15 %
Average Wage	\$7.60		\$7.62	
Retentions	209	76 %	86	73 %
Health Benefits	174	63 %	18	15 %

Grant terminations were namely RCA cases.

San Joaquin	Goal		Actual	
Caseload	902		677	
Entered Employments	360		270	
Terminations	71	20 %	53	20 %
Reductions	231	64 %	173	64 %
Average Wage	\$4.75		\$5.50	
Retentions	231	64 %	173	64 %
Health Benefits	92	58 %	69	43 %

The unemployment rate in the county has remained at 13 percent.

Santa Clara	Goal		Actual	
Caseload	850		991	
Entered Employments	228		638	
Terminations	25	11 %	397	62 %
Reductions	129	57 %	241	38 %
Average Wage	\$5.60		\$5.49	
Retentions	147	65 %	357	56 %
Health Benefits	11	5 %	214	38 %

Grant terminations were mainly RCA cases

Stanislaus	Goal		Actual	
Caseload	850		519	
Entered Employments	228		104	
Terminations	25	11 %	14	13 %
Reductions	129	57 %	24	23 %
Average Wage	\$5.60		\$5.19	
Retentions	147	65 %	59	57 %
Health Benefits	11	5 %	--	--

Data on health benefits not available during FY 1996.

Tulare	Goal		Actual	
Caseload	265		136	
Entered Employments	45		31	
Terminations	3	7 %	1	3 %
Reductions	15	33 %	3	9 %
Average Wage	\$5.25		\$4.62	
Retentions	23	51 %	1	3 %
Health Benefits	12	27 %	--	--

In FY 1996, the unemployment rate for the county hovered around 19 percent -- more than double the State rate. The majority of placements were in part-time positions. Data on health benefits not tracked prior to October, 1996.

The California Initiative

The California Initiative is a special cooperative effort between the ORR, the California Department of Social Services (CDSS), and interested counties, which began in FY 1995, to improve refugee program results in selected counties in California. The Initiative is a multi-year effort. During FY 1995, a Federal/State/County team entered into a partnership to examine ways to improve employment and self-sufficiency outcomes for refugees residing in two California counties which are heavily impacted by refugee resettlement: Merced and Orange counties. The team conducted in-depth, on-site assessments of the existing service to improve the system and achieve better client outcomes.

In response to program improvements recommended by the team, Merced County made almost 30 program changes to its Greater Avenues for Independence (GAIN) program, the service system for county AFDC recipients, for the purpose of increasing employment and self-sufficiency outcomes among both refugee and general AFDC recipients. As a result of these program improvements, in FY 1996 Merced County was able to increase the number of entered employments among refugee AFDC recipients by 14 percent over FY 1995. More importantly, there was a 52 percent increase in the number of 90-day job retentions in FY 1996 compared to FY 1995. The job retention rate as a percentage of entered employments increased from 67 percent in FY 1995 to 89 percent in FY 1996.

In Orange County, the California Initiative resulted in the shifting of AFDC refugees from the GAIN system to the refugee-specific service system in the county and the expansion of the refugee service system to include a broader range of services needed to help refugees become self-sufficient. Since these program changes were not fully implemented until late in the fiscal year,

sufficient data are not yet available to determine whether these changes resulted in better outcomes.

National Discretionary Projects

During FY 1996, ORR approved approximately \$12 million in social services discretionary grants to improve resettlement at national, regional, State, and community levels.

Major discretionary awards included the following:

- \$6,155,770 in 65 grants to States and local non-profit agencies to strengthen refugee communities and families.
- \$1,578,085 to 8 national voluntary agencies to promote resettlement of refugees outside of impacted areas and in preferred communities.
- \$695,546 to 8 voluntary resettlement agencies to help them respond to the unexpected arrival of new ethnic populations.
- \$765,625 to 7 agencies to continue microenterprise projects of training, entrepreneurial skills, and small amounts of capital to help start small refugee businesses.
- \$627,056 to 4 grantees for mental health services, and
- \$539,606 to 6 grantees for orientation training and services.

In addition, ORR awarded approximately \$11 million in targeted assistance discretionary grants as follows:

- \$4,476,856 was awarded in 26 grants to States to continue special employment services.
- Under a special appropriation of \$5 million to ORR through the Foreign Operations, Export Financing, and Related Programs Appropriations Act, ORR provided \$4,959,108 to 17 States and one county to augment the targeted assistance

discretionary program, particularly to localities most impacted by the influx of refugees such as Loatian Hmong, Cambodians and Soviet Pentecostals. Additionally, ORR awarded \$688,893 to 5 States for microenterprise development projects. All of these grants are intended to increase refugees' progress toward economic independence.

Details of these awards follow.

Preventive Health

ORR awarded 42 grants totaling \$2,589,157 to States to screen newly arrived refugees for health problems that may need followed-up and treatment lest they become a public health problem.

Alabama	Control parasites, TB and hepatitis B, provide health education	\$11,457
Arizona	Maricopa County, Department of Health, treatment of TB, staff makes home visits, monitors compliance	42,678
California	Health assessment, TB and communicable, disease control	329,191
Colorado	TB control and preventive health assistance at State and local levels	34,651
Connecticut	Coordinate refugee health services; focus on TB	35,581
District of Columbia	Health screening, follow-up	40,364
Florida	Assessment, control of communicable diseases	161,499
Georgia	TB, Hepatitis B, improve birth outcomes for Somali women	56,779
Idaho	North Central District Health Department. Screen TB, hepatitis, follow-up	17,331
Illinois	Assessment, therapy, especially for TB and Hepatitis B	97,089
Indiana	Maintain database, follow-up	22,340
Iowa	Screening, follow-up	31,923
Kansas	Screening, treatment	24,769
Louisiana	Move refugees into existing health systems	29,033
Massachusetts	Control of disease, TB, Hepatitis B	118,320
Maryland	Coordinate with State and local health departments	66,567
Maine	Reimburse Division of Public Health Nursing for home visits	7,667
Michigan	Assist local agencies in outreach, translation, screening	63,739
Minnesota	Screening, follow-up	62,227

Missouri	Outreach, follow-up	45,750
Montana	Missoula County Health Department. Health intervention through 200 home visits, translation	5,000
North Carolina	Screening and treatment, TB, hepatitis, dental care	29,290
North Dakota	Screening, control of parasites, TB, hepatitis	7,740
Nevada	Screening, treatment, referral, TB	24,009
New Hampshire	Support hepatitis screening and vaccination	6,783
New Jersey	Health assessments	72,763
New Mexico	Locating, screening, follow-up of as many refugees as can be located	12,583
New York	Assessment, identify providers, referral	193,951
New York City	Department of Health, refinement of data collection, assessment	451,979
Ohio	Control of TB, Hepatitis B, vaccinations	40,640
Oregon	Outreach, screening, follow-up, data management	36,994
Pennsylvania	Collection and analysis of refugee health data	39,792
Philadelphia	Department of Health, Health assessment and follow-up in public health and primary care	41,319
South Dakota	TB testing	5,037
Tennessee	Assessment, treatment, referral	31,617
Texas	Contractual support for counties to control TB, hepatitis, parasites	115,152
Utah	Disease prevention, health education, treatment	22,763
Vermont	Assessments, follow-up, immunizations	5,000
Washington	Interpreter services	97,106
Wisconsin	Analyze health trends of new arrivals and recommend programs	50,693

Summary of Current Discretionary Grants FY 1996

TAG 10% Employment

ORR awarded 26 grants totaling \$4,476,856 to State and private agencies to implement special employment services which cannot be met with formula social services or with TAG formula grants.

Alabama	Job development, financial management in Mobile area	\$150,000
	Catholic Charities English Action Center, to train and find jobs for Lao and Cambodians as school para-professionals	110,319
Colorado	Employment services and case management for arriving refugees	126,887
District of Columbia	D.C. Refugee Center and Indochinese Community Center, provide Vocational English as a Second Language and job seeking and job retention skills	73,050
Florida	Council of Churches, employment services for Haitians	200,000
Idaho	College of Southern District Refugee Center, economic planning, English as a Second Language, and employment services	163,850
Illinois	Mutual Assistance Associations Coalition, employment help for long-term dependency	136,226
Illinois	Employment and adjustment services for Bosnians and Pentecostals in Chicago	128,612
Iowa	Lutheran Social Services in Lynn County, economic independence among former political prisoners	49,972
Kansas	Fund four providers to find jobs and run a crime/alcohol prevention educations	128,630
Maine	Vocational English and other employment services	105,000
Massachusetts	Address critical systemic issues preventing family self-sufficiency	203,981
Michigan	Lutheran Social Services of Detroit, training, work and family management	174,846
Minnesota	Certified nursing assistant training	249,900

Montana	Refugee Community Centers, employment services in Missoula and Billings	150,000
North Dakota	Lutheran Social Services, Fargo, job linking services	100,000
New Hampshire	Refugee Community Center, employment services at refugee community center	108,666
New York	Enhanced volunteer-based English for employed refugees in New York City	53,168
New York	Brooklyn College, English for former Soviets to qualify to provide licensed child care	190,908
Oregon	Computer training center for former Soviets	166,604
Tennessee	Catholic Charities, aid to Kurds to maintain self-sufficiency	100,000
Virginia	Council of Churches, Harrisburg employment enhancement for Soviet Evangelicals	121,304
Washington	Decrease welfare use by reimbursement for work-related expenses	300,000
Washington	Job development, placement and post-placement services	200,000
Washington	PIC of Clark County, employment services for Pentecostals	105,033
Wisconsin	Mutual Assistant Associations, job readiness and placement	849,900

In addition, ORR awarded a \$22,000 Wilson/Fish Grant to the United States Catholic Conference for employment services in the Commonwealth of Kentucky.

TAG 20% Employment

ORR awarded 49 new grants totaling \$10,891,576 to State and County Departments to implement employment services which cannot be met with formula social services or with TAG formula grants.

California	The Hmong American Women Association and the Fresno Center, family day care and family center services	\$224,594
California	Fresno County and Dayspring Development Association, academic and job skills training for high school drop-outs	321,784
California	Santa Clara County, vocational English and short-term skills training	152,482
California	The Cambodian Family Association, school to work	220,968

	program, parenting guidance, employment services	
California	Certified Nurse Assistant and Hospital Assistant training for Hmong and Russian communities	147,686
California	English training, employment services for women and youth	135,402
California	Microenterprise and loan funds	180,781
California	Employment services, on-the-job-training, English training	250,000
California	Employment and microenterprise services for elderly and youth	350,000
California	Microenterprise and loan services	79,200
California	Certified Nurse Assistant and Hospital Assistant training in Stockton area	155,939
California	Orange County, short-term training skills for former political prisoners and for women	496,346
California	Los Angeles County, support to the Los Angeles project to implement the California Initiative	100,000
California	Merced County and the Lao Family Community, work experience, vocational training, on-job-training, post-placement services	360,621
California	The Women's Economic Development Corporation of California, for Cambodians in Long Beach to assist home-based and other businesses	351,340
California	San Joaquin County, on-the-job-training and vocational English	250,000
Colorado	Support technical assistance to English language providers	200,000
Colorado	The Refugee Network Council, vocational English, on-the-job-training, supportive services, access to JTPA services	134,000
Florida	Job development, placement, on-the-job-training, English training	209,987
Florida	Intrastate secondary resettlement	500,000
Idaho	Provide intensive language and employment services for the elderly, women and youth	123,833

Illinois	Provide English training, on-the-job training and 24-month specialized adjustment services	113,628
Illinois	Jewish Vocational Services, short-term training in data entry, vocational English training and internships	200,000
Illinois	An agency coalition for electronic assembly training and placement	140,480
Illinois	Employment services	182,859
Louisiana	Catholic Charities of New Orleans, two Vocational English training sites which are computer assisted	126,167
Massachusetts	Middlesex County and Boston Technical Center, short-term skills training, vocational English, mathematics and computer training	250,000
Massachusetts	Jewish Vocational Service, to collect curricula, adapt self-directed job search software, web site	140,860
Massachusetts	Employment and mental health services in western Massachusetts	200,000
Michigan	Employment services	198,240
Missouri	Job development and post-placement services	260,000
Maryland	Geriatric nursing assistant training	69,300
Mississippi	Employment services, English training, follow-on support	104,000
North Carolina	Employment services for undeserved groups	259,400
North Dakota	Employment Services	169,679
New Jersey	Refugee and Immigrant Services and providers' coalition, continue special employment services to Cubans and Soviets	499,996
New York	Private Industry Council, work place English training, job placement, on-the-job training	87,297
New York	Employment services, English and vocational English training for multi-ethnic refugees	169,575
New York	Employment services for women refugees	80,000
Oregon	Employment training for Soviet Pentecostals	200,000

Oregon	Range of services for Soviet Pentecostals	137,438
Pennsylvania	Employment services and job placement for multi-ethnic refugees	226,292
South Dakota	Lutheran Social Services, career planning and job skills training for Sudanese and Bosnians	88,260
Texas	Orientation, support services for employment for Bosnians	65,883
Virginia	Enhanced employment services for Arlington County's multicultural population	153,572
Washington	Employment and training in five counties	250,000
Washington	Youth employment	141,276
Washington	Cambodian MAA, employment services	120,000
Wisconsin	Keeping Education For Youth Success (KEYS) School to work services and youth employment	1,312,411

Microenterprise Development Initiative

In FY 1996, ORR awarded eleven continuation awards and no new awards. The total funds awarded were \$1,385,768 to develop and administer microenterprise programs. Six awards were third year continuations that totaled \$696,875, and five awards were second year continuation grants that totaled \$688,893.

These projects are intended for recently arrived refugees on public assistance, who possess few personal assets or who lack a credit history that meets commercial lending standards. They are also intended for refugees who have been in the U.S. for several years and who have held entry-level jobs which do not provide an adequate standard of living. Microenterprise projects typically include components of training and technical assistance in business skills, credit, administration of revolving loan funds, and business management seminars.

Since the program's inception in September, 1991, ORR has provided funding for 11 three-year microenterprise development projects and six two-year projects. These 17 projects have achieved outcomes in microenterprise from the beginning of the program to September 30, 1996, as follows:

Client Businesses - Four hundred seventy-nine businesses have been developed under this program. Of these, 401 were start-ups; 78 were expansions of existing micro-businesses. Forty-nine percent of these businesses were in the service industry; 27 percent were retail; 11 percent were in manufacturing; 13 percent did not fall in the above categories. Forty percent were home-based. Eighty-nine percent were still operating as of September 30, 1996.

Loan Funds - The ORR program provided \$1,523,032 in loan funds, representing 293 business loans at an average loan amount of \$5,198 to refugee entrepreneurs during this period to help capitalize their businesses. Of this amount, ORR provided \$715,624 in loan capital which leveraged an additional \$754,436 in other financing. The default rate was 3.5 percent of the amount of money loaned and 3.1 percent of the number of loans.

Excluding loan funds, the total amount of ORR funding for these 17 microenterprise projects was \$3,881,305 over the three-year period. This represents an average cost per business start of \$8,103.

Client Characteristics - Over 4,444 refugees have participated in business training. At the time of their entry into training, nearly 35 percent had been in the U.S. less than 2 years; another 39 percent had been in the U.S. 2- 5 years. Nineteen percent had been in the U.S. over 5 years. About 58 percent were competent in English while 31 percent had little or poor English language skills. The largest ethnic groups in the training classes were Vietnamese (46 percent), former Soviets (22 percent), Hmong (6 percent), Ethiopians (4 percent), Bosnians (2 percent), Rumanians (2 percent) and Somalians (1 percent).

Thirty-four percent were women and 66 percent were men; over 59 percent were married; 30 percent were single; leaving some participants undetermined. Thirty-three percent had been business owners prior to entry into the ORR program.

Grants have been awarded as follows:

Third Year Continuations:

Church Avenue Merchants Block Association Brooklyn, NY	\$110,000
Economic and Employment Development Center, Los Angeles, CA	\$137,500
Fresno County Economic Opportunities Commission Fresno, CA	\$110,000
Institute for Cooperative Community Development, Manchester, NH	\$99,375
Institute for Social and Economic Development, Iowa City, IA	\$120,000
Women Venture, St. Paul, MN	\$120,000

Second Year Continuations:

Catholic Charities of Louisville, KY, (Wilson-Fish grantee for the State of Kentucky) for Jewish Family & Vocational Services, Louisville, KY	\$95,893
Commonwealth of Massachusetts for Jewish Vocational Services	\$168,000
State of New York for Worker Ownership Resource Center, Geneva, NY	\$125,000
State of Pennsylvania for Lutheran Child and Family Services	\$150,000
State of Wisconsin for ADVOCAP, Inc. in Fond Du Lac, for CAP Services, Inc. in Stevens Point, and for Western Dairyland Opportunity Council in Independence, WI	\$150,000

An additional grant was awarded for technical assistance to microenterprise grantees:

Institute for Social and Economic Development, Iowa City, IA	\$68,750
--	----------

Microenterprise (Targeted Assistance)

ORR awarded five grants totaling \$688,893 to public and private non-profit organizations to provide technical assistance and small loans for starting and developing refugee businesses.

Catholic Charities, Kentucky	\$95,893
Massachusetts Office of Health and Human Services	\$168,000
New York Department of Social Services	\$125,000
Pennsylvania Department of Public Welfare	\$150,000
Wisconsin Department of Workforce Development	\$150,000

Refugee Crime Victimization

ORR continued its interagency agreement with the Bureau of Justice Assistance in the Department of Justice, for a fourth year, providing \$200,000 to the non-profit National Crime Prevention Council (NCPC) for services through the Outreach to New Americans Project. The agreement provides technical assistance and information sharing among projects funded which include crime or domestic violence prevention activities under ORR's Refugee Community and Family Strengthening program and other refugee hosting communities.

Under the terms of the agreement, NCPC organized a peer assistance network and a national workshop in Washington, D.C. for teams of ORR's crime prevention grantees. Each team consisted of a police officer and a refugee community or local non-profit partner.

English Language Training (ELT)

Technical Assistance

In FY 1996, under the Targeted Assistance Discretionary Grant Program, ORR provided a grant to the Colorado Refugee Services Program to subcontract to the Spring Institute for International Studies to design and implement technical assistance to English language training (ELT) programs around the country. The technical assistance, ongoing consultation, and inservice training are provided by a participating network of five ELT partners, namely, the Center for Applied Linguistics (CAL), the Refugee Education and Employment Program (REEP) in Virginia, the Minnesota Department of Children, Families and Learning, the Comprehensive Adult Student Assessment System (CASAS) in California, and the Spring Institute.

Community/Family Strengthening

FY 1996 Funds

ORR awarded 55 grants totaling \$4,672,536 to public and private non-profit organizations to support the third year of projects designed to strengthen refugee families in the areas of health, youth, employment, English language training, parent-school relationships, crime, spouse and child abuse, citizenship and community activities. These grantees committed to cost-share 25% of the costs of these projects.

Arizona	International Consortium of Phoenix, for community center for all area refugees	\$75,335
California	Cambodian Association, Long Beach, counseling for women	84,000
California	International Rescue Committee, San Diego, coalition of organizations for classes for mothers and children	159,377
California	Vietnamese Community, Orange County, in-home counseling for spouse/child abuse	93,750
California	State University, Stanislaus, Turlock, parent-child literacy and parenting instructions	60,134
California	African Community Refugee Center, Los Angeles, various services, counseling, information and referral, English language training	60,228
California	Catholic Charities, Santa Clara, with Vietnamese MAA, youth services	161,250
California	Catholic Charities of Orange County, Consortium of local agencies for citizenship education	230,620
California	International MAA, San Diego, family preservation and outreach to train women	37,500
Colorado	Jewish Family Services, support groups, English as a Second Language, classes at community library	112,500
Colorado	Lutheran Social Services, Colorado Springs, health, family relations, safety, crime prevention	37,500
Connecticut	Jewish Family Services of Stamford, health issues among Soviet refugees	50,423
Connecticut	Jewish Federation of Greater Hartford, citizenship training	32,050
District of Columbia	Indochinese Community Center, leadership project for Vietnamese youth	75,445

District of Columbia	Lutheran Social Services, physical and mental health services, access for women	112,500
Georgia	Save the Children Foundation, available services for domestic violence	131,250
Georgia	New Sullivan Center, liaison between refugees and law enforcement and education systems	131,250
Idaho	Services to decrease isolation and stress, and to increase social and economic adjustment	52,500
Illinois	Travelers and immigrants aid for Bosnian MAA in Chicago	53,953
Illinois	East Central Mutual Assistance Association, Urbana, family strengthening through English language training, referral, counseling, volunteers	30,000
Iowa	Police liaison, Bosnian and Sudanese Orientation	*
Iowa	English language training, day care, support services for employment	45,000
Kansas	Southeast Asian Mutual Assistance Association, health education and access to health services	73,963
Kansas	Community Services Center, Kansas City, expand facilities	80,041
Kentucky	Western Mutual Assistance Association, Bowling Green, parent training, health care, English language training, day care for new arrivals	58,000
Kentucky	Catholic Charities of Louisville, specific needs of different groups of refugees	85,602
Kentucky	Catholic Social Services Bureau, Lexington, English language training, case management employment services	56,250
Louisiana	Associated Catholic Charities of New Orleans, youth services through recreation, life planning courses and tutoring	108,865
Maryland	Domestic violence, linking with women-in-crises services	*
Massachusetts	Cambodian Community, Greater Fall River, community center, develop leadership services	75,000

*Continued for a third project year with no new funds.

Massachusetts	International Institute of Greater Lawrence, English language training, job skills training, placement	60,000
Massachusetts	International Institute of Boston, orientation and other services for Ethiopians	75,000
Maine	Catholic Charities, Portland, employment services,	45,000
Michigan	Arab-American/Chaldean Council, Detroit, family strengthening through information and referral, English training, orientation	45,000
Minnesota	Institution for Education and Advocacy, advanced English as a Second Language and mentoring for students and adults	161,235
Nebraska	Lincoln Interfaith Council, Asian community and cultural center, social services	97,500
New Hampshire	International Institute of Boston, aid for refugees in Manchester and Hillsboro	56,250
New Jersey	Jewish Family Services, northern Middlesex County, help Soviets get jobs and advanced positions	75,000
New York	Haitian Centers Council, Brooklyn, citizenship education, parenting skills for Haitians in three States	150,000
New York	Interreligious Council of Central Syracuse, Southeast Asian community center, social services for women and seniors	75,000
New York	St. Rita's Center, New York City, family strengthening through domestic violence intervention	60,000
Ohio	Train women for child care, clinical intervention, English	131,250
Oregon	Ecumenical Ministries of community development center for Soviets in Portland	98,274
Pennsylvania	Jewish Family and Children Services, Pittsburgh, family strengthening through English language training, school liaison	112,425
South Dakota	Pierre, community development through housing, parenting education	135,000
Texas	Catholic Charities, Fort Worth, family literacy, citizenship classes, survival workshops	60,547
Vermont	Immigration and Refugee Services, employment services in	85,552

Addison and Chittenden Counties		
Virginia	Refugee and Immigrant Services, Richmond, English language training and employment assistance	93,750
Virginia	English training and job enhancement in four northern counties	165,000
Washington	Bi-lingual education and support for women and families at risk of domestic violence	101,250
Washington	Central Seattle Community Health Centers, health education and advocacy	135,000
Wisconsin	Lakeshore Indochinese MAA, Manitowoc, parenting education, juvenile gang diversion, elderly isolation services	30,000
Wisconsin	Wausau, MAA, coordinated case management for 45 families	82,575
Wisconsin	Family violence prevention	150,000
Wisconsin	Hmong MAA of Sheboygan, strengthen parents and intergenerational recreation	27,642

ORR also awarded 12 new grants totaling \$1,483,234 for community and family strengthening programs. These projects are fully funded by ORR for the first year, but have proposed to share costs in the second and third year using non-Federal funds.

California	Jewish Federation of Greater East Bay, Jewish family and children's services for youth, seniors, and victims of domestic abuse	\$200,000
California	Jewish Vocation and Career Counseling Services, day care for Soviet seniors, survival skills, training for certified nurse assistants	155,720
Georgia	Leadership training for refugee women	250,000
Massachusetts	International Rescue Committee, Boston, newly arrived refugee youth program	125,000
Minnesota	International Institute of Minnesota, English training, parenting education, citizenship preparation for Sudanese women	55,475
Missouri	International Institute of Metro St. Louis, develop community links for the refugees	50,000

North Carolina	Catholic Social Services, Mecklenburg County, crime prevention, community education/orientation	84,888
Rhode Island	City of Providence, drop-out prevention and protective service for Southeast Asian youth	236,000
Texas	Austin/Travis County Health and Human Services, two community centers, orientation to American culture, health education	87,211
Washington	Refugee and Immigrant Forum, Snohomish County, expand citizenship classes	25,000
Wisconsin	Wausau School District, parent outreach and literacy program for Southeast Asians	103,940
Wisconsin	Hmong MAA, La Crosse, address domestic violence, gang delinquency, leadership, citizenship	110,000

**Mental Health: ORR - SAMHSA/CMHSA
Intra-Agency Agreement**

Technical Assistance for mental health activities with refugees is available to U.S. resettlement communities under an intra-agency agreement with Substance Abuse and Mental Health Services Administration/Community Mental Health Services Administration. Under this agreement, two psychologists respond to requests for consultation, conference presentations, and telephone consultation regarding mental health issues among refugee populations.

During Federal fiscal year 1996, consultations were held with agencies in the following states: Oregon, New York, Virginia, Colorado, Massachusetts, Nebraska, Florida, Indiana, Washington, South Dakota, Arizona, and Georgia.

**ORR - National Institute of Mental Health
Intra-Agency Agreement**

Survivors of Torture

Estimates of the number of torture survivors among refugee populations vary, but are generally considered to be small in number. ORR is concerned that proper care and treatment be available for people who have endured torture. In addition, ORR is aware that many refugees have endured serious traumatic events other than torture which require similar special care and treatment.

ORR entered into an intra-agency agreement with NIMH for the purpose of convening a conference in 1997 on survivors of torture. The central focus of the conference was an increase in knowledge and expertise available in local communities where refugees are resettled; plans to assess the number of survivors of torture in U.S. communities; and an evaluation of the need for research and treatment.

ORR Standing Announcement

In June 1996, ORR issued a revision of the standing announcement (first published in 1994) which provides for services to newly arriving refugees. This announcement has two application

dates each year and will continue to be available for applicants when new populations of refugees are admitted to the U.S.

There are several allowable activities under this announcement. These include the following categories: Category 1, Preferred Communities; Category 2, Unanticipated Arrivals; Category 3, Community Orientation; Category 4, Mental Health.

The grants awarded under these categories were made as follows

Category 1: Preferred Communities

In 1994, with the intent to increase opportunities for refugee self-sufficiency and effective resettlement, the ORR Director announced funds available for grants to voluntary agencies to 1) increase placements of newly arriving refugees in preferred communities where there is a history of low welfare utilization and a favorable earned income potential relative to the cost of living, and 2) decrease placements of refugees in communities where there is a history of extended welfare use.

In 1996, ORR awarded two, third-year continuation grants, five, second-year continuation grants and one new grant, totaling \$1,194,117, to each of eight national voluntary resettlement agencies to enhance services in preferred communities with good employment opportunities and to reduce the number of refugees placed in high refugee impact communities.

An additional supplement was awarded to six preferred communities grantees to enhance resettlement services for a new population, the Benadir from Somalia, arriving during the spring and summer months of 1996. The supplements totaled \$383,968.

Continuation grants for increased placement of refugees in communities with ample employment opportunities were awarded to eight grants totaling \$1,194,117 to increase placement of arriving refugees in preferred communities where they have opportunities to attain early employment and sustained economic independence.

- Benadir Supplement \$140,006
- Immigrant and Refugee Services of America \$150,000
- Benadir Supplement \$53,673
- International Rescue Committee \$150,000
- Benadir Supplement \$65,399
- World Relief Corporation \$62,176
- Benadir Supplement \$60,924
- Episcopal Migration Ministries \$152,280
- Benadir Supplement \$43,122
- Church World Service \$175,524
- Benadir Supplement \$20,844
- Hebrew Immigration Aid Society \$132,000

One new grant was awarded under Preferred Communities:

- Lutheran Immigration and Refugee Services \$150,000

Category 2: Unanticipated Arrivals

ORR awarded eight grants totaling \$695,546 to provide services for a significant and unanticipated increase in the number of arriving refugees..

- International Institute of Boston, MA, Bosnians, Iraqi, former Soviets, Somali, for mental health, \$100,000.
- International Institute of Boston, MA, Bosnians, Iraqi, Soviets, Somali, providing English training, job assistance, mental health services, \$145,587.
- Prince George's County Board of Education, MD, English training for Benadir, \$60,475.
- Catholic Charities of Northern Nevada, provide Cubans with case management,

- English training, employment services, \$95,527.
- Mohawk Valley Resource Center, NY, translators for medical services for Bosnians, \$72,000.
- Church World Service Interreligious Council, Syracuse, NY, employment services, English training, orientation, counseling, \$50,000.
- International Rescue Committee, NY, \$41,957.
- Ethiopian Community Development Council, VA, case management, transportation for Benadir, \$130,000.

Category 3: Community Orientation

ORR awarded 6 grants totaling \$539,606 to serve newly arriving refugees through orientation services that are ethnically and linguistically matched to the refugee population.

- Fresno County and Pacific College Center and Center for Peace and Conflict, CA, to adapt best practices in cross cultural mediation for Bosnians and Iraqi, \$150,000.
- Immigrant and Refugee Services of America, DC, orientation training for recently arrived refugee families, \$150,000.
- Catholic Charities of Boston, MA, orientation services for Bosnians, Cubans, Somali and Iraqi, \$13,550.
- Catholic Social Services, Lincoln, NE, focus groups for refugees from Vietnamese and Cuban communities, \$26,602.
- International Rescue Committee, New York City, NY, orientation services for Atlanta, Boston, Phoenix, South Dakota and Seattle, \$127,241.
- Wausau Hmong Mutual Assistance Association, WI, orientation for new Hmong in central Wisconsin, recently arrived from Thailand camps, \$72,213.

Category 4: Mental Health

Newly arriving refugees arrive with anticipation of their new lives in the U.S. They may have difficult adjustments with the resettlement experience, and some arrive having experienced severe trauma related to their flight. ORR provides for four types of activities under its Mental Health program: 1) training and ongoing consultation for direct service workers to increase their knowledge and skill in working with refugees experiencing distress, 2) orientation programs for refugees to U.S. mental health services, 3) orientation for mainstream mental health professionals to refugees and refugee programs, 4) clinical services to refugees of populations new to U.S. communities where there is little knowledge of their cultures and mental health characteristics.

ORR awarded four grants totaling \$627,056 to improve services to newly arrived refugees who have been made vulnerable in their resettlement by having suffered mental and/or physical torture prior to or during their escape.

- **International Rescue Committee, CA,** mental health supportive services for Bosnians in San Francisco, \$60,138.
- **Immigration and Refugee Services of America and the Center for Victims of Torture, DC,** national response to need for training for providers subgrants in Minnesota, Illinois, and Virginia, \$300,000.
- **Center for Cultural Dynamics, Denver,** \$116,918.
- **Catholic Social Services, Atlanta,** mental health services for refugees, \$150,000.

Ethnic Community Organization

ORR awarded 7 continuation grants totaling \$667,543 to develop networks, newsletters, leadership training, and needs assessment among ethnic organizations as follows:

- **Southeast Asian Resource Action Center, DC,** a national alliance of Vietnamese Services Agencies, \$115,000.

- **Ethiopian Community Development Center, Arlington, VA,** to educate the general public, develop a mutual assistance association network, \$110,010.
- **Hmong National Development, D.C.** develop Hmong businesses, newsletter, technical assistance, leadership, \$129,670.
- **Montagnard Dega Association, Greensboro, NC,** to reduce isolation of Montagnards in 16 states, phone network, \$8,663.
- **Haitian Centers Council, Brooklyn, NY,** to develop organizationally and write the leadership of eight community centers in NY, NJ, CT, PA; \$100,000.
- **Cambodian Network Council, DC,** seventy-one Mutual Assistance Associations, technical assistance for institution network, \$104,200.
- **Kurdish Human Rights Watch, Vienna, VA,** needs assessment, technical assistance, networking, organized national conference, \$100,000.

Other

Other discretionary grants and contracts awarded by ORR in FY 1996 are:

- **Refugee Replacement Academy contract,** to convene an academy to discuss the placement planning activities for arriving refugees. The academy was given the task of reviewing current practices and to recommend changes, if indicated.
- **Mid-America Consulting Group, Beachwood, OH** \$249,840
- **Conference planning and support, \$300,000,** to the Southeast Asian Resource Action Center, Washington, D.C.
- **Victim Services, Inc.,** specialized services for survivors of torture who seek treatment in the greater New York City area, \$100,000
- **Maryland, Citizenship Conference, \$21,229**

Program Monitoring

ORR tracks the effectiveness of the refugee program through regular reviews of the Quarterly Performance Reports submitted by each State. As funds permit, staff also visit State programs to confer with program officials, service providers, and refugee community leaders about the effectiveness of the refugee program. ORR visited the following programs in FY 1996:

Massachusetts—ORR staff monitored the Massachusetts Wilson/Fish alternative project to review the program design and the service delivery network. Staff met with service providers, refugee clients, and State officials.

New Mexico—In FY 1996, New Mexico qualified for the targeted assistance program for the first time. Staff traveled to Santa Fe and Albuquerque to assist the State Coordinator in training New Mexico Department of Human Services staff, Bernadillo County officials, current service providers, and the refugee community about the program.

Texas—Staff traveled to Austin to discuss with State staff the reorganization of the Office of Immigration and Refugee Affairs and the administration of the refugee program. Site visits in Dallas included local volag affiliates and MAAs providing TAG or other ORR-funded employment services. ORR also monitored ESL classes and convened several meetings with refugee communities.

Virginia—In FY 1996, ORR undertook a thorough review of refugee program activities in the area outside the Northern Virginia counties. The review concluded that refugee service providers have effectively structured their services around the concept of early self-sufficiency. As a consequence, virtually all refugees begin ESL immediately after arrival and employment services soon after that. Few refugee families even applied for cash assistance in this area of the State. In FY 1997, ORR will monitor resettlement activities in the Northern Virginia counties as well.

Washington—A team of three Federal staff visited King County, Washington in September 1996. The purpose of the visit was to conduct an on-site

assessment of the quality of services provided to refugees and the outcomes achieved with ORR funding in the most impacted county in the State. As a result of the on-site assessment, the team, in partnership with the State, has formulated several strategies for improving the overall quality of services, employment outcomes, and self-sufficiencies.

III. REFUGEES IN THE UNITED STATES

Population Profile

This section characterizes the Amerasian, entrant, and refugee population (hereafter, referred to as refugees unless noted otherwise) in the United States, focusing primarily on those who have entered since 1983. All tables referenced by number appear in Appendix A.¹

Nationality of U. S. Refugee Population

Southeast Asians² remain the largest refugee group among recent arrivals. Of the approximately 1,358,000 refugees who have arrived in the United States since 1983, about 45 percent have fled from nations of Southeast Asia (refer to Table 1). Based on State Department figures for the period FY 1975 through FY 1996 (refer to Illustration 1 below), about 59 percent have fled from nations of Southeast Asia.

Vietnamese continue to be the majority refugee group from Southeast Asia, although the ethnic composition of the entering population has become more diverse over time. About 135,000 Southeast Asians fled to America at the time of the collapse of the Saigon government in 1975. Over the next four years, large numbers of boat people escaped Southeast Asia and were admitted to the U.S. The majority of these arrivals were Vietnamese. The Vietnamese share has declined gradually, however, especially since persons from Cambodia and Laos began to arrive in larger numbers in 1980.

For the period FY 1983 through FY 1996, Vietnamese refugees made up 70 percent of refugee arrivals from Southeast Asia, while 18 percent were from Laos, and 12 percent were from Cambodia. Parenthetically, slightly less than half the refugees from Laos are from the highlands of that nation and are culturally distinct from the Lowland Lao. More recently, refugees from outside of Southeast Asia have arrived in larger numbers. Beginning in FY 1988, refugees arriving from the former Soviet Union have surpassed refugees arriving from Vietnam. Only in FY 1995 were refugees from the former Soviet Union eclipsed by refugees from Cuba.

¹ Tables do not include refugees who arrived prior to FY 1983. However, the Bureau of Population, Refugees, and Migration, U.S. Department of State, reports 804,903 arrivals for the period FY 1975 through FY 1982.

² Southeast Asian refugees are almost entirely represented by Cambodians, Laotians, and Vietnamese.

ILLUSTRATION 1 - Summary Of Refugee Admissions (FY 1975 - FY 1982)

FISCAL YEAR	Africa	Asia	Eastern Europe	Soviet Union	Latin America	Near East Asia
1975	0	135,000	1,947	6,211	3,000	0
1976	0	15,000	1,756	7,450	3,000	0
1977	0	7,000	1,755	8,191	3,000	0
1978	0	20,574	2,245	10,688	3,000	0
1979	0	76,521	3,393	24,449	7,000	0
1980	955	163,799	5,025	28,444	6,662	2,231
1981	2,119	131,139	6,704	13,444	2,017	3,829
1982	3,326	73,522	10,780	2,756	602	6,369
Subtotal	6,400	622,555	33,605	101,633	28,281	12,429
1983-1996 Subtotal	52,682	614,143	113,936	375,243	35,748	86,512
1975-1996 Grand Total	59,082	1,236,698	147,541	476,876	64,029	98,941

Note: An additional 8,214 refugees were admitted between FY 1988 and FY 1993 under the Private Sector Initiative (PSI) for a total of 2,091,381 refugee admissions from FY 1975-FY 1996 (excluding Cuban and Haitian entrants).

Source: Bureau of Population, Refugees, and Migration, U.S Department of State.

Beginning with FY 1983, refugees from five countries or regions represented nearly 80 percent of all arrivals. Vietnamese refugees retain the largest share of arrivals (31 percent) followed by refugees from the former Soviet Union (27 percent), Laos (eight percent), Cuba (nearly eight percent), and Cambodia (five percent). For FY 1996, refugees from five countries or regions represented nearly 92 percent of all arrivals. Three of the same five countries or regions retained the largest share of arrivals. The former Soviet Union moved into first place with nearly 32 percent followed by Cuba with 22 percent followed by Vietnam with 18 percent followed by the former Yugoslavia with 13 percent and Somalia with seven percent.

Geographic Location of Refugees

Southeast Asian refugees have settled in every State and several territories of the United States (refer to Table 2). From FY 1983 through FY 1996, more Southeast Asians initially resettled in California than any other State. For the same period, more non-Southeast Asians resettled in New York than any other State. Illustration 2 (below) highlights the top five rankings for both

Southeast Asian and non-Southeast Asian arrivals by State of initial resettlement for the period FY 1983 through FY 1996.

The majority of refugees initially resettled in California were from Vietnam (42 percent) followed by refugees from the former Soviet Union (20 percent). Seventy-two percent of the refugees initially resettled in New York were from the former Soviet Union followed by refugees from Vietnam (nine percent). Seventy-eight percent of the refugees initially resettled in Florida were from Cuba and Haiti. Sixty-seven percent were from Cuba (46 percent were entrants and 21 percent were refugees). Another 11 percent were from Haiti (10 percent were entrants and one percent were refugees). In Texas, refugees from Vietnam (58 percent) and refugees from the former Soviet Union (five percent) made up the largest proportion. In the State of Washington, refugees from Vietnam (37 percent) and refugees from the former Soviet Union (31 percent) made up the largest proportion.

ILLUSTRATION 2 - Rankings for Southeast Asian and Non-Southeast Asian Arrivals by State of Initial Resettlement (FY 1983 - FY 1996).

State	S.E. Asian	Non-S.E.Asian
California	1	2
Florida	-	3
Illinois	-	4
Minnesota	4	-
New York	5	1
Texas	2	-
Washington	3	5

California and New York have resettled the greatest number of refugees to date (refer to Table 3). With the exception of FY 1984 and FY 1985, California followed by New York received the greatest number of refugees until FY 1995. In FY 1984 and FY 1985, California received the greatest number of refugees followed by Texas followed by New York. In FY 1995 and FY 1996, Florida received more refugees than California or New York. Illustration 3 (below) highlights the top five rankings for all arrivals by State of initial resettlement for FY 1983 through FY 1996 as well as for FY 1996.

ILLUSTRATION 3 - Arrivals by State of Initial Resettlement for FY 1983 through 1996, and FY 1996.

State	Arrivals for FY 1983 1996	Arrivals for FY 1996
California	1	2
Florida	3	1
New York	2	3
Texas	4	5
Washington	5	4

Of the approximately 16,500 arrivals initially resettled in Florida, 87 percent were from Cuba (76 percent were entrants and another 11 percent were refugees). The majority of refugees initially resettled in California were from the former Soviet Union (39 percent) followed by refugees from Vietnam (31 percent). Seventy-nine percent of the refugees initially resettled in New York were from the former Soviet Union followed by refugees from the former Yugoslavia (nine percent). In the State of Washington, refugees

from the former Soviet Union (56 percent) and refugees from Vietnam (27 percent) made up the largest proportion. In Texas, refugees from Vietnam (44 percent) and refugees from the former Yugoslavia (18 percent) made up the largest proportion. (Refer to Table 4).

Secondary Migration

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 Refugee Assistance Amendments of 1982 amended the Refugee Act of 1980 (section 412(a)(3)) directing ORR to compile and maintain data on the secondary migration of refugees within the United States. In response to this directive, ORR developed the Refugee State-of-Origin Report (ORR-11) for estimating secondary migration. Beginning with FY 1983, the principal use of the ORR-11 data has been to allocate ORR social service funds to States. The most recent compilation was September 30, 1996.

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. With the assistance of their sponsors, almost all arriving refugees apply for social security numbers immediately upon arrival in the United States. Therefore, the first three digits of a refugee's social security number are a good indicator of his or 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 provide ORR-11 data for refugees currently receiving assistance or services in their programs (for the most recent three-year period). Compilation of ORR-11 data by all reporting States results in a 53 X 53 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 interest to ORR.

Available information also indicates that much of the secondary migration of refugees takes place during their first few years after arrival 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. Examination of the detailed State-by-State matrix showed several migration patterns: a strong movement in and out of California and Florida, a strong movement into Minnesota and Washington, and a substantial amount of population exchange between contiguous or geographically close States (refer to Table 5).

Almost every State experiences both gains and losses through secondary migration. On balance, 20 States gained net population through secondary migration. The largest net gain was recorded by the State of Minnesota, with new in-migration of 2,445. The primary sources for the migration into Minnesota were California (743),

Virginia (299), and Texas (195). Washington also recorded strong secondary migration, with net in-migration of 1,472. The primary sources for the migration into Washington were California (496), Oregon (270), and Texas (179). Florida recorded both strong in-migration and out-migration, with net in-migration of 1,240. California recorded the largest net loss due to migration (2,703), followed by Texas (1,473), Florida (1,386), and New York (1,245).

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 U.S. This involves a balance among three elements: the employment potential of the refugees, including their education and skills, English language competence and health; 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. Past refugee surveys have found that the economic adjustment of refugees to the U.S. has been a successful and generally rapid process. During 1996, the process of refugee economic adjustment appears to have followed patterns similar to those of recent years, as discussed below.

Current Employment Status of Refugees

In 1996, ORR completed its 25th survey of a national sample of refugees selected from the population of all refugees who arrived between May 1, 1991, through April 30, 1996. The survey collected basic biographical information, as well as data on past and present (1) education, (2) English language training, (3) job training, and (4) labor force participation of each adult member of the household. The survey also collected family housing, income, and welfare utilization data.

The 1996 survey indicates that both Southeast Asian and non-Southeast Asian refugees appear to find employment at a lower rate than the general population of the U.S., but that they also appear to improve their economic circumstances over time. Employment rates have gone up and unemployment rates have gone down three consecutive years in a row. To evaluate the economic progress of refugees, ORR used three common measures of employment effort: the

employment-to-population ratio (or EPR); the labor force participation rate; and the unemployment rate.

Table 1 presents the EPR¹ in October, 1996 for refugees 16 and over in the five-year sample population. The survey found that the overall EPR for all refugees was 51 percent (59 percent for males and 43 percent for females). These employment data are nearly nine percentage points higher than the EPR recorded in the 1995 survey and over 15 percentage points higher than the EPR recorded in the 1994 survey. By contrast, the EPR for the U.S. population was 63 percent in 1996. Although lower than that of the U.S. population as a whole, refugee employment appears to increase with each year of residence in the U.S. While the overall EPR for the 1996 arrivals was only 38 percent, the EPR of refugees who had arrived in previous years approximated the EPR for the U.S. population, reaching nearly 61 percent for refugees who arrived in 1991.²

¹ **The Employment-to-Population Ratio (EPR)**, also called the **employment rate**, is the ratio of the number of individuals age 16 or over who are employed (full- or part-time) to the total number of individuals in the population who are age 16 or over, expressed as a percentage.

² The refugee sample population includes many refugees who have been in the country for only a short time and also excludes from the sample refugees who arrived before May 1991 (who are more likely to be residing in self-sufficient households).

TABLE 1 - Employment Status of Refugees by Year of Arrival and Sex

Year of Arrival	Employment Rate (EPR)			Labor Force Participation Rate			Unemployment Rate		
	All	Male	Female	All	Male	Female	All	Male	Female
1996	38.1%	49.3%	27.2%	56.3%	69.3%	42.6%	31.9%	29.5%	36.4%
1995	49.3	56.6	41.9	56.3	63.7	48.8	12.4	11.1	14.2
1994	50.8	57.6	44.1	56.0	63.4	48.7	9.3	9.4	9.3
1993	47.5	54.9	40.2	52.9	59.6	46.3	10.3	7.9	13.3
1992	54.0	61.0	46.8	59.6	67.6	51.6	9.6	9.9	9.2
1991	60.8	69.6	51.4	67.0	76.3	57.3	9.2	8.9	10.1
Total Sample	51.0	58.6	43.4	57.4	65.4	49.4	11.2	10.4	12.2
U.S. Rates	63.2	70.9	56.0	66.8	74.9	59.3	5.4	5.4	5.4

Note: As of October 1996. Not seasonally adjusted. Data refer to refugees 16 and over in the five-year sample population consisting of Amerasians, Entrants, and Refugees of all nationalities who arrived in the years 1991-1996.

From the 1996 data, ORR also calculated the labor force participation rate³ for refugees 16 and over in the five-year sample population (refer to Table 1). This rate is closely related to the EPR, except it includes individuals looking for work as well as those currently employed. In October, 1996, the overall labor force participation rate for the five-year refugee population was 57 percent (65 percent for males and 49 percent for females). Like the EPR, the labor force participation rate of refugees is lower than that of the U.S. population (67 percent in 1996). However, whereas the overall labor force participation rate for the 1996 survey was only 57 percent, the labor force participation rate for refugees who had arrived in previous years matched that for the U.S. population, reaching 67 percent for refugees who arrived in 1991.

A comparison of employment measures for each year, i.e., 1991 through 1996 (refer to Table 1) indicates that for the 1996 arrivals, the EPR (individuals who are currently employed) was 38 percent and the labor force participation rate (individuals looking for work as well as those currently employed) was 56 percent. The difference (18 percent) is the proportion of the

adult population seeking employment but unable to find it. The difference between the EPR and labor force participation is seven percent for the 1995 arrivals, five percent for the 1994 and 1993 arrivals, and six percent for the 1992 and 1991 arrivals.

For all of the survey respondents, the difference between the EPR and labor force participation rate diminishes with time. Similarly, the unemployment rate⁴ drops with time. The survey found that the unemployment rate for all refugees was 11 percent (10 percent for males and 12 percent for females). For 1996 arrivals, the unemployment rate was 32 percent. The unemployment rate dropped to 12 percent for 1995 arrivals, dropped again to nine percent for 1994 arrivals, rose to 10 percent for 1993 and 1992 arrivals, and dropped to its lowest level for 1991 arrivals (9.2 percent). Even with a difference of 23 percent between 1996 arrivals and 1991 arrivals, the unemployment rate for refugees in their fifth year of residence was noticeably higher than the unemployment rate for the U.S. (5.4 percent). However, by focusing on aggregated data only, important differences between refugee groups are obscured.

³ The labor force consists of adults age 16 or over looking for work as well as those with jobs. The labor force participation rate is the ratio of the total number of persons in the labor force divided by the total number of persons in the population who are age 16 or over, expressed as a percentage.

⁴ The unemployment rate is a measure of the proportion of persons looking for work. Specifically, it is the ratio of the total number of adults age 16 and over who are looking for work to the total number of adults age 16 and older in the labor force, expressed as a percentage. (See footnote above for explanation on labor force.)

TABLE 2 - Employment Status of Selected Refugee Groups by Sex

Employment Measure	Africa	Latin America	Middle East	Eastern Europe	Former Soviet Union	Vietnam	Other S.E. Asia	All
Employment-to-Population Ratio (EPR)	33.3%	62.7%	38.2%	67.0%	40.3%	58.9%	21.9%	51.0%
-Males	50.3%	75.0%	50.8%	71.0%	48.7%	62.7%	29.0%	58.6%
-Females	19.6%	46.6%	20.0%	63.1%	33.3%	54.9%	13.8%	43.4%
Worked at any point since arrival	43.7	67.6	49.0	71.1	45.8	59.3	26.1	54.6
-Males	62.2	76.9	60.6	77.3	55.2	63.2	35.3	62.2
-Females	28.9	55.3	32.3	65.1	37.9	55.2	15.5	46.8
Labor Force Participation Rate	44.9	71.5	59.3	75.4	51.2	59.3	28.9	57.4
-Males	63.7	81.0	71.1	81.4	61.6	63.2	37.1	65.4
-Females	30.0	59.0	43.2	69.5	42.4	55.4	18.4	49.4
Unemployment Rate	26.1	12.3	35.2	11.0	21.3	1.0	23.9	11.2
-Males	20.7	7.5	28.6	13.0	20.9	1.0	22.4	10.4
-Females	35.3	20.9	52.6	8.8	21.6	1.0	23.8	12.2

Note: As of October 1996. Not seasonally adjusted. Data refer to refugees 16 and over in the five-year sample population consisting of Amerasians, Entrants, and Refugees of all nationalities who arrived in the years 1991-1996.

By disaggregating the data, the EPR, the labor force participation rate, and the unemployment rate provide additional insights into the economic adjustment of refugees. Table 2 reveals significant differences between the employment rates of the seven refugee groups formed from the survey respondents⁵. The EPR for the seven refugee groups ranged from a high of 67 percent for Eastern Europe (matching the EPR for the U.S. population), followed by Latin America (63 percent) and Vietnam (59), to a low of (22 percent) for Other Southeast Asia and (33 percent) Africa. Most notable is the 23 percent increase in the EPR for Eastern Europe between the 1995 and 1996 surveys. As a result, Latin America fell to

second place and Vietnam fell to third place from the 1995 to 1996 survey. Refugees from Southeast Asia and Africa endured the lowest EPR in both the 1995 and 1996 surveys.

Table 2 also reveals differences for the labor force participation rate among the seven refugee groups formed from the survey respondents. The labor force participation followed the same pattern as the EPR; the rate was highest for Eastern Europe (75 percent) followed by Latin America (72 percent) and Vietnam (59 percent), and lowest for Other Southeast Asia (29 percent) and Africa (45 percent). As previously stated, the difference between the EPR and the labor force participation rate is the proportion of the adult population seeking employment but unable to find it. It is interesting to note that the largest disparity between the EPR and labor force participation rate (21 percent) and associated largest unemployment rate (35 percent) was for the Middle East. Whereas the smallest disparity between the EPR and labor force participation rate (one half percent) and associated lowest unemployment rate (one percent) was for Vietnam.⁶

⁵ The seven refugee groups are derived from the following countries or regions: Africa (Burundi, Eritrea, Ethiopia, Kenya, Liberia, Somalia, Sudan, and Zaire), Latin America (Cuba and Haiti), the Middle East (Afghanistan, Iran, Iraq, and Syria), Eastern Europe (Albania, Bosnia and Hercegovina, Croatia, Macedonia, Montenegro, and Romania), the former Soviet Union (Azerbaijan, Armenia, Belarus, Estonia, Georgia, Kyrgyzstan, Kazakhstan, Latvia, Lithuania, Moldova, Russia, Tajikistan, Turkmenistan, Ukraine, and Uzbekistan), Vietnam (including Amerasians), and Other Southeast Asia (Burma, Laos, and Thailand).

⁶ Where the difference between the two employment measures is small, the associated unemployment rate

Table 2 also presents the proportion of refugees who have ever held employment since arrival in the U.S. Overall, the proportion of refugees currently working is about 93 percent of the refugees who have ever worked (ranging from a low of 76 percent for Africa to a high of 99 percent for Vietnam). The comparable figure for 1995 is 93 percent (ranging from a low of 80 percent for Africa to a high of 98 percent for Eastern Europe). There continue to be some significant differences among refugee groups. The group from Eastern Europe exhibited the highest rate of employment since arrival (71 percent) followed by Latin America (68 percent) and refugees from Vietnam (59 percent). The group from Other Southeast Asia exhibited the lowest rate of employment since arrival (26 percent). The remaining groups entered into employment at a rate between 44 and 49 percent. The Middle East exhibited the greatest difference between the rate of current employment and employment since arrival (11 percent), followed by Africa (10 percent), the former USSR (six percent), and all others (each under five percent).

Further disaggregation of the data by sex provides another vantage point relative to the employment status of refugees (refer to Table 2). Overall, the EPR for males was 59 percent versus 43 percent for females. The biggest disparity within refugee groups was for the Middle East and Africa. For the Middle East, the EPR for males was 31 percent higher than for females, the labor force participation rate for males was 28 percent higher than for females, and the unemployment rate was 29 percent for males versus 53 percent for females. For Africa, the EPR for males was also 31 percent higher than for females, the labor force participation rate for males was 34 percent higher than for females, and the unemployment rate was 21 percent for males versus 35 percent for females.

The survey also asked refugees age 16 and over why they were not looking for employment. Attending school accounted for the largest proportion (31 percent) with an associated median

tends to be small (which suggests that some refugee groups may not actively be looking for work).

age of 21. Poor health or handicap accounted for the second largest proportion (27 percent) with an associated median age of 60. Limited English accounted for another 12 percent with an associated median age of 46. Child care or other family responsibilities accounted for another 12 percent with an associated median age of 38. Furthermore, for those citing child care or other family responsibilities, 85 percent were age 25 or over and 91 percent were female. A variety of other answers including a mixture of the aforementioned explanations accounted for the balance.

Factors Affecting Employment Status

Achieving economic self-sufficiency is based on the employment prospects of adult refugees, which hinges on a mixture of refugee skills, family size and composition (e.g., number of dependents to support), 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 U.S. also influence their prospects for self-sufficiency.

The average number of years of education for all 1996 arrivals was approximately eleven (refer to Table 3). The level of education prior to arrival has risen sharply over the past decade, most probably as a result of a significant increase in the proportion of refugees from Eastern Europe (particularly, the former Yugoslavia) and the former Soviet Union. The 1996 survey revealed a pronounced disparity between the educational backgrounds among the seven refugee groups formed from the survey respondents. The average years of education was highest for the former Soviet Union (12 years) and lowest for Other Southeast Asia (three years). By combining high school, technical school, and university degrees, again, the former Soviet Union (over 81 percent) ranks highest for education while Other Southeast Asia (approximately four percent) ranks the lowest.

Refugees from Africa (31 percent) and Other Southeast Asia (60 percent) showed the largest proportion for no formal education before arriving in the U.S. However they rank high for attending

high school for a degree since arriving in the U.S. Eastern Europe ranked highest for attending high school for a degree since arriving in the U.S. Africa also shows the highest proportion for attempting to earn an Associate Degree (six percent). The Middle East and Vietnam show the highest proportion for attempting to earn a Bachelor's Degree (11 percent and 15 percent, respectively). It should be noted that even though the survey asks about years of schooling and the highest degree or certificate obtained prior to coming to the U.S., the correspondence between years of schooling and degrees or certifications among different countries is not necessarily the same. Consequently, some degree of caution is necessary when interpreting education statistics.

At the time of arrival for refugees 16 and over in the five-year population, 71 percent spoke no English (refer to Table 3). By the time of the interview, only 15 percent spoke no English. At the time of arrival, 84 percent of refugees from Other Southeast Asia spoke no English followed by Eastern Europe and Vietnam (both 78 percent), Latin America (72 percent), refugees from the former Soviet Union (66 percent), followed by the Middle East (45 percent) and Africa (37 percent). By the time of the interview, 54 percent of refugees from Other Southeast Asia and 38 percent from Latin America still spoke no English. All other refugee groups had dropped below 13 percent. By the time of arrival, refugees from Southeast Asia and Latin America also had the smallest percentage for speaking English well or fluently (18 and 26 percent, respectively).

TABLE 3 - Educational and English Proficiency Characteristics of Selected Refugee Groups

Education and Language Proficiency	Africa	Latin America	Middle East	Eastern Europe	Former Soviet Union	Vietnam	Other S.E.Asia	All
Average Years of Education before U.S.	7.6	10.4	9.7	10.6	12.4	10.5	3.2	10.7
Highest Degree before U.S.								
None	30.7%	10.7%	18.2%	11.7%	1.3%	20.4%	60.2%	15.0%
Primary School	25.3	20.8	38.7	23.5	7.6	12.3	25.2	14.5
Secondary School	28.4	35.0	25.6	29.4	28.6	61.2	2.8	41.5
Technical School	3.4	3.2	5.0	18.0	19.9	.3	.7	7.8
University Degree	9.2	22.2	10.4	12.5	32.6	3.8	.4	15.4
Medical Degree	0.0	1.4	0.0	0.0	3.8	0.0	.4	1.3
Attended School/University (since U.S.)	30.3	11.1	28.3	15.4	19.0	28.9	28.0	23.0
Attended School/University (since U.S.) for degree/certificate	26.2	8.1	25.9	15.0	17.6	27.6	25.0	21.4
High School	12.4	6.3	9.1	10.4	5.2	6.5	19.2	7.2
Associate Degree	6.0	.9	3.6	1.8	3.4	5.7	.9	3.9
Bachelor's Degree	4.3	0.0	11.1	2.1	5.4	14.5	1.4	8.3
Master's/Doctorate	1.6	0.0	0.0	0.0	1.0	.2	0.0	.4
Professional Degree	0.0	.6	0.0	.8	1.1	.1	.8	.5
Other	0.0	.3	0.0	0.0	.3	.3	1.3	.3
Degree Received	0.0	3.0	3.6	7.5	2.9	1.6	4.1	2.6
At Time of Arrival								
Percent Speaking no English	37.0	71.9	45.4	77.7	65.7	78.3	84.3	71.3
Percent Not Speaking English Well	36.4	17.7	40.1	17.0	26.2	20.4	11.1	22.5
Percent Speaking English Well or Fluently	26.6	9.2	13.8	5.3	7.7	1.2	4.6	5.8
At Time of Survey								
Percent Speaking no English	11.4	37.8	8.3	11.9	12.5	7.3	53.5	14.9
Percent Not Speaking English Well	14.8	33.6	27.6	42.6	33.7	62.8	28.6	45.0
Percent Speaking English Well or Fluently	73.8	26.1	63.5	45.5	52.9	29.8	17.5	39.5

Note: Data refer to refugees 16 and over in the five-year sample population consisting of Amerasians, Entrants, and Refugees of all nationalities who arrived in the years 1991-1996. These figures refer to self-reported characteristics of refugees. Professional degree refers to a law degree or medical degree.

English language proficiency is another factor crucial to economic self-sufficiency (refer to Table 4). In this year's survey, 40 percent of all refugees indicated that they spoke English well or fluently (at the time of the survey), 45 percent indicated that they did not speak English well, while 15 percent claimed they spoke no English at all. Those speaking no English had the lowest EPR (27 percent) and those speaking English well or fluently had the highest EPR (59 percent). The difference in EPR between these two groups is 32 percent. Although many refugees improve their English language proficiency over time, it appears that those who do not are the least likely to be employed. Of the 15 percent of the survey respondents who spoke no English at the time of the survey, the median age was 50. Females comprised 56 percent and males comprised 44 percent. The majority came from Latin America (30 percent)⁷ followed by refugees from the former Soviet Union (25 percent) followed by Vietnam (20 percent) and Southeast Asia (15 percent).

It appears that English Language Training (ELT) was effective. The survey found that 56 percent of all survey respondents had participated in some ELT. Table 5 details the amount of ELT relative to English proficiency. Note that the raw (weighted) number is given for each ELT class type and for each group to help look behind the percentages. For refugees who attended ELT classes every day, those who speak no English show a total of five percent as opposed to those who speak English well or fluently (42 percent). Comparable percentages are repeated for refugees who participated in ELT classes two to six times per week. For classes that met only one time per week, the percentage of refugees who do not speak English jumps to 17 percent compared to 32 percent of those refugees who speak English well or fluently.

Since arrival into the U.S., refugees from the former Soviet Union (72 percent) followed by

⁷ It is interesting to note that refugees from Latin America have both low English Language proficiency and a high EPR. These seemingly contradictory findings might be due to the concentration of Cubans in Florida where English language proficiency is not always required for employment.

TABLE 4 - English Proficiency and Associated EPR by Year of Arrival

Year of Arrival	Percent Speaking No English (EPR)	Percent Not Speaking English Well (EPR)	Percent Speaking English Well or Fluently (EPR)
At Time of Arrival			
1996	71.8 (38.9)	22.0 (34.2)	6.2 (43.5)
1995	70.7 (45.5)	23.1 (57.6)	6.2 (63.5)
1994	74.6 (49.8)	19.6 (51.9)	5.6 (61.5)
1993	71.5 (46.2)	22.6 (53.1)	5.8 (42.6)
1992	70.4 (50.1)	23.9 (60.6)	5.4 (75.4)
1991	67.6 (59.4)	24.8 (63.4)	6.4 (76.3)
Total Sample	71.3 (48.7)	22.5 (55.9)	5.8 (61.6)
At Time of Survey			
1996	27.3 (28.2)	48.3 (38.4)	24.4 (48.8)
1995	20.2 (33.1)	48.4 (51.1)	31.0 (57.7)
1994	16.7 (27.7)	50.0 (51.4)	32.3 (62.5)
1993	13.0 (23.1)	42.8 (50.4)	43.6 (52.0)
1992	10.2 (19.3)	42.4 (54.4)	47.2 (61.0)
1991	8.1 (16.9)	36.1 (67.4)	54.6 (64.2)
Total Sample	14.9 (26.8)	45.0 (52.6)	39.5 (58.8)

Note: As of October 1996. Not seasonally adjusted. Data refer to refugees 16 and over in the five-year sample population consisting of Amerasians, Entrants, and Refugees of all nationalities who arrived in the years 1991-1996. These figures refer to self-reported characteristics of refugees.

Eastern Europe (51 percent) have received ELT outside of high school the most, whereas Latin America (20 percent) and the Middle East (36 percent) have received ELT the least (refer to Table 6). ELT continues long after arrival for many refugees. From 1991 through 1996, ELT (outside of high school) for all refugee groups remained at approximately 50 percent. Only in 1993 was ELT much less (45 percent). The proportion of refugees who are currently in ELT is 17 percent. Nearly 25 percent of refugees who arrived in the U.S. in 1996 were currently attending ELT. For refugees who arrived in the

U.S. five years earlier, the rate dropped to less than 10 percent. Refugees from Other Southeast Asia who are currently attending ELT followed by Vietnam and refugees from the former Soviet Union ranked the highest. The Middle East followed by Latin America and Eastern Europe ranked the lowest.

The proportion of refugees who have attended job training classes lags far behind ELT (refer to Table 6). Only six percent of refugees who arrived in the U.S. in 1996 had received some job training, compared with 53 percent receiving ELT. With time, refugees appear to receive more job training. For refugees who arrived in the U.S. five years earlier, 12 percent had received some job training. Refugees from the former Soviet Union had received the greatest amount versus refugees from Vietnam who had received the least. Overall, nearly ten percent of all survey respondents had attended job training. Of that ten percent, six and one half percent indicated they spoke English well or fluently at the time of the survey, while less than three percent indicated that they did not speak English well and less than one half percent indicated that they did not speak English at all.

Other Economic Indicators

The earnings of employed refugees appear to rise with length of residence in the United States (refer to Table 7). For 1996 arrivals, the average hourly wage was \$6.02 per hour. For 1991 arrivals, the average hourly wage had risen to \$7.55 per hour (an increase of 20 percent). The overall hourly wage of employed refugees in the five-year population was \$7.05 (up from \$6.77 reported in the 1995 survey). The median wage for all full-time hourly workers in the U.S. for the fourth quarter of 1996 was \$9.62 per hour. The average weekly earnings for full-time salaried workers in the U.S. in 1996 was about \$14.10 per hour. The number of refugees who reported home ownership also appears to rise with length of residence. Whereas less than six percent of 1996 arrivals reported home ownership, over 12 percent of 1991 arrivals reported home ownership.

TABLE 5 - English Proficiency (at time of survey) and Associated ELT (since arrival)			
Length of English Language Training	Percent Speaking No English	Percent Not Speaking English Well	Percent Speaking English Well or Fluently
Classes Met Every Day			
0.5 Years (N = 493)	5.6%	59.9%	34.4%
1.0 Years (N = 605)	3.4	53.8	42.8
1.5 Years (N = 25)	9.8	42.8	47.4
2.0 Years (N = 46)	2.0	44.8	53.2
2.5 Years (N = 11)	13.9	72.1	14.0
3.0 Years (N = 3)	0.0	83.7	16.3
3.5 Years (N = 1)	0.0	100.0	0.0
4.0 Years (N = 2)	0.0	100.0	0.0
(Total N = 1,308)*			
Total Sample	4.7	53.3	42.0
Classes Met 2 - 6 Times Per Week			
0.5 Years (N = 710)	8.6	40.1	51.4
1.0 Years (N = 383)	7.1	51.6	40.3
1.5 Years (N = 82)	9.3	48.3	41.2
2.0 Years (N = 88)	10.0	46.8	43.2
2.5 Years (N = 17)	2.9	41.3	55.8
3.0 Years (N = 29)	10.2	59.5	30.4
3.5 Years (N = 15)	0.0	79.7	20.3
4.0 Years (N = 14)	32.5	14.9	52.6
(Total N = 1,392)*			
Total Sample	8.9	44.2	46.5
Classes Met 1 Time Per Week			
0.5 Years (N = 30)	22.0	49.5	28.6
1.0 Years (N = 14)	7.2	63.0	29.8
1.5 Years (N = 1)	50.0	0.0	50.0
2.0 Years (N = 3)	0.0	40.6	59.4
2.5 Years (N = 1)	0.0	0.0	100.0
(Total N = 49)*			
Total Sample	16.6	51.0	32.4

*Total N includes all answer categories including missing or unknown.

Note: Data refer to refugees 16 and over in the five-year sample population consisting of Amerasians, Entrants, and Refugees of all nationalities who arrived in the years 1991-1996. These figures refer to self-reported characteristics of refugees.

TABLE 6 - Service Utilization by Selected Refugee Groups and for Year of Arrival

Type of Service Utilization	Africa	Latin America	Middle East	Eastern Europe	Former Soviet Union	Vietnam	Other S.E. Asia	All
ELT since arrival Inside High School	8.3%	2.6%	9.0%	8.8%	7.2%	6.8%	16.2%	7.1%
ELT since arrival Outside of High School	46.5	19.7	36.2	51.0	71.8	43.1	43.8	49.2
Job training since arrival	10.3	6.7	4.4	8.4	21.4	3.1	5.4	9.7
Currently attending ELT Inside High School	8.3	2.2	9.0	8.8	7.2	6.8	16.2	7.0
Currently attending ELT Outside of High School	13.2	8.0	4.8	8.0	17.3	20.4	21.2	16.5
Type of Service Utilization by Year of Arrival	1996	1995	1994	1993	1992	1991	All	
ELT since arrival Inside High School		6.3%	5.8%	6.0%	8.6%	8.1%	7.5%	7.1%
ELT since arrival Outside of High School		53.3	50.7	50.4	45.2	49.3	49.6	49.2
Job training since arrival		6.3	7.8	8.9	9.7	12.4	12.1	9.7
Currently attending ELT Inside High School		6.3	5.6	6.0	8.6	8.1	7.5	7.0
Currently attending ELT Outside of High School		24.6	21.8	17.6	16.4	11.3	9.7	16.5

Note: Data refer to refugees 16 and over in the five-year sample population consisting of Amerasians, Entrants, and Refugees of all nationalities who arrived in the years 1991-1996. In order that English language training (ELT) not be confused with English high school instruction, statistics for both populations are given.

TABLE 7 - Hourly Wages and Home Ownership for Year of Arrival

Year of Arrival	Hourly Wages of Employed	Own Home or Apartment	Rent Home Or Apartment
1996	\$6.02	5.5%	90.8%
1995	6.65	3.7	94.8
1994	6.73	4.6	94.1
1993	7.16	7.1	91.4
1992	7.61	9.7	89.0
1991	7.55	12.2	86.5
Total Sample	7.05	6.8	91.7

Note: Data refer to refugees 16 and over in the five-year sample population consisting of Amerasians, Entrants, and Refugees of all nationalities who arrived in the years 1991-1996. These figures refer to self-reported characteristics of refugees.

Medical Coverage

Overall, 20 percent of adult refugees who arrived in the U.S. during the five-year period lacked medical coverage of any kind throughout the year preceding the survey (refer to Table 8). This proportion varied widely among the five refugee groups, from a low of about one percent for the

group from Africa and Other Southeast Asia to a high of 33 percent for the Middle East. Refugees from Eastern Europe were the most likely to have medical coverage through employment (29 percent) whereas the group from Africa were the least likely to have medical coverage through employment (two percent). Medical coverage through Medicaid or RMA was highest for Other Southeast Asia (84 percent) and lowest for Vietnam (24 percent).

The proportion of refugees without medical coverage ranged from a low of six percent for 1996 arrivals to a high of 25 percent for 1994 arrivals. For refugees who arrived in the U.S. in 1991, the rate dropped to less than 13 percent. These rates are lower than those reported in the 1995 survey. As a general rule, medical coverage through employment increases with time in the U.S., and medical coverage through government aid programs declines with time in the U.S. Overall, 22 percent of the refugees surveyed had medical coverage through employment and 41 percent had medical coverage through Medicaid or RMA. Medical coverage through employment rose from 8 percent for refugees who arrived in 1996 to 33 percent for refugees who arrived in 1991. And,

TABLE 8 - Source of Medical Coverage for Selected Refugee Groups and for Year of Arrival

Source of Medical Coverage	Africa	Latin America	Middle East	Eastern Europe	Former Soviet Union	Vietnam	Other S.E. Asia	All
No Medical Coverage in any of past 12 months	1.0%	28.6%	32.9%	15.1%	9.5%	28.7%	0.7%	20.2%
Medical Coverage through employer	2.1	21.0	21.7	28.6	26.7	21.3	4.5	21.9
Medicaid or RMA	54.7	34.9	42.7	44.2	58.2	24.4	83.8	41.2
Source of Medical Coverage by Year of Arrival	1996	1995	1994	1993	1992	1991	All	
No Medical Coverage in any of past 12 months		5.7%	21.1%	24.5%	21.5p%	20.7%	12.9%	20.2%
Medical Coverage through Employer		7.6	13.6	20.9	21.9	29.4	33.0	21.9
Medicaid or RMA		82.3	54.2	37.5	37.3	31.5	29.7	41.2

Note: As of October 1996. Data refer to refugees 16 and over in the five-year sample population consisting of Amerasians, Entrants, and Refugees of all nationalities who arrived in the years 1991-1996.

medical coverage through Medicaid or RMA dropped from 82 percent for refugees who arrived in 1996 to 30 percent for refugees who arrived in 1991. Only after five full years of residence were more adult refugees covered through an employer than through government aid programs.

Economic Self-Sufficiency

Table 9 details the economic self-sufficiency of the five-year sample population of the 1996 survey. Overall, about 49 percent of all refugee households in the United States for five years or less had achieved economic self-sufficiency by October 1996 (up from 37 reported in the 1995 survey and up from 31 percent reported in the 1994 survey). An additional 23 percent had achieved partial independence, with household income a mix of earnings and public assistance (up from 22 percent reported in the 1995 survey and 13 percent reported in the 1994 survey). For about 24 percent of refugee households, however, income in 1996 consisted entirely of public assistance (dropping 7 percentage points from the 31 percent reported in the 1995 survey and dropping 10 percentage points from the 34 percent reported in the 1994 survey). The gap between economic independence for Southeast Asian versus non-Southeast Asian households appears to have reversed itself. Over 52 percent of Southeast Asian households were entirely self sufficient compared to 46 percent for non-Southeast Asian households.

The difference between the two groups in the 1994 survey was 13 percent (23 percent for Southeast Asians and 36 percent for non-Southeast Asians). By the 1995 survey, the difference had diminished to less than four percent (35 percent for Southeast Asians and under 39 percent for non-Southeast Asians). Differences between the 1995 and 1996 surveys indicate that both Southeast Asian and non-Southeast Asian households are moving away from complete dependence to partial dependence to self-sufficiency. These findings correspond with higher employment rates reported above (refer to Table 1 and Table 2).

With time, refugee households progress towards self-sufficiency. Progress appears to take place more quickly for Southeast Asian households than for non-Southeast Asian households. Twenty-three

percent of Southeast Asian households who arrived in the U.S. in 1996 reported that they were self-

TABLE 9 - Dependency and Self-Sufficiency of Refugee Households by Year of Arrival

Ethnic Group	Year of Arrival	Public Assistance Only	Both Public Assistance and Earnings	Earnings Only
S.E. Asians	1996	30.8%	38.5%	23.1%
All Others		34.1	30.4	26.3
S.E. Asians	1995	19.5	37.9	35.5
All Others		20.5	27.1	43.5
S.E. Asians	1994	22.1	24.0	51.1
All Others		27.0	20.7	47.0
S.E. Asians	1993	18.9	24.7	52.5
All Others		31.5	17.3	45.1
S.E. Asians	1992	18.5	18.8	60.3
All Others		27.6	13.2	54.2
S.E. Asians	1991	15.6	16.4	66.0
All Others		22.9	23.7	51.2
S.E. Asians	1991 - 1996	19.3	24.6	52.5
All Others	1991 - 1996	26.3%	21.3%	46.2%
All Groups	1991 - 1996	23.8%	22.5%	48.5%

Note: Data refer to refugees 16 and over in the five-year sample population consisting of Amerasians, Entrants, and Refugees of all nationalities who arrived in the years 1991-1996. Refugee households with neither earnings or assistance are excluded.

The gap between economic independence for Southeast Asian versus non-Southeast Asian households appears to have reversed itself. Over 52 percent of Southeast Asian households were entirely self sufficient compared to 46 percent for non-Southeast Asian households. The difference between the two groups in the 1994 survey was 13 percent (23 percent for Southeast Asians and 36

percent for non-Southeast Asians). By the 1995 survey, the difference had diminished to less than four percent (35 percent for Southeast Asians and under 39 percent for non-Southeast Asians). Differences between the 1995 and 1996 surveys indicate that both Southeast Asian and non-Southeast Asian households are moving away from complete dependence to partial dependence to self-sufficiency. These findings correspond with higher employment rates reported above (refer to Table 1 and Table 2).

With time, refugee households progress towards self-sufficiency. Progress appears to take place more quickly for Southeast Asian households than for non-Southeast Asian households. Twenty-three percent of Southeast Asian households who arrived in the U.S. in 1996 reported that they were self-sufficient. For refugees that entered five years earlier, the percentage doubled to 66 percent. For non-Southeast Asian households, the trend is not as pronounced, i.e., from 26 percent in 1996 to 51 percent in 1991. Equally noteworthy are the percentages associated with complete dependence. Over time, complete dependence falls by over 15 percent for Southeast Asian households (from 31 percent for 1996 arrivals to 16 percent for 1991 arrivals). For non-Southeast Asian households, complete dependence falls by 11 percent (from less than 34 percent in 1996 to 23 percent for 1991 arrivals).

Table 10 details several household characteristics by type of income. Households receiving cash assistance average three members and no wage earners, while those with a mix of earnings and assistance income average five members and two wage earners. Households that receive no cash assistance average three members with approximately two wage earners. A child under the age of six as well as a household member under the age of 16 was present in welfare dependent households and households with a mix of earnings and assistance more often than households with earnings only.

English language proficiency was higher in families with earnings only and lower in families with assistance only. Approximately 13 percent of all refugee households dependent solely on public

assistance contained one or more persons fluent in English. In contrast, about 21 percent of households with a mix of earnings and assistance reported at least one fluent English speaker. An even higher proportion of households with earnings income only (22 percent) reported at least one fluent English speaker. Again, the relationship between English language proficiency and income is clear.

TABLE 10 - Characteristics of Households by Type of Income

Household Characteristics	Refugee Households with			Total Sample
	Public Assistance Only	Both Public Assistance and Earnings	Earnings Only	
Average Household Size	3.4%	4.7%	3.4%	3.7%
Average Number of wage earners per household	0.0	1.7	1.9	1.3
Percent of households with at least one member:				
Under the age of 6	25.0%	27.7%	17.1%	21.4%
Under the age of 16	48.7	62.1	47.7	50.7
Fluent English Speaker	12.7	21.3	21.6	19.0

Note: Data refer to refugees 16 and over in the five-year sample population consisting of Amerasians, Entrants, and Refugees of all nationalities who arrived in the years 1991-1996. Refugee households with neither earnings or assistance are excluded.

Welfare Utilization

The 1996 survey showed that welfare utilization continues to decline. This decrease corresponds to an increase in refugee employment.⁸ As in previous years, welfare utilization varied considerably among refugee groups. Table 11 presents welfare utilization data on the households of the seven refugee groups formed from survey respondents. Non-cash assistance was generally higher than cash assistance, probably because Medicaid, food stamp, and housing assistance programs, though available to cash assistance households, are also available to households with

⁸ Refer to Current Employment Status of Refugees, Table 1 and Table 2, above.

low-income workers. Over 48 percent of refugee households reported receiving food stamps in the previous 12 months, approximately 12 percentage points lower from the year before (60 percent). Utilization ranged from a high of 69 percent for the group from Other Southeast Asia to a low of 29 percent for Latin America (following the same trend as the 1995 and 1994 surveys). Forty-one percent of all refugees reported that their medical coverage was through low-income medical assistance programs (Medicaid or RMA), down three percentage points from the 1995 survey and down nine percentage points from the 1994 survey. Utilization of government medical assistance programs this year ranged from a low of 24 percent for Vietnam to a high of 84 percent for Other Southeast Asia. Twelve percent of refugee households reported that they lived in public housing projects (down approximately two percentage points from both the 1995 and 1994 surveys).

Forty-six percent of refugee households had received some kind of cash assistance in at least one of the past 12 months. This represents a decrease of nine percent from 1995 and a decrease of seven percent from 1994. Overall, receipt of any type of cash assistance was highest for the group from Other Southeast Asia (71 percent) and lowest for Latin America (14 percent). Fifteen percent of all refugee households had received AFDC in the last 12 months, approximately two percent less than what was reported in the 1995 survey and 11 percent less than what was reported in the 1994 survey. Utilization ranged from a high of 31 percent for Other Southeast Asia to a low of five percent for Latin America. AFDC for Eastern Europe was only five percent. Little more than four percent of sampled households received RCA in 1996.

Twenty-one percent of refugee households had at least one household member who received Supplemental Security Income (SSI) in the past twelve months. This rate is down slightly from the rate reported in the 1995 survey (22 percent). Utilization varied largely according to the number of refugees over age 65. Refugees from the former Soviet Union were found to utilize SSI most often. With about 11 percent of their

five-year population aged 65 or over, 34 percent of their households received SSI. By contrast, not one other refugee group had more than four percent of their five-year population aged 65 or over. The median age for the seven refugee groups ranged from a low of 12 years for Other Southeast Asia to 33 years for the former Soviet Union.

TABLE 11 - Public Assistance Utilization of Selected Refugee Groups

Type of Public Assistance	Africa	Latin America	Middle East	Eastern Europe	Former Soviet Union	Vietnam	Other S.E. Asia	All
Cash Assistance								
Any Type of Cash Assistance	40.5%	14.0%	40.8%	56.7%	63.2%	39.9%	70.9%	46.2%
AFDC	21.3	4.8	17.4	5.2	13.6	21.3	30.9	15.4
RCA	8.1	4.6	1.1	29.8	3.4	1.2	0.0	4.3
SSI	11.1	6.9	4.3	9.5	33.5	18.2	20.3	20.5
General Assistance	11.1	0.0	19.4	18.2	28.9	3.7	32.5	14.9
Non-cash Assistance								
Medicaid or RMA	54.7	34.9	42.7	44.2	58.2	24.4	83.8	41.2
Food Stamps	67.0	29.3	51.4	57.2	59.8	38.6	68.5	48.5
Housing	41.8	4.3	5.0	1.6	18.3	4.5	26.8	11.6

Note: Data refer to refugees 16 and over in the five-year sample population consisting of Amerasians, Entrants, and Refugees of all nationalities who arrived in the years 1991-1996. Medicaid and RMA data refer to adult refugees age 16 and over. All other data refer to refugee households and not individuals. Many households receive more than one type of assistance.

General Assistance (also called General Relief or Home Relief in some States) is a form of cash assistance funded entirely with State or local funds. It generally provides assistance to single persons, childless couples, and families with children that are not eligible for AFDC. The 1996 survey reported that about 15 percent of refugee households received some form of GA during the past twelve months compared to 23 percent reported in the 1995 survey. Refugees from Other Southeast Asia showed the highest utilization rate (33 percent) followed by the former Soviet Union (29 percent). Refugees from the former Soviet Union initially resettled in New York are a case in point (discussed in more detail below). Latin America showed the lowest utilization rate (zero percent). The lack of utilization by refugees from Latin America may be related to their concentration in Florida, which has no state funded General Assistance program (also, discussed in more detail below).

The relationship between employment and receipt of welfare varied across refugee groups. Refugees from Latin America showed the lowest welfare utilization and the second highest EPR. Refugees

from Other Southeast Asia showed the highest welfare utilization and the lowest EPR. Refugees from Eastern Europe showed relatively high welfare utilization and the highest EPR. Refugees from the Middle East and the former Soviet Union showed relatively high welfare utilization rates, but only a moderate EPR. Africa showed a moderate welfare utilization rate and low EPR, whereas Vietnam showed a moderate welfare utilization rate and high EPR.

Receipt of employment-related services, e.g., ELT and job training since arrival, and receipt of welfare also varied across refugee groups. Refugees from Africa, Eastern Europe, and the former Soviet Union showed high participation in employment-related services and high welfare utilization. Latin America showed relatively low employment-related services and low welfare utilization. Other Southeast Asia showed high welfare utilization but low ELT and job training. And the Middle East and Vietnam showed moderate welfare utilization and low ELT and job training. Overall, the 1995 survey showed comparable trends.

Employment and Welfare Utilization Rates by State

Washington and Pennsylvania, showed the highest GA utilization (29, 15, and 14 percent respectively).

The 1996 survey also reported welfare utilization and employment rate by State of residence. Table 12 shows the EPR and utilization rates for various types of welfare for twelve States, as well as the nation as a whole. Unlike Table 11, which computes welfare utilization rates for entire households, Table 12 presents data on utilization by individual refugees (including children).

The EPR was generally low where the proportion of individuals receiving welfare was high and high where welfare utilization is low. Five of the six States with the highest EPR had low welfare utilization. Specifically, Georgia had the highest EPR (71 percent) followed by Oregon (66 percent), Texas (64 percent), Florida (63 percent), Illinois (62 percent) and Michigan (57 percent). Florida had the lowest welfare utilization (7 percent) followed by Michigan and Texas (11 percent each), Georgia (14 percent), and Oregon (16 percent). Illinois had both a relatively high EPR and relatively high welfare utilization. Alternatively, New York had the lowest EPR (36 percent) and second highest amount welfare utilization (48 percent) followed by California which had the second lowest EPR (42 percent) and the third highest proportion of welfare utilization (43 percent). Washington and Minnesota had the third and fourth lowest EPR (44 and 45 percent, respectively) and the fourth and seventh highest amount of welfare utilization (39 and 28 percent, respectively). Massachusetts and Pennsylvania had the fifth and sixth lowest EPR (45 and 46 percent, respectively) and the fifth and the highest amount of welfare utilization (36 and 52 percent, respectively).

California, followed by Pennsylvania and Washington, showed the highest proportion of AFDC utilization (24, 15, and 14 percent, respectively). Pennsylvania, followed by Illinois and New York showed the highest proportion of RCA utilization (seven, three, and three percent, respectively). Massachusetts, followed by Pennsylvania and New York, showed the highest proportion of SSI utilization (20, 16, and 12 percent, respectively). New York, followed by

It is interesting to note the change in rate of welfare utilization that results from substituting individuals for households as the unit of analysis (the difference between the utilization rates reported in Table 11 and Table 12). The utilization rate for individuals receiving AFDC was 12 percent versus 15 percent for households. The utilization rate for individuals receiving RCA was two percent versus four percent for households. The utilization rate for individuals receiving GA was nine percent versus 15 percent for households. Most notable is the drop in SSI: The utilization rate for individuals receiving SSI was eight percent versus 21 percent for households. Finally, the overall welfare utilization rate for refugee individuals (30 percent) was 16 percent lower than the total welfare utilization rate for refugee households. As a general rule, measuring welfare utilization by household tends to inflate the utilization rate somewhat because households are counted as dependent on welfare

even if only one member of a large family received any type of assistance.

Overall, findings from ORR's 1996 survey indicate (as in previous years) that refugees face significant problems upon arrival in the U.S. But, over time, refugees generally find jobs and move toward economic self-sufficiency in their new country. The 1996 survey demonstrates that the employment rate of refugees has made significant strides toward matching that of the U.S. population. Data also show that the continued progress of many refugee households toward self-sufficiency is tied to education and English proficiency.

Technical Note: The ORR Annual Survey, with interviews in the fall of 1996, is the 25th in a series conducted since 1975. Until 1993, the survey was limited to Southeast Asian refugees. A random sample was selected from the ORR Refugee Data File. ORR's contractor contacted the family by a letter in English and a second letter in the refugee's native language. If the person sampled was a child, an adult living in the same household was interviewed. Interviews were

State	Arrivals*	Number of Individuals (vs. Households) on Welfare					Total**
		EPR	AFDC	RCA	SSI	GA	
California	(2,150)	41.6	23.6	1.3	7.5	10.8	43.3
New York	(1,074)	36.1	4.5	3.2	12.2	28.6	48.4
Florida	(947)	62.9	1.5	1.6	3.3	1.0	6.9
Washington	(488)	44.3	13.7	2.0	8.4	14.5	38.7
Texas	(415)	64.3	3.6	1.9	4.8	1.0	11.3
Illinois	(246)	61.5	8.9	3.3	8.9	8.1	29.3
Georgia	(282)	70.6	2.1	2.1	4.3	5.3	13.8
Massachusetts	(188)	45.4	10.1	1.1	19.7	4.8	35.6
Michigan	(230)	57.4	4.3	0	4.8	1.7	11.3
Minnesota	(236)	45.2	9.7	1.7	7.6	9.3	28.4
Pennsylvania	(182)	45.5	15.4	7.1	15.9	13.7	52.2
Oregon	(155)	65.7	5.2	0	11.0	0	16.1
Other States	(1,641)	58.4	10.9	2.2	6.8	2.3	22.2
All States	(8,234)	51.0	11.5	2.0	7.8	9.1	30.4

*The State arrival figures are weighted totals.

**The column totals represent individuals who received any combination of AFDC, RCA, SSI and/or GA, e.g., if an individual received AFDC, RCA, SSI, and GA, he/she is counted four times.

Note: As of October 1996. Not seasonally adjusted. Welfare utilization refers to receipt of public assistance in at least one of the past twelve months. The listed utilization rate for each type of public assistance is the ratio of the number of individuals (including minor children) receiving such aid to the total number of individuals in the five-year sample population residing in that State. **Because some refugees have difficulty distinguishing between GA and AFDC, some GA utilization may reflect AFDC utilization.** For data on welfare utilization by household, see Table 9.

conducted by telephone in the refugee's native language. The questionnaire and interview procedures were essentially the same between the 1981 survey and the 1992 survey, except that beginning in 1985 the sample was expanded to a five-year population consisting of refugees from Southeast Asia who had arrived over the most recent five years.

Prior to 1993, the annual survey was restricted to Southeast Asian refugees who had arrived during a five-year period ending approximately six months before the time of the interview. In 1993, the survey was expanded beyond the Southeast Asian refugee population to include refugee, Amerasian, and entrant arrivals from all regions of the world. Each year a random sample of new arrivals is identified and interviewed. In addition, refugees who had been included in the previous year's survey--but had not resided in the U.S. for more than five years--are again contacted and interviewed for the new survey. Thus, the survey continuously tracks the progress of a randomly selected sample of refugees over their initial five years in this country. This permits comparison of refugees arriving in different years, as well as the relative influence of experiential and environment factors on refugee progress toward self-sufficiency across five years. Altogether, 2,102 households were contacted and interviewed this year.

For 1996, refugees included in the 1995 survey who had not yet resided in the U.S. for five years were again contacted and interviewed along with a new sample of refugees, Amerasians, and entrants who had arrived between May 1, 1995 and April 30, 1996. Of the 2,288 re-interview cases from the 1995 sample, 1,780 were contacted and interviewed, and 22 were contacted, but refused to be interviewed. The remaining 486 re-interview cases could not be traced in time to be interviewed. Of the 450 new interview cases 322 were contacted and interviewed, another two were contacted, but refused to cooperate, and the remaining 126 could not be traced in time to be interviewed. The resulting responses were then weighted according to year of entry and ethnic category.

In addition, of the 485 re-interview cases, which could not be traced in time to be interviewed, nine died, five moved back to their native countries, and two were seriously ill and unable to give an interview. Of the 125 new interview cases, which could not be traced in time to be interviewed, two died, and one moved back to his native country.

APPENDIX A

TABLES

TABLE 1: AMERASIAN, ENTRANT, AND REFUGEE ARRIVALS BY COUNTRY OF CITIZENSHIP

FY 1983 - FY 1996

COUNTRY OF ORIGIN	FY 1983	FY 1984	FY 1985	FY 1986	FY 1987	FY 1988	FY 1989	FY 1990	FY 1991	FY 1992	FY 1993	FY 1994	FY 1995	FY 1996	FY 83-96
Afghanistan	2790	2023	2198	2418	3161	2211	1741	1595	1443	1465	1234	24	13	11	22327
Albania	56	42	44	82	47	74	42	104	1339	1168	397	159	47	26	3627
Bulgaria	137	129	125	151	108	149	106	345	563	102	23	26	6	1	1971
Cambodia	13041	19727	19175	9845	1786	2897	2162	2328	179	162	61	15	6	5	71389
Cuba A/	617	87	180	143	292	3366	4170	4706	4188	3843	3098	2685	6115	3488	36978
Cuba (Entrant) B/	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	2813	3906	12783	31038	16866	67406
Czechoslovakia	1227	822	948	1427	1031	661	910	331	153	16	1	3	0	0	7530
Ethiopia	2544	2517	1739	1265	1800	1447	1723	3114	4085	2927	2710	297	192	170	26530
Haiti C/	0	0	0	0	0	4	1	0	0	57	1252	3465	1689	62	6530
Haiti (Entrant) D/	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	10397	725	1578	963	322	13985
Hungary	644	544	520	653	664	771	1054	259	12	2	0	1	0	0	5124
Iran	902	2862	3421	3204	6625	6236	4835	3100	2650	1964	1155	859	972	1249	40034
Iraq	1583	161	232	305	196	40	103	66	822	3375	4560	4922	3474	2690	22529
Laos	2907	7218	5195	12313	13394	14597	12560	8715	9232	7285	6945	6211	3681	2203	112456
Liberia	0	0	0	0	0	4	1	0	1	620	946	590	55	42	2259
Libya	0	0	5	1	2	2	1	1	344	1	0	0	0	0	357
Nicaragua	0	0	0	0	36	201	341	634	194	18	60	13	13	25	1535
Poland	5508	4300	2822	3577	3406	3308	3577	1628	371	165	52	43	22	9	28788
Romania	3741	4293	4456	2588	2999	2833	3277	4070	4533	1510	230	81	32	12	34655
Rwanda	0	0	0	0	1	0	0	0	0	0	7	31	87	129	255
Somalia	0	1	0	0	2	6	45	17	119	1528	2695	3508	2524	6440	16885
Sudan	4	0	3	0	2	1	6	59	6	126	253	1288	1693	583	4024
USSR (Former) E/	1371	730	647	794	3458	20020	39387	49741	38493	61001	48318	43094	35493	29271	371818
Vietnam	22819	24856	25222	21703	19661	17571	21924	27795	28384	26853	31405	34100	32243	16107	350643
Vietnam (Amerasian)	0	0	0	0	3	370	8737	13905	16567	17132	11220	2885	948	906	72673
Yugoslavia (Former) F/	10	26	22	2	2	2	3	2	1	3	1877	7417	9869	12017	31253
Zaire	11	31	31	11	9	7	20	70	39	63	199	83	115	42	731
Other/Unknown G/	128	235	181	77	178	152	206	350	262	363	352	265	264	240	3253
Table Total	60040	70604	67166	60559	58863	76930	106932	122935	113980	144959	123681	126426	131554	92916	1357545

a/ Includes Cubans with either refugee status or humanitarian parolee status (prior to FY 1992).

b/ Includes Cubans with either entrant status, humanitarian parolee status (as of FY 1992), or Havana Parolee status.

c/ Includes Haitians with either refugee status or humanitarian parolee status (prior to FY 1992).

d/ Includes Haitians with entrant status or humanitarian parolee status (as of FY 1992).

e/ Includes refugees from the republics of the former Soviet Union.

f/ Includes refugees from the republics of the former Yugoslavia.

g/ Includes countries with fewer than 100 arrivals as well as cases with unknown country of origin.

TABLE 2: AMERASIAN, ENTRANT, AND REFUGEE ARRIVALS BY COUNTRY OF CITIZENSHIP AND STATE OF INITIAL RESETTLEMENT
 FY 1983 - FY 1996

STATE	Afghan-istan	Albania	Bulgaria	Cambodia	Cuba a/ (Refugee)	Cuba b/ (entrant)	Czechoslovakia	Ethiopia	Haiti c/ (refugee)	Haiti d/ (entrant)	Hungary	Iran	Iraq	Laos	Total
Alabama	35	0	0	291	73	109	5	67	85	27	3	32	12	265	3416
Alaska	7	2	0	4	0	0	2	0	0	0	0	46	5	39	572
Arizona	438	27	176	659	211	607	40	632	81	10	66	305	815	416	17226
Arkansas	3	3	0	31	1	14	8	7	0	0	5	15	31	435	1727
California	8609	177	515	18605	1271	1420	1715	6103	124	221	799	25117	3970	49351	360711
Colorado	371	8	21	681	73	12	130	451	75	0	36	184	73	1412	13079
Connecticut	91	185	45	1173	231	345	120	137	183	81	442	237	84	995	14029
Delaware	34	0	3	0	18	4	0	11	2	12	2	29	0	7	463
District Of Columbia	331	4	20	371	66	16	37	1146	58	1	134	146	289	412	9914
Florida	247	250	110	1142	24926	53748	217	619	1334	11480	230	497	429	821	116703
Georgia	670	10	4	1783	177	289	75	1254	34	40	111	399	258	1133	28237
Hawaii	31	0	1	75	0	1	13	3	0	0	2	5	3	580	3852
Idaho	23	32	57	273	68	5	293	8	116	0	23	19	167	238	4393
Illinois	328	201	91	3002	329	518	323	1018	78	70	137	761	2412	2253	51751
Indiana	81	5	9	227	12	20	37	119	33	3	22	84	109	192	4306
Iowa	3	3	0	582	7	8	13	142	20	0	54	36	108	1853	10575
Kansas	95	0	0	452	7	20	12	39	10	1	0	71	52	848	8628
Kentucky	38	3	3	454	219	475	0	54	29	13	0	40	380	272	7805
Louisiana	34	0	0	561	98	297	16	49	37	52	1	45	9	698	9375
Maine	336	7	72	739	45	1	26	137	0	0	18	130	10	25	3430
Maryland	465	95	39	1111	501	161	145	1552	208	90	76	1148	198	373	23206
Massachusetts	113	243	13	5706	54	149	963	586	387	355	79	445	264	1547	43573
Michigan	56	484	59	205	175	326	111	350	287	42	72	222	4600	1908	25975
Minnesota	183	3	8	2659	49	26	49	809	54	1	67	141	65	13201	31611
Mississippi	4	0	0	15	0	28	11	13	12	13	2	9	1	16	1200
Missouri	216	103	65	789	540	33	212	950	380	8	147	143	701	644	18561
Montana	5	0	0	5	0	0	7	9	0	0	0	1	0	243	833
Nebraska	242	4	0	167	85	38	68	10	6	0	10	14	349	294	6399
Nevada	149	16	7	127	1009	1191	14	362	0	19	15	268	27	158	5157
New Hampshire	10	40	0	340	0	1	93	1	0	0	11	38	5	85	2651
New Jersey	589	219	41	310	2466	1561	238	393	725	323	172	477	121	168	26741
New Mexico	56	0	0	278	1159	1369	13	11	0	0	3	38	104	220	5112
New York	3705	1124	342	3149	874	1373	781	1392	806	777	715	5108	771	1281	194474
North Carolina	136	2	5	1551	271	55	41	184	33	13	36	64	16	942	10857
North Dakota	27	1	2	144	93	1	105	94	89	3	45	31	423	37	3288
Ohio	66	25	8	1703	4	62	115	577	9	39	187	159	350	1398	19640
Oklahoma	44	0	0	489	8	20	10	32	0	0	1	201	43	464	6072
Oregon	185	6	10	976	6	494	32	256	56	87	25	142	100	1418	21781
Pennsylvania	326	73	49	3156	328	318	204	753	318	100	253	282	715	1149	39854
Rhode Island	2	55	1	1305	6	7	0	13	2	11	239	17	7	1285	5343
South Carolina	23	0	6	107	0	10	0	10	0	0	8	33	10	102	1534
South Dakota	57	0	15	34	48	0	69	456	0	0	83	33	83	65	2778

TABLE 2 (continued): AMERASIAN, ENTRANT, AND REFUGEE ARRIVALS BY COUNTRY OF CITIZENSHIP AND STATE OF INITIAL RESETTLEMENT
 FY 1983 - FY 1996

STATE	Afghan- istan	Albania	Bulgaria	Cambodia	Cuba a/ (Refugee)	Cuba b/ (entrant)	Czechos- lovakia	Ethiopia	Haiti c/ (refugee)	Haiti d/ (entrant)	Hungary	Iran	Iraq	Laos	Total	
Vermont	0	34	27	223	8	0	306	7	0	0	19	19	9	83	2515	
Virginia	2346	37	19	2229	112	241	38	835	175	34	59	59	530	408	894	24827
Washington	456	55	66	4851	226	63	196	1457	242	0	551	403	722	3757	53831	
West Virginia	11	3	5	16	0	1	8	1	0	0	6	6	9	0	19	357
Wisconsin	48	35	7	212	1	23	26	66	0	0	11	11	62	2	12688	17108
Wyoming	35	0	0	0	0	0	3	2	0	0	5	5	3	0	14	148
American Samoa	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	1
Guam	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	51
Puerto Rico	0	0	0	0	173	265	0	0	0	1	0	0	0	0	0	439
Unknown H/	0	0	0	10	30	8	0	0	0	10	3	3	3	0	1	113
Table Total	22327	3627	1971	71389	36978	67406	7530	26530	6530	13985	5124	40034	22529	112456	1357545	

a/ Includes Cubans with either refugee status or humanitarian parolee status (prior to FY 1992).

b/ Includes Cubans with either entrant status, humanitarian parolee status (as of FY 1992), or Havana Parolee status.

c/ Includes Haitians with either refugee status or humanitarian parolee status (prior to FY 1992).

d/ Includes Haitians with entrant status or humanitarian parolee status (as of FY 1992).

e/ Includes refugees from the republics of the former Soviet Union.

f/ Includes refugees from the republics of the former Yugoslavia.

g/ Includes countries with fewer than 100 arrivals as well as cases with unknown country of origin.

h/ Includes unknown States.

TABLE 2 (continued): AMERASIAN, ENTRANT, AND REFUGEE ARRIVALS BY COUNTRY OF CITIZENSHIP AND STATE OF INITIAL RESETTLEMENT
 FY 1983 - FY 1996

STATE	Liberia	Libya	Nicaragua	Poland	Romania	Rwanda	Somalia	Sudan	USSR E/ (Former)	Vietnam (Refugee)	Vietnam (Amerasian)	Slavia F/ (Former)	Zaire	Other/ G/ Unknown	Total
Alabama	0	0	0	40	36	0	0	0	211	1198	889	31	0	7	3416
Alaska	0	0	0	28	32	0	0	0	150	182	55	19	0	1	572
Arizona	21	16	55	255	1198	0	263	58	1583	5810	2050	1314	12	108	17226
Arkansas	0	0	0	107	7	0	0	0	38	918	94	9	0	1	1727
California	61	52	269	3587	8591	2	3635	267	72620	136048	14588	2329	97	568	360711
Colorado	0	0	16	212	113	6	69	54	3731	4086	766	462	21	16	13079
Connecticut	2	0	27	1118	738	10	88	25	4179	2294	787	377	0	35	14029
Delaware	0	0	0	16	12	0	0	3	180	113	2	11	0	4	463
District Of Columbia	41	15	19	191	81	3	307	98	62	3177	2470	119	100	200	9914
Florida	15	33	647	724	1084	7	41	56	5295	8616	2121	1740	23	251	116703
Georgia	59	5	7	151	374	13	1574	87	3553	11282	3604	1188	22	81	28237
Hawaii	0	0	0	6	2	0	0	0	20	2470	638	0	0	2	3852
Idaho	10	0	0	320	389	6	0	7	822	872	97	516	26	6	4393
Illinois	44	16	21	3562	4541	21	320	47	19098	6859	1633	3845	5	218	51751
Indiana	10	0	0	188	126	6	14	7	1358	1097	116	317	6	108	4306
Iowa	15	0	0	175	119	3	137	386	435	3863	1407	1132	53	21	10575
Kansas	4	0	0	36	32	0	92	26	951	5059	741	63	0	17	8628
Kentucky	0	12	0	29	66	7	169	14	1076	2353	1071	1000	0	28	7805
Louisiana	7	0	54	83	23	0	0	0	88	5972	1166	79	0	6	9375
Maine	0	0	0	383	96	13	181	140	343	252	299	218	36	39	3430
Maryland	209	0	31	676	366	1	651	77	8725	4638	1317	218	26	109	23206
Massachusetts	107	0	15	777	190	0	842	6	16654	11592	1787	639	5	55	43573
Michigan	31	14	0	2033	2133	0	247	5	5544	4310	1348	1330	0	83	25975
Minnesota	149	0	0	284	236	0	920	223	4986	5857	974	560	31	76	31611
Mississippi	0	0	0	9	7	0	0	2	15	953	90	0	0	0	1200
Missouri	67	17	3	626	553	21	484	148	2967	4819	2090	1664	28	143	18561
Montana	1	0	4	14	7	0	0	0	422	82	8	25	0	0	833
Nebraska	0	25	0	188	36	0	0	9	821	2869	1022	129	0	13	6399
Nevada	0	17	28	159	44	0	31	78	72	1124	67	151	0	24	5157
New Hampshire	0	0	1	31	44	13	0	0	216	1020	65	175	0	5	2651
New Jersey	164	2	59	1624	746	0	39	25	9354	5190	1172	500	13	50	26741
New Mexico	0	0	35	46	34	0	12	0	115	1119	488	6	0	6	5112
New York	431	28	41	5442	5530	1	877	193	139155	12011	4875	3337	72	283	194474
North Carolina	69	0	21	215	116	13	280	30	801	3837	1652	435	0	39	10857
North Dakota	0	0	0	112	138	0	164	106	360	401	494	382	3	33	3288
Ohio	35	7	12	228	980	1	73	11	10138	2628	371	411	18	25	19640
Oklahoma	29	0	0	103	60	0	0	0	110	3717	697	36	0	8	6072
Oregon	4	9	0	101	1374	0	225	15	8506	6029	1353	323	7	42	21781
Pennsylvania	152	1	7	1406	968	60	265	28	16636	8361	2758	1028	13	147	39854
Rhode Island	166	0	0	89	35	0	0	0	1743	319	31	10	0	0	5343
South Carolina	0	0	0	12	20	0	0	0	301	789	59	40	0	4	1534

TABLE 2 (continued): AMERASIAN, ENTRANT, AND REFUGEE ARRIVALS BY COUNTRY OF CITIZENSHIP AND STATE OF INITIAL RESETTLEMENT
FY 1983 - FY 1996

STATE	Liberia	Libya	Nicaragua	Poland	Romania	Rwanda	Somalia	Sudan	USSR E/ (Former)	Vietnam (Refugee)	Vietnam (Amerasian)	Slavia F/ (Former)	Zaire	Other/ G/ Unknown	Total
South Dakota	0	8	0	160	168	0	29	448	445	233	166	145	12	21	2778
Tennessee	40	14	23	159	156	24	632	308	1116	2942	1219	390	43	50	12633
Texas	205	35	88	1313	1235	13	947	785	3827	33166	6996	1745	39	144	69233
Utah	1	0	0	360	66	0	172	93	1339	2635	933	646	0	3	9457
Vermont	0	0	0	31	182	0	0	1	287	290	587	400	0	2	2515
Virginia	93	9	20	220	157	4	2190	71	1968	9902	1606	565	2	63	24827
Washington	9	22	21	931	900	7	795	80	16956	16318	3594	1053	18	82	53831
West Virginia	8	0	0	19	9	0	1	0	8	64	150	18	0	1	357
Wisconsin	0	0	10	198	40	0	119	7	2379	831	79	239	0	25	17108
Wyoming	0	0	0	7	0	0	0	0	44	29	6	0	0	0	148
American Samoa	0	0	0	0	1	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	1
Guam	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	33	18	0	0	0	51
Puerto Rico	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	439
Unknown H/	0	0	1	4	7	0	0	0	15	14	7	0	0	0	113
Table Total	2259	357	1535	28788	34655	255	16885	4024	371818	350643	72673	31253	731	3253	1357645

a/ Includes Cubans with either refugee status or humanitarian parolee status (prior to FY 1992).

b/ Includes Cubans with either entrant status, humanitarian parolee status (as of FY 1992), or Havana Parolee status.

c/ Includes Haitians with either refugee status or humanitarian parolee status (prior to FY 1992).

d/ Includes Haitians with entrant status or humanitarian parolee status (as of FY 1992).

e/ Includes refugees from the republics of the former Soviet Union.

f/ Includes refugees from the republics of the former Yugoslavia.

g/ Includes countries with fewer than 100 arrivals as well as cases with unknown country of origin.

h/ Includes unknown States.

TABLE 3: AMERASIAN, ENTRANT, AND REFUGEE ARRIVALS BY STATE OF INITIAL RESETTLEMENT

FY 1983 - FY 1996

STATE	FY 1983	FY 1984	FY 1985	FY 1986	FY 1987	FY 1988	FY 1989	FY1990	FY 1991	FY 1992	FY 1993	FY 1994	FY 1995	FY 1996	FY 83-96
Alabama	242	353	245	284	136	73	218	275	329	329	204	195	304	229	3416
Alaska	20	27	41	65	11	7	27	69	48	81	39	72	20	45	572
Arizona	1200	828	1165	958	703	677	1069	1544	1690	1551	1112	1287	1686	1756	17226
Arkansas	143	212	153	146	178	69	120	122	149	71	103	106	77	78	1727
California	16364	21390	21453	19551	23379	34841	30884	31142	32813	33558	31413	27590	22448	13885	360711
Colorado	601	771	633	693	675	479	1055	1216	1282	1131	1153	1204	1150	1036	13079
Connecticut	750	963	908	793	699	796	1141	1642	1231	1292	1017	1085	917	795	14029
Delaware	24	19	15	39	21	12	57	61	20	73	33	42	28	19	463
District Of Columbia	576	468	385	423	345	427	959	1096	1174	1033	687	692	927	722	9914
Florida	1592	1410	1652	1293	1236	3855	5316	6720	5775	15906	8491	16035	30999	16423	116703
Georgia	971	1356	1292	1014	938	765	1498	2144	2610	3174	3132	3339	3302	2702	28237
Hawaii	340	302	308	257	362	192	269	351	296	336	293	283	178	85	3852
Idaho	85	400	524	327	76	175	245	325	345	350	290	372	464	415	4393
Illinois	3053	3361	2951	2619	2145	2396	5149	4557	3952	5176	4038	4455	4332	3567	51751
Indiana	254	331	317	293	114	118	228	354	402	356	460	360	358	361	4306
Iowa	317	595	575	773	404	457	862	978	873	808	844	931	1164	994	10575
Kansas	563	720	826	529	416	270	525	805	690	700	698	635	761	490	8628
Kentucky	177	245	381	398	191	211	314	586	755	659	628	802	1096	1362	7805
Louisiana	879	989	775	604	394	280	382	725	792	853	689	732	762	519	9375
Maine	278	437	285	266	139	174	184	365	265	162	249	203	271	152	3430
Maryland	929	1426	1023	853	888	985	1843	2385	2269	3342	2486	1838	1853	1086	23206
Massachusetts	2284	2598	2836	2281	1649	2817	4344	4676	3399	4471	3554	3375	2891	2398	43573
Michigan	1530	1067	1046	1084	1163	1096	1675	2266	2277	2710	2256	2824	2648	2333	25975
Minnesota	1630	1870	1715	1912	2005	2602	2834	2260	2019	2760	2784	2654	2491	2075	31611
Mississippi	106	122	140	140	78	54	95	112	106	47	53	66	54	27	1200
Missouri	821	970	917	992	609	553	1079	1630	1664	2064	1736	1873	1760	1893	18561
Montana	35	51	33	28	72	56	61	100	106	88	46	40	58	59	833
Nebraska	244	204	126	187	197	166	365	660	1032	789	563	592	754	520	6399
Nevada	358	381	275	265	271	251	310	280	347	393	325	512	610	579	5157
New Hampshire	126	115	171	65	89	179	253	286	226	213	160	250	301	217	2651
New Jersey	971	1054	937	964	1045	1299	2210	2885	2618	3306	2476	2627	2763	1586	26741
New Mexico	206	217	282	153	136	57	255	341	479	491	512	698	775	510	5112
New York	5475	5359	4921	4283	5196	7514	20010	23289	16336	27256	23483	21131	17330	12891	194474

TABLE 3: AMERASIAN, ENTRANT, AND REFUGEE ARRIVALS BY STATE OF INITIAL RESETTLEMENT
 FY 1983 - FY 1996

STATE	FY 1983	FY 1984	FY 1985	FY 1986	FY 1987	FY 1988	FY 1989	FY 1990	FY 1991	FY 1992	FY 1993	FY 1994	FY 1995	FY 1996	FY 83-96
North Carolina	848	626	619	572	389	410	705	891	882	911	1197	786	1010	1011	10857
North Dakota	118	193	209	121	34	79	113	166	256	483	380	370	425	341	3288
Ohio	1057	1191	1024	824	705	591	1260	2277	1678	2381	2150	1663	1444	1395	19640
Oklahoma	571	732	603	446	246	219	340	452	549	354	537	409	397	217	6072
Oregon	1020	1172	965	798	714	929	1852	2345	1988	2556	1842	1923	2054	1623	21781
Pennsylvania	1886	2172	2146	1797	1422	1878	3669	4287	3389	4300	3618	3568	3012	2710	39854
Rhode Island	345	576	512	430	307	409	482	662	400	460	235	260	162	103	5343
South Carolina	120	133	79	84	65	64	81	92	133	152	116	177	153	85	1534
South Dakota	160	135	135	122	95	94	132	247	311	280	253	285	242	287	2778
Tennessee	547	644	664	918	487	465	672	948	1140	1327	1089	1195	1346	1191	12633
Texas	5119	5659	5043	4280	3091	2686	4050	5758	5834	6024	5633	6234	5599	4223	69233
Utah	695	1005	896	716	504	352	619	759	635	568	583	619	709	797	9457
Vermont	101	109	45	123	101	81	182	254	240	262	249	275	231	262	2515
Virginia	1726	2033	1574	1543	1340	1088	1413	2072	2076	1973	2196	2090	2001	1702	24827
Washington	2109	2974	2818	2457	2047	1832	3677	4094	4795	5410	5740	5683	5868	4327	53831
West Virginia	33	22	43	24	7	2	18	53	42	45	31	17	8	12	357
Wisconsin	398	587	472	743	1342	1824	1792	1239	1183	1876	1792	1922	1195	743	17108
Wyoming	31	19	7	13	5	4	28	12	18	11	0	0	0	0	148
American Samoa	0	1	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	1
Guam	0	6	0	11	0	0	0	6	17	5	6	0	0	0	51
Puerto Rico	0	0	0	0	2	13	5	34	35	42	26	49	162	71	439
Unknown A/	12	4	6	5	0	7	6	40	10	10	1	1	4	7	113
Table Total	60040	70604	67166	60559	58863	76930	106932	122935	113980	144959	123681	126426	131554	92916	1357545

a/ Includes Unknown States.

TABLE 4: AMERASIAN, ENTRANT, AND REFUGEE ARRIVALS BY COUNTRY OF CITIZENSHIP AND STATE OF INITIAL RESETTLEMENT

FY 1996

STATE	Cuba A/ (Refugee)	Cuba B/ (Entrant)	Ethiopia	Haiti C/ (Refugee)	Haiti D/ (Entrant)	Iran	Iraq	Laos	Rwanda	Somalia	Sudan	Ussr E/ (Former)	Vietnam (Refugee)	Vietnam (Amerasian)	Yugo- Slavia F/ (Former)	Other/ G/ Unknown	Total
Alabama	15	55	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	20	98	25	16	0	229
Alaska	0	0	0	0	0	7	0	0	0	0	0	30	4	0	4	0	45
Arizona	48	168	1	0	2	21	186	17	0	171	17	258	239	45	574	9	1756
Arkansas	0	9	0	0	0	0	0	12	0	0	0	6	51	0	0	0	78
California	60	329	59	0	0	783	160	995	2	917	34	5394	4264	74	782	32	13885
Colorado	28	0	3	2	0	5	27	15	6	21	11	410	263	12	231	2	1036
Connecticut	64	138	0	1	3	7	0	7	1	47	18	279	82	18	123	7	795
Delaware	0	2	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	3	12	0	0	2	0	19
District of Columbia	9	4	2	0	0	5	89	15	0	124	21	0	300	63	62	28	722
Florida	1846	12413	16	32	298	16	62	25	1	15	10	349	534	52	709	45	16423
Georgia	80	91	13	0	0	30	48	10	4	606	14	201	1082	107	409	7	2702
Hawaii	0	1	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	83	1	0	0	85
Idaho	19	0	0	0	0	0	25	0	4	0	1	46	64	0	255	1	415
Illinois	51	227	7	1	0	12	158	1	7	138	6	1304	225	12	1395	23	3567
Indiana	6	5	0	0	0	1	28	0	0	0	5	129	55	4	121	7	361
Iowa	0	2	0	0	0	0	1	54	0	111	22	30	373	17	381	3	994
Kansas	0	9	0	0	0	1	3	6	0	24	11	42	373	8	8	5	490
Kentucky	62	306	0	0	0	0	96	6	5	119	7	119	169	3	464	6	1362
Louisiana	18	72	0	3	0	0	4	45	0	0	0	2	308	38	29	0	519
Maine	7	0	0	0	0	1	0	0	6	38	25	41	7	0	14	13	152
Maryland	25	45	7	2	0	32	1	6	1	287	1	465	99	7	74	34	1086
Mass.	9	69	1	0	2	2	38	26	0	286	0	1344	391	2	222	6	2398
Michigan	56	159	2	0	0	5	594	46	0	164	2	448	239	7	580	31	2333
Minnesota	0	7	11	0	0	4	4	307	0	529	66	638	264	12	229	4	2075
Mississippi	0	7	0	0	1	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	19	0	0	0	27
Missouri	61	8	7	0	0	2	137	37	5	283	10	235	355	14	716	23	1893
Montana	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	47	6	0	6	0	59
Nebraska	28	32	0	0	0	0	115	0	0	0	0	34	253	14	44	0	520
Nevada	74	373	3	0	0	8	6	0	0	14	6	3	44	0	48	0	579
New Hampshire	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	6	0	0	21	84	2	101	3	217
New Jersey	260	306	0	9	1	1	24	0	0	11	8	590	248	12	111	5	1586

Table 4 (continued): Amerasian, Entrant, and Refugee Arrivals By Country Of Citizenship And State Of Initial Resettlement
 Fy 1996

STATE	Cuba A/ (Refugee)	Cuba B/ (Entrant)	Ethiopia	Haiti C/ (Refugee)	Haiti D/ (Entrant)	Iran	Iraq	Laos	Rwanda	Somalia	Sudan	Ussr E/ (Former)	Vietnam (Refugee)	Vietnam (Amerasian)	Yugo- Slavia F/ (Former)	Other/ G/ Unknown	Total	
New Mexico	73	332	0	0	0	0	0	8	1	0	0	0	5	79	10	0	2	510
New York	101	385	1	7	7	195	92	17	17	0	300	15	10200	362	35	1153	21	12891
North Carolina	101	28	0	0	0	1	0	30	30	4	173	1	108	380	17	167	1	1011
North Dakota	33	0	0	0	0	0	6	0	0	0	129	19	21	6	0	126	1	341
Ohio	0	42	2	0	0	2	56	6	1	40	5	871	155	3	201	11	1395	
Oklahoma	0	7	0	0	0	0	1	3	0	0	0	0	1	189	8	8	0	217
Oregon	0	252	3	0	0	7	16	6	0	112	1	805	273	4	141	3	1623	
Pennsylvania	16	201	0	4	1	5	124	3	46	96	0	1425	366	20	395	8	2710	
Rhode Island	0	4	0	0	0	0	0	24	0	0	0	0	71	0	3	1	103	
South Carolina	0	6	0	0	0	0	0	8	0	0	0	0	22	40	1	8	0	85
South Dakota	19	0	1	0	0	5	25	0	0	0	80	65	0	0	91	1	287	
Tennessee	56	171	1	1	0	2	144	0	11	239	39	56	266	36	165	4	1191	
Texas	150	431	23	0	0	25	193	33	10	428	82	219	1691	156	744	38	4223	
Utah	16	1	0	0	0	21	59	0	0	146	8	76	142	16	310	2	797	
Vermont	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	21	77	3	161	0	262	
Virginia	21	75	1	0	2	20	84	22	4	647	22	224	353	9	197	21	1702	
Washington	47	41	6	0	0	23	76	13	5	162	9	2411	1138	39	354	3	4327	
West Virginia	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	12	0	12	
Wisconsin	0	9	0	0	0	0	0	407	0	63	4	173	14	0	71	2	743	
Puerto Rico	29	42	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	71	
Unknown H/	0	2	0	0	5	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	7
Table Total	3488	16866	170	62	322	1249	2690	2203	129	6440	583	29271	16107	906	12017	413	92916	

A/ Includes Cubans With Refugee Status.
 B/ Includes Cubans With Either Entrant Status, Humanitarian Parolee Status, Or Havana Parolee Status.
 C/ Includes Haitians With Refugee Status.
 D/ Includes Haitians With Entrant Status Or Humanitarian Parolee Status.
 E/ Includes Refugees From The Republics Of The Former Soviet Union.
 F/ Includes Refugees From The Republics Of The Former Yugoslavia.
 G/ Includes Countries With Fewer Than 50 Arrivals As Well As Cases With Unknown Country Of Origin.
 H/ Includes Unknown States.

**TABLE 5: AMERASIAN, ENTRANT, AND REFUGEE SECONDARY MIGRATION a/
FY 1994 - FY 1996**

STATE	IN-MIGRATION	OUT-MIGRATION	NET MIGRATION
Alabama	27	141	-114
ALASKA b/	0	28	-28
Arizona	419	331	88
Arkansas	56	46	10
California	2146	2703	-557
Colorado	313	124	189
Connecticut	218	142	76
Delaware	16	17	-1
District Of Columbia	30	678	-648
Florida	2626	1386	1240
Georgia	452	357	95
Hawaii	4	38	-34
Idaho	76	112	-36
Illinois	373	461	-88
Indiana	9	55	-46
Iowa	732	239	493
Kansas	104	149	-45
Kentucky	100	198	-98
Louisiana	228	232	-4
Maine	61	39	22
Maryland	533	260	273
Massachusetts	175	274	-99
Michigan	471	286	185
Minnesota	2713	268	2445
Mississippi	44	48	-4
Missouri	15	356	-341
Montana	52	22	30
Nebraska	16	139	-123
Nevada	401	180	221
New Hampshire	0	50	-50
New Jersey	34	572	-538
New Mexico	3	225	-222
New York	498	1245	-747
North Carolina	414	148	266
North Dakota	14	119	-105
Ohio	20	175	-155
Oklahoma	81	78	3
Oregon	86	424	-338
Pennsylvania	0	477	-477
Rhode Island	25	19	6
South Carolina	103	41	62
South Dakota	190	189	1
Tennessee	49	375	-326
Texas	386	1473	-1087
Utah	0	227	-227
Vermont	5	66	-61
Virginia	283	645	-362
Washington	1969	497	1472
West Virginia	0	13	-13
Wisconsin	247	237	10
Wyoming	0	2	-2
Other	0	211	-211
Table Total	16817	16817	0

a/ This table represents a compilation of unadjusted ORR-11 data reports submitted by States.

The population base is Amerasians, entrants, and refugees receiving State-administered services on 09/30/96. 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, while in-migrants are persons living there on the reporting date who were initially placed elsewhere.

b/ Not participating in the refugee program.

Table 6

FY 1995 Formula Funds To States And Private Sector Fish-Wilsons

State	FY 1995 CMA State Allocations	FY 1995 CMA Private Sector Fish-Wilson	FY 1995 Total CMA Allocations	FY 1995 Social Services Formula	FY 1995 Social Services Political Prisoners 1/	FY 1995 Social Services Private Sector Fish-Wilson	FY 1995 Total Social Services Allocations	FY 1995 TAP Formula Allocation	FY 1995 Cuban/Haitian Assistance Allocation	FY 1995 Total TAP Allocations	FY 1995 Total Formula Allocations
Alabama	\$142,000		\$142,000	133,380			\$133,380				\$275,380
Alaska	\$0	\$40,552	\$40,552	0		75,000	\$75,000				\$75,000
Arizona	\$2,316,160		\$2,316,160	668,638			\$668,638				\$2,984,798
Arkansas	\$37,541		\$37,541	94,113			\$94,113				\$131,654
California	\$60,957,191 2/	\$930,400 3/	\$61,887,591	15,426,873	871,014	180,000 3/	\$16,477,887	\$10,064,542		\$10,064,542	\$26,542,429
Colorado	\$1,735,979		\$1,735,979	673,327	26,664		\$699,991	\$291,444		\$291,444	\$991,435
Connecticut	\$1,877,635		\$1,877,635	604,205			\$604,205				\$604,205
Delaware	\$28,141		\$28,141	75,000			\$75,000				\$103,141
Dist. Of Col.	\$1,604,180		\$1,604,180	325,983			\$325,983				\$1,930,163
Florida	\$39,300,000		\$39,300,000	6,736,395	48,217		\$6,784,612	\$3,619,164	\$18,291,322	\$21,910,486	\$67,995,098
Georgia	\$5,495,861		\$5,495,861	1,641,375	130,948		\$1,772,323	\$150,875		\$150,875	\$1,923,203
Hawaii	\$1,120,557		\$1,120,557	166,031			\$166,031				\$1,286,588
Idaho	\$419,334		\$419,334	174,019			\$174,019				\$593,353
Illinois	\$8,918,688		\$8,918,688	2,374,967	38,662		\$2,413,629	\$1,174,139		\$1,174,139	\$3,587,768
Indiana	\$0		\$0	199,549			\$199,549				\$199,549
Iowa	\$1,929,573		\$1,929,573	542,204	23,331		\$565,535	\$173,754		\$173,754	\$739,289
Kansas	\$796,632		\$796,632	389,720	26,293		\$416,013				\$416,013
Kentucky	\$0	\$1,208,336	\$1,208,336	0		333,103	\$333,103				\$1,541,439
Louisiana	\$0		\$0	414,382	33,404		\$447,786	\$144,744		\$144,744	\$592,530
Maine	\$237,723		\$237,723	100,000			\$100,000				\$337,723
Maryland	\$2,058,861		\$2,058,861	1,401,361	25,701		\$1,427,062	\$269,900		\$269,900	\$3,755,823
Massachusetts	\$9,389,453 4/		\$9,389,453	2,044,121	57,771		\$2,101,892	\$689,528		\$689,528	\$2,791,420
Michigan	\$4,000,000		\$4,000,000	1,355,511	24,590		\$1,380,101				\$5,380,101
Minnesota	\$3,407,099		\$3,407,099	1,648,496	34,367		\$1,682,863	\$680,620		\$680,620	\$4,768,542
Mississippi	\$770,000		\$770,000	75,000			\$75,000				\$845,000
Missouri	\$2,445,240		\$2,445,240	919,768	27,478		\$947,246	\$130,322		\$130,322	\$3,522,808
Montana	\$0		\$0	75,000			\$75,000				\$75,000
Nebraska	\$1,099,286		\$1,099,286	326,504	26,219		\$352,723				\$1,452,009
Nevada	\$0	\$1,747,400	\$1,747,400	0		183,239	\$183,239				\$1,930,639
New Hampshire	\$328,941		\$328,941	100,556			\$100,556				\$429,497
New Jersey	\$3,729,370		\$3,729,370	1,409,870			\$1,409,870	\$409,529		\$409,529	\$5,548,769
New Mexico	\$1,100,000		\$1,100,000	303,405			\$303,405				\$1,403,405
New York	\$20,058,376		\$20,058,376	12,347,742	39,651		\$12,387,393	\$3,371,299	\$708,678	\$4,079,977	\$36,525,646
North Carolina	\$1,000,000		\$1,000,000	533,668	23,257		\$557,125				\$1,557,125
North Dakota	\$768,645		\$768,645	199,723			\$199,723				\$968,368
Ohio	\$3,000,000		\$3,000,000	1,056,100			\$1,056,100				\$4,056,100
Oklahoma	\$656,798		\$656,798	240,015	25,775		\$265,790				\$922,588
Oregon	\$5,187,362 5/		\$5,187,362	1,028,486	57,994		\$1,086,480	\$575,979		\$575,979	\$6,849,821
Pennsylvania	\$5,252,203		\$5,252,203	1,930,540	26,664		\$1,957,204	\$553,086		\$553,086	\$7,762,493
Rhode Island	\$351,381		\$351,381	164,120			\$164,120	\$201,700		\$201,700	\$553,081
South Carolina	\$38,538		\$38,538	100,000			\$100,000				\$138,538
South Dakota	\$241,423		\$241,423	132,859			\$132,859				\$374,282
Tennessee	\$540,909		\$540,909	595,174			\$595,174				\$1,136,083
Texas	\$8,500,000		\$8,500,000	3,133,393	240,566		\$3,373,959	\$1,243,610		\$1,243,610	\$13,117,569
Utah	\$1,713,281		\$1,713,281	279,438			\$279,438	\$210,030		\$210,030	\$2,202,749
Vermont	\$414,027		\$414,027	127,302			\$127,302				\$541,329
Virginia	\$4,824,482		\$4,824,482	1,057,316	50,068		\$1,107,384	\$451,791		\$451,791	\$6,383,657
Washington	\$10,457,487		\$10,457,487	3,373,581	141,466		\$3,515,047	\$1,051,244		\$1,051,244	\$15,023,778
West Virginia	\$25,904		\$25,904	75,000			\$75,000				\$100,904
Wisconsin	\$1,189,203		\$1,189,203	1,040,470			\$1,040,470				\$2,229,673
Wyoming	\$0		\$0	75,000			\$75,000				\$75,000
Total	\$219,465,464	\$3,926,688	\$223,392,152	\$67,889,880	\$2,000,000	\$771,342	\$70,661,222	\$25,457,300	\$19,000,000	\$44,457,300	\$338,510,674

1/ Consist Of Social Services Discretionary Funds Which Are Awarded By Formula.
 2/ Cal-Welfare: \$27,624,044; Cal-Health: \$33,333,147
 3/ The Mass. FW Represents \$2,391,101 Of This Allocation.
 4/ The Oregon REEP Program Represents \$3,417,198 Of This Allocation.

APPENDIX B
FEDERAL AGENCY REPORTS

Bureau of Population, Refugees, and Migration

Department of State

During 1996, refugee problems around the world remained acute and widespread. The United Nations High Commissioner for Refugees (UNHCR) estimated there were 20 million refugees in the world, many living in precarious situations. The human consequences of strife, especially in the ongoing conflict in Africa's Great Lakes region, the former Yugoslavia, and Northern Iraq, demanded the world's attention and resources. There were positive developments, however, in the former Yugoslavia, the signing of the Dayton Peace Accords in late 1995 set out the framework for peace among the warring parties and sought to guarantee refugees and displaced persons the right to return in safety to their places of origin. With Saddam Hussein's incursions into Northern Iraq, the U.S. Government undertook three movements of some 6,700 Iraqis of special concern from Northern Iraq to Guam for asylum-processing and resettlement in the U.S.

The U.S. is the world's leading nation in assistance to the world's refugees and victims of conflict and resettles about half of the refugees referred by the UNHCR for resettlement each year. The Department of State's Bureau of Population, Refugees, and Migration (PRM) has primary responsibility for formulating U.S. policies on these issues and for administering the U.S. refugee assistance and admissions programs.

Refugee Assistance programs support important foreign policy, as well as humanitarian, objectives. These objectives include the protection of refugees and victims of internal conflicts; provision of basic needs to sustain life and health; and resolution of refugee crises through repatriation, local integration or resettlement in third countries, including the U.S. These objectives are largely achieved by administering and monitoring U.S. contributions to UN agencies, international and non-governmental refugee and relief organizations and by working with the UN and other Governments to offer resettlement, where

appropriate. The Bureau manages the admissions of refugees for permanent resettlement in the U.S. in conjunction with INS and HHS's Office of Refugee Resettlement, and provides funding to U.S. private voluntary agencies for initial resettlement assistance.

The FY 1996 appropriation for Migration and Refugee Assistance (MRA) was \$670,983,000. Of this amount, approximately \$86 million was used for activities related to the admission of refugees to the U.S. Included in this \$86 million were costs for (1) refugees processing and documentation, carried out by Joint Voluntary Agencies in Southeast Asia, Turkey, Saudi Arabia, Kenya, and individual voluntary agencies in Europe; (2) overseas English-language and cultural orientation programs; (3) transportation, in the form of repayable loans, arranged through the International Organization for Migration; and (4) Reception and Placement grants to voluntary agencies for support of initial resettlement activities in the U.S.

Of the 75,693 refugees admitted to the U.S. in FY 1996, the largest number came from East Asia (19,235) and the former Soviet Union (29,536). As in previous years the President authorized in-country processing in the former Soviet Union, Vietnam and Cuba for persons who would qualify as refugees were they outside their country of origin. In addition, the U.S. offered resettlement to refugees outside their country of origin who were deemed to be of "special humanitarian concern" to the U.S. and given priority processing status. Family reunification also continued to be a high priority.

Department of Justice

Refugee Program

As provided for in the Refugee Act of 1980, the Immigration and Naturalization Service (INS) is responsible for the interview of refugee applicants and the subsequent approval/denial of refugee status. INS also inspects and admits approved refugee applicants to the United States and processes refugees' adjustment of status to lawful permanent resident.

While the performance of these responsibilities involves virtually all INS District Offices, INS refugee program responsibilities are primarily discharged by the Service's overseas offices. Refugee operations are overseen by three district offices: Bangkok, with geographic responsibility for East Asia; Rome, with responsibility for the former Soviet Union, Europe, the Near East, Africa, and South Asia; and Mexico City, which oversees Latin America and the Caribbean. These offices maintain direct liaison with representatives of the United Nations High Commissioner for Refugees (UNHCR), the International Organization for Migration, U.S. government agencies, foreign governments, and all voluntary agencies with offices or representation abroad.

INS officers assigned to INS overseas offices and on temporary duty assignments overseas interviewed and approved approximately 75,700 applicants who were admitted to the United States as refugees in FY 1996.

As in recent years, in-country processing initiatives accounted for a significant portion of the INS refugee workload:

Former Soviet Union Emigration. The in-country processing of refugee applicants in Moscow resulted in the arrival of 29,500 nationals from the 15 republics that once made up the Soviet Union. During the course of the fiscal year, INS officers in Moscow processed more than 39,000 applicants for refugee status.

Cuban Refugees. During FY 1996, 6,133 Cuban refugees were admitted to the U.S. after having their refugee applications processed in-country.

Since FY 1995, INS has maintained a permanent presence in Cuba to ensure that the September 9, 1994 Migration Agreement between the United States and Cuba is fulfilled. The Agreement allows for the legal migration of at least 20,000 Cubans into the United States through a combination of refugee status determinations, immigrant visa issuances, and parole authorizations.

Bosnian Refugees. The INS continued to respond to Bosnians fleeing their homeland with increased circuit rides conducted throughout the Former Republic of Yugoslavia. By the end of FY 1996, over 12,000 Bosnians had been admitted to the United States as refugees.

Orderly Departure Program (ODP)

FY 1996 brought to an end the extensive resettlement efforts established in 1979 in Vietnam under the Orderly Departure Program as an alternative to clandestine and hazardous boat departures from Vietnam. INS remains available to interview any previously scheduled applicants who now may have obtained exit permission from Vietnam, a prerequisite for processing under Vietnamese law.

Asylum Program

The Immigration and Nationality Act, as amended by the Refugee Act of 1980, provided that aliens on U.S. territory or at ports of entry, regardless of nationality, could request asylum. Pursuant to the regulations promulgated by the Department of Justice (DOJ) in July 1990, the Asylum Officer Corps (AOC) was established with the Immigration and Naturalization Service (INS) to adjudicate asylum claims of applicants who are not in removal proceedings. The Executive Office for Immigration Review (EOIR) has exclusive jurisdiction over the asylum applications of those aliens against whom proceedings for removal from the United States have already begun.

In December 1994, the Department of Justice promulgated new regulations to streamline the asylum process. The intent of asylum reform was to establish an efficient, integrated asylum process for the INS and EOIR which provides for the quick identification of meritorious asylum applications and referral to EOIR via charging documents of those which cannot be approved. In addition, a major goal of Asylum Reform was to get "current with receipts" and reduce the backlog of pending asylum claims. With the combined effect of the streamlined process and the decoupling of employment authorization from the asylum application process, it was expected that fewer new asylum cases would be filed under Reform. New receipts declined by 40 percent in FY 1995 and by an additional 34 percent in FY 1996. The Asylum Offices should be in a position to not only keep current with new receipts, but also to address the existing backlog, which currently stands at approximately 445,000 cases pending completion. Since the reforms were implemented, the AOC has completed more than 180,000 applications from the backlog. During the 16 years since the Refugee Act was enacted, there have been over 1.2 million asylum applications filed with the INS. Of the cases adjudicated by the INS, some 24 percent have been approved.

Asylum Applications

Preliminary INS data for FY 1996 indicate that 129,579 asylum applications were filed with the INS (49,447 new filings, 58,418 applications under the *American Baptist Churches v. Thornburgh (ABC)* resettlement agreement, and 21,714 re-opened cases). The leading nationalities were as follows: El Salvador (67,601), Guatemala (14,275), Mexico (9,721), India (4,670), and Haiti (4,169). These five nationalities composed 78% of the applications filed for the year. During the year, the Asylum Officer Corps scheduled 173,201 asylum interviews, while conducting 66,786 interviews, and completed 109,855 asylum cases. The completing 120,721 asylum cases.

Human Rights Documentation Center. The INS Resource Information Center (RIC), created as part of the Asylum Program in Fiscal Year 1991, is an in-house research and documentation center on human rights. Its primary mission is to provide background information on human rights

conditions in refugee-producing countries to Asylum Officers in order to assist them in making informed decisions. The RIC is one of several government-sponsored centers in countries that receive refugees, primarily in Europe and North America, which share the goal of providing objective, credible information to decision makers.

For several years, the INS has benefited greatly from an information-sharing agreement with the Canadian Government, specifically the Immigration and Refugee Board, and the United Nations High Commissioner for Refugees' Center for Documentation and Research (UNHCR/CDR) in Geneva. All three centers share the same software platform and use standard formats which enable easy sharing of information in full text database format. The shared information is available to all U.S. asylum adjudicators in electronic format at their work stations. In FY 1996, the information became available for the first time on CD-ROM. Much of the same country conditions information is also available at the UNHCR Web Site on the Internet.

Office of Refugee Health

U.S. Public Health Service

The following is a report to the Office of Refugee Resettlement by the Office of International and Refugee Health. ORR, under an intra-agency agreement with OIRH, funds the refugee health function at OIRH, including the Associate Director of OIRH for Refugee Health. The report covers the period of August, 1996 through December, 1996.

that may impede their ability to become self sufficient.

Goals of Refugee Health

The two principal goals of providing health care to refugees coming to the United States are:

- to protect the health of the U.S. population
- to assure that the health status of refugees does not impede their achieving self sufficiency.

Refugee Health Screening

Overseas health screening of refugees is conducted primarily for the purpose of identifying those individuals who have health conditions which would exclude them from entry into the United States under regulations promulgated by the U.S. Secretary of Health and Human Services. Individuals with "A" and "B" conditions identified by overseas screening must be referred to U.S. public health officials upon arrival in the U.S. These procedures are intended to protect the health of U.S. residents.

Health screening of refugees after they arrive in the U.S. is directed at both goals. Overseas screening for certain diseases, especially TB, has been found to be unreliable. For this reason, screening is repeated shortly after refugees enter the U.S. Refugees, after arrival in the U.S., additionally are screened for health conditions that may impede their ability to become self sufficient.

Refugees are treated for those health conditions, which have been identified overseas as the result of testing in the U.S., that may be a threat to the health of the U.S. population, and are referred for treatment of other acute and chronic conditions

APPENDIX C

RESETTLEMENT AGENCY REPORTS

(The following reports were prepared by the Voluntary Resettlement Agencies. Each report expresses the judgments or opinions of the individual agency reporting.)

Church World Service

Immigration and Refugee Program

Church World Service (CWS) is the relief, development, and refugee assistance arm of the National Council of the Churches of Christ in the US, an ecumenical body representing thirty-three Protestant and Orthodox communions in the United States. CWS observed its 50th anniversary in 1996, marking five decades of direct service to nearly 400,000 refugees. In Fiscal Year 1995, the Church World Service Immigration and Refugee Program (CWS/IRP) resettled 5,257 United States Refugee Program-designated refugees and 3,706 Cuban/Haitian Entrants through its network of local affiliate offices and sub-offices and participating denominations.

CWS/IRP serves as the agency through which ten national church denominations cooperate ecumenically to minister to and resettle refugees. Its national program and policy are designed by the Immigration and Refugee Program Committee (IRPCOM), which is composed of a representative from each of the denominations participating in refugee resettlement. These include: *American Baptist Churches USA; The Southern Baptist Convention; The United Methodist Church; Presbyterian Church (USA); Christian Church (Disciples of Christ); Church of the Brethren; Seventh-Day Adventist Church; Reformed Church in America; United Church of Christ; and The African Methodist Episcopal Church.* Every local church throughout the country related to these denominations is a potential part of the CWS/IRP resettlement network.

Refugee resettlement and related programmatic activities are administered and coordinated nationally by CWS/IRP New York headquarters and locally in conjunction with a field office in **Miami, Florida**. The CWS/IRP New York office consists of various departments that are charged with implementing various resettlement activities, including: the processing of case documentation; relaying refugee arrival information; management of local programs; guidance on new program initiatives; and the provision of refugee-related information and orientation.

CWS/IRP Refugee-Related Activities

Current activities encompass a wide variety of programmatic areas:

- CWS/IRP administers the **Joint Voluntary Agency Office** in Nairobi, Kenya which has overseen the processing of nearly 30,000 refugee applicants from various countries of Africa during its six years of operation.
- The **Burmese Student Adjustment Program** continues its third year, linking member denominations and ERRSS affiliates with Burmese student asylum-seekers currently pursuing advanced degrees in universities in Indiana, New York and Pennsylvania. CWS/IRP's participation in this small-scale initiative is by agreement with the Institute of International Education, supported through the United States Information Agency.
- In a unique voluntary agency/international organization cooperative effort, CWS/IRP provides partial administrative support to the **Washington, DC Office of UNHCR** in exchange for assistance with technical and program service development for its resettlement network.
- In FY 1996, CWS/IRP continue participation in the **Matching Grant Program**, through which eight ERRSS affiliates seek to garner community and volunteer support and provide enhanced services to over 300 newly-arrived refugees. The ERRSS affiliates involved are located in Denver, Colorado; New Haven, Connecticut; Indianapolis, Indiana; Greensboro, North Carolina; Knoxville, Tennessee; Houston, Texas; and Richmond, Virginia.
- CWS/IRP and the Episcopal Migration Ministries received approval for **Preferred Communities** funding for three areas where both agencies have a joint affiliate presence:

Knoxville, Tennessee; Richmond, Virginia; and Syracuse, New York. This initiative allows the ERRSS involved to expand their capacity to serve all refugees by improving and extending their volunteer and congregational outreach.

- By contractual arrangement with the INS Office of International Affairs, CWS/IRP provides reception, placement, resettlement and emergency services to Cuban and Haitian Entrants under the auspices of the **Cuban/Haitian Primary & Secondary Resettlement Program**; the CWS/IRP Miami Office is responsible for primary oversight of this program in coordination with New York headquarters. Federal funding for this program is supplemented by financial and in-kind support from CWS/IRP constituent denominations and local congregations, who have been involved in service to the Cuban and Haitian emigre communities in South Florida for decades. Recent years have seen large numbers of Caribbean asylum-seekers served under this contract, with 3,706 Cuban and Haitian Entrants resettled in FY 1996, 9,693 served in FY 1995, and numbers in previous years ranging from 500 to 11,000. Although approximately 80% of these Cuban and Haitian arrivals rejoin relatives within Florida, the remaining 20% reunite with family outside of the state or are resettled as free cases throughout the CWS/IRP affiliate network..
- The **Haitian Legal Project**, established in 1992 by the CWS/IRP Miami office with support member denominations to assist Haitian asylum-seekers paroled into the United States after the downfall of Jean-Bertrand Aristede, continues to provide expert legal counseling, file asylum applications and represent Haitians at interviews and hearings. Services are concentrated in the Miami and South Florida area, while other cases have been assisted by affiliate offices around the country under the guidance of Project staff.
- Based south of Miami in Homestead, Florida, the **Denominational Social Services Program** continued its third year of assisting Haitian victims of Hurricane Andrew in steps toward

self-sufficiency, including help with finding permanent housing, employment, job training, English classes and emergency assistance.

FY 1996 Highlights:

- **African Cases:** During FY 1996, ERRSS affiliates and participating denominations in the communities of Phoenix, Arizona; Rochester, New York; Dallas, Texas; Houston, Texas; Chicago, Illinois; Richmond, Virginia; New Haven Connecticut; Garden Grove, California; Greensboro, North Carolina; and Minneapolis, Minnesota resettled the majority of the CWS/IRP African caseload. Interchurch Refugee and Immigration Ministries, the **Chicago, Illinois** ERRSS affiliate, was able to secure full church sponsorships for 59 Benadir utilizing a cluster sponsorship model. A total of 19 area churches were involved in this project, providing fully furnished apartments with security deposits for the new arrivals and contributing over \$40,000 in cash and in-kind donations. The newly-established Benadir community organized a celebration dinner to thank these sponsors, which included demonstrations of Benadir cultural arts. The Sudanese Resource Coalition, a group of church volunteers and services providers formed with the encouragement of the Refugee Program of the Minnesota Council of Churches Refugee Program - the **Minneapolis, Minnesota** ERRSS - met monthly during FY 1996 for resource-sharing in order to provide continuous assistance and care to newly-arrived Sudanese refugees. One of the initiatives facilitated by a volunteer was to assist the Sudanese to manufacture their traditional crafts, particularly clay figurines, with the goal of making this enterprise an income generator.
- During FY 1996, VWS/IRP continued to promote and develop joint affiliate operations with partners at EMM and LIRS affiliates as a means of enhancing capacity and quality of services to refugees while increasing the potential of local congregational and community support for resettlement. CWS/IRP built on its long history of joint affiliation with Episcopal Migration Ministries

during this period, maintaining a joint presence in 18 affiliate sites and sub-offices. Six joint CWS/IRP - LIRS affiliates, comprising both main and sub-offices, new exist, with three additional sites in **Houston, Dallas and Fort Worth, Texas** scheduled to be designated in the coming year. In this spirit of cooperation, FY 1996 saw the first **joint national conference** of the three agencies, held in Alexandria, Virginia.

- The CWS/IRP Miami field office as a lead agency in the **Florida Intrastate Resettlement Program**, processing during this period 110 Cuban Entrants and refugees from the Miami area for relocation and enhanced services offered by the Florida Council of Churches Refugee Program ERRSS affiliate in Orlando and Lutheran Social Services of Northeast Florida in Jacksonville.
- During this Fiscal Year CWS/IRP, resettled 3,404 Cuban Entrants and 302 Haitian Entrants under the **Cuban/Haitian Primary and Secondary Resettlement Program**. Arrivals were processed from the U.S. Naval Base in Guantanamo Bay, Krome Detention Center, and the Boyston Center in Florida. Of these totals, nearly 1,600 Cuban and Haitian free case arrivals were resettled by 14 ERRSS affiliates and participating denominations throughout the United States. The Program was expanded during the Fiscal Year to include resettlement of small numbers of free cases from the Cuban Expanded Migration Agreement who have been paroled into the U.S. without family sponsors.

FY 1996 Entrant Resettlements

Cuba	3,404
Haiti	302
Total	3,706

FY 1996 USRP Refugee Arrivals

Africa	848
Former Soviet Union	2,756
Latin America	429
NearEast	217
Southeast Asia	1,007
Total	5,257

Episcopal Migration Ministries

Episcopal Migration Ministries (EMM), a program of the Domestic and Foreign Missionary Society of the Protestant Episcopal Church, (DFMS), responds to refugees, immigrants, and displaced persons both domestically and internationally. EMM operates a national resettlement program through 35 diocesan programs and advocates for the protection of refugees and displaced persons worldwide. EMM resettled approximately 2,400 refugees in 1996. EMM has offices at the Episcopal Church Center, 815 Second Avenue, NYC 10017.

Located at the national headquarters of the Episcopal Church, EMM is linked with an array of Church programs which collectively support the commitment of EMM to assist refugees and those in refugee-like situations in all facets of their resettlement experience. EMM also has lead responsibility for ensuring that refugee and immigrant protection issues are a part of the Church's public policy and social action agenda. Its advocacy efforts were linked in 1995 to those of Church World Service and Lutheran Immigration & Refugee Services through a tri-agency "Refugee Protection Campaign." This ecumenical effort continues with special attention being given to Liberian refugees in 1996.

EMM's resettlement program relies heavily on parish and volunteer sponsorship. Diocesan resettlement work is managed by a refugee coordinator who is an appointee of the diocesan bishop. The direct linkage between EMM and the Church's diocesan structure helps stimulate broad Church interest in the program and enables a diverse network of providers, parishes, and volunteers to support a vital program without high administrative overhead. Each diocesan bishop agrees, through the appointment of a resettlement coordinator, to not only resettle refugees under the terms of the agreement between EMM and the Bureau of Population, Refugees, and Migration, but also to promote within the churches an interest in the welfare and protection of refugees within the United States and abroad.

While EMM has operations in major urban areas, many sites are in medium-sized cities where job

prospects for refugees are outstanding and the reception of communities to refugees excellent. In 1996, the number of refugees received by EMM in any particular site ranged from 15 to 250 refugees. In 1996, EMM was rated as the best performing resettlement agency by the Bureau of Population Refugee Migration.

In recent years EMM has developed collaborative relations with Church World Service and Lutheran Immigration and Refugee Services in now 25 communities throughout the country. These jointly operated programs have strengthened services to refugees through more cost effective administrative arrangements and was enhanced broad ecumenical advocacy and witness on behalf of new comers and uprooted persons worldwide..

EMM Mission Statement

The goals of EMM are to:

- Accept lead responsibility within the Episcopal Church to assist and advocate for refugees, immigrants, and uprooted persons.
- Develop and nurture a network of diocesan programs which reflect the Church's commitment to serve refugees and immigrants.
- Offer services and support for newcomers to allow them to develop their full potential as contributing members of American society.
- Access the resources of the Church in promoting justice and peace for displaced persons around the world.
- Promote understanding within the Church of the contributions and gifts of refugees and immigrants.

Support for the Program

In addition to funds allocated to the dioceses for the care and maintenance of refugees, EMM provides technical assistance to local programs in carrying out resettlement, serves as a source of information about worldwide refugee issues as well as legislation and policies affecting domestic resettlement, develops and disseminates materials which foster sponsorship of refugees, and promotes linkages to programs within the national church that could assist resettlement programs. EMM does regular mailings on important policy and overseas refugee issues. An annual convening of the EMM network in partnership with CWS and LIRS provides both practical training on resettlement policies and practices as well as an overview of major domestic and international refugee developments.

Through the Presiding Bishop's Fund for World Relief, the Church supports international and domestic refugee and immigration projects which respond to critical humanitarian needs or offer innovative approaches to delivering services to newcomers.

Matching Grant Program

EMM resettled approximately 360 refugees in 1996 under the matching grant program and expects to increase this number to 750 in 1997. The matching grant program has traditionally meshed well with the essentially volunteer nature of its resettlement structures.

Preferred Communities

EMM has received support to enhance resettlement services in Fargo, North Dakota under ORR's Preferred Community discretionary grant program. This site is operated jointly with LIRS. Tucson, Arizona and Las Vegas, Nevada received first time preferred community awards in 1996. In partnership with Church World Service, EMM had support for preferred communities in Richmond, Virginia; and Knoxville and Chattanooga, Tennessee.

**Operations and Network Coordinator,
Organization and Structure**

Eight EMM staff members are assigned to one of the following units: Processing and Placement, Resettlement Operations, Matching Grant and Special Projects, and Finance.

FY 1996 Refugee Arrivals

EMM responds to refugees from all parts of the world. As the number of refugees from Southeast Asia declines, EMM and its network is resettling increasing numbers of Bosnians, and refugees from Africa and the Middle East. In 1996, EMM participated in a special initiative for Benadir and Kurdish refugees. The breakdown of the EMM caseload for 1996 is noted below:

Africa

Benadir	140
Cameroonian	3
Ethiopian	4
Nigerian	1
Rwandese	5
Somali	73
Sudanese	29
Zairian	10
Total	265

Eastern Europe

Bosnian	666
Romanian	2
Total	668

Former Soviet Union

Armenian	2
Armenian Baku	39
Baku Jew	9
Byelorussian	27
Great Russian	88
Russian	1
Soviet Jew	30
Ukrainian	209
Total	405

Latin America

Cuban	123
Haitian	5

Total	128
--------------	------------

Near East

Iranian	1
Iraqi	94

Total	95
--------------	-----------

Southeast Asia

Amerasian	50
Burmese	5
Laotian	9
ODP	53
REED	340
Vietnamese	6

Total	463
--------------	------------

FY 96 TOTAL REFUGEE ARRIVALS

Africa	265
Eastern Europe	668
Former Soviet	343
Latin America	128
Near East	95
Southeast Asia	463

Total	1,962
--------------	--------------

Ethiopian Community Development Council

The Ethiopian Community Development Council, Inc. (ECDC) was established in 1983 as a nonprofit organization to respond to the expanded service delivery needs of Ethiopians fleeing repressive government policies in their homeland. ECDC was organized to promote the cultural, educational, and socio-economic development of the Ethiopian community in the U.S. However, from our inception, ECDC has provided a wide range of social services to refugees and immigrants from Africa, Southeast Asia, the Middle East, and Central and South America. Over the years, ECDC has become a major community-based service provider at the local level and assumed a leadership role within the refugee community at the national level.

ECDC provides direct client services, brings a committed activism to bear on issues of public policy affecting African refugees, and conducts a series of symposia by distinguished speakers discussing timely issues regarding the Horn of Africa. ECDC also pursues activities to enhance networking among African refugee organizations around the country and to assist them in community development and organizational capacity-building activities.

Goals

ECDC's program goals focus on the following:

- Developing and implementing a broad range of culturally sensitive and linguistically appropriate programs and services that respond to the many adjustment and resettlement challenges facing refugees.
- Offering information and referral and technical assistance to community-based organizations.
- Carrying out a program of public education at the local, State, and national levels to expand awareness of African refugee concerns.
- Encouraging members of the community to participate in the American civic process.

- Fostering cooperation, respect, and understanding between the African refugee community and the American community at large.
- Conducting educational and research activities concerning the Ethiopian community in the U.S., Ethiopia, and the Horn of Africa, and controversies endemic to the region.

Activities

Local Program Focus - Our program of social and support services is designed to help people build economically independent lives in their new homeland. We offer orientation and adjustment counseling; employment services and job placement; vocational training, including driver's education; ESL instruction; immigration counseling; transitional housing; AIDS information and outreach; information and referral; document translation and interpretation services; microenterprise loans and small business development; and crisis intervention and emergency assistance.

ECDC's Center for Ethiopian Studies invites scholarly work and provides an ongoing program of research, publications, and dialogue on topics concerning Ethiopia and the Horn of Africa. The Center conducts an annual program of lectures and symposia that bring people of diverse viewpoints together in an atmosphere of constructive communication, giving them an opportunity to "agree to disagree," and giving other groups the impetus to sponsor similar activities around the country.

National Program Focus - Building on our close working relationships with individuals and organizations around the country at the local, State, and national levels, ECDC has spearheaded efforts to address the plight of Ethiopian and other African refugees, focused attention on African refugee admissions and immigration policies, and urged support for domestic resettlement programs that speak to African refugee concerns. ECDC has led the way in strengthening and formalizing a network of over 30 African refugee Mutual

Assistance Associations (MAAs) around the country.

Projects of national scope and significance that we have undertaken include the following:

- Conducting and co-sponsoring the second National conference, *African Refugees: Human Dimensions of the Continuing Crisis in Africa* (1995).
- Carrying out an African Refugee Resource Development project since 1991 which provides information, referral, and technical assistance resource and leadership development to African MAAs and publishes the quarterly newsletter, **African Refugee Network**.
- Publishing the **Selected Resource Guide on African Refugees**, which lists over 850 books, articles, and papers relating to African refugees (1994).
- Conducting and co-sponsoring a national conference, *African Refugees: Human Dimensions to a Global Crisis* (1993).
- Conducting a national needs assessment study of the development needs of Ethiopian refugees in the U.S. and publishing a two-volume study report (1988-1990).
- Organizing and co-sponsoring a national Conference on African and Haitian Refugees (1989).
- Conducting mental health training workshops in seven U.S. cities for service providers working with Ethiopian refugees (1984).
- Holding the first Conference on Ethiopian Refugees in the U.S. (1983).

Resettlement Program

ECDC has sought to pass along the legacy of welcome and generosity that this country has given to members of the African refugee community through our own resettlement and placement program. Our African Refugee Migration and

Services (ARMS) program was initiated in 1990 after ECDC became the first community-based organization since passage of the Refugee Act of 1980 to be named by the Department of State as a national voluntary agency. Local resettlement is carried out by independent community-based MAAs that have become official ECDC affiliates. ECDC serves both as a resettlement agency and as the national office for affiliates located around the country. We provide program support and technical assistance to our affiliated MAAs and monitor all resettlement activities.

ECDC and our affiliates are committed to the goal of assisting refugees achieve economic self-sufficiency as quickly as possible. To that end, professional staff and dedicated volunteers focus on helping refugees overcome barriers through a program of integrated and complementary services that support and strengthen their capacity to become self-supporting. With strong ties to their local communities, affiliates are well-suited to helping refugees through their initial and subsequent adjustment and resettlement periods. ECDC is a member of InterAction and like our affiliates works closely with local and State agencies.

In FY 1996, ECDC signed cooperative agreements with the following affiliates:

- Alliance for African Assistance (AAA), San Diego, California.
- African Community Refugee Center (ACRC), Los Angeles, California.
- African Committee Services (ASC), New York City, New York.
- Ethiopian Community Association of Chicago (ECAC), Chicago, IL.
- ECDC Multicultural Services Center (MSC), Arlington, Virginia.
- Refugee Services Alliance (RSA), Houston, Texas.

During FY 1996, ECDC resettled 505 refugees. The following table indicates by region ECDC's refugee arrivals:

Africa	266
Indochina	94
Europe	109
Latin America	10
Near East	56
Total	801

Hebrew Immigrant Aid Society

HIAS, the Hebrew Immigrant Aid Society, is the national and worldwide arm of the organized American Jewish community for the rescue, relocation and resettlement of refugees and migrants. It works closely with other Jewish agencies across the nation to maintain an extensive cooperative network of help and support.

The largest proportion of the HIAS caseload (46%) is resettled in New York City, through the extensive services available from the New York Association for New Americans (NYANA), a beneficiary of the United Jewish Appeal-Federation of Jewish Philanthropies of New York, Inc. Other large resettlement sites among the 139 communities receiving HIAS assisted refugees in FY 1996 included San Francisco, CA; Chicago, IL; Los Angeles, CA; Philadelphia, PA; Boston, MA; Cleveland, OH and Baltimore, MD.

Through alliances with its resettlement network, HIAS has been able to establish a resettlement model that emphasizes local responsibility within a framework of national oversight. In this way, HIAS has been able to encourage the provision of significant amounts of locally provided resources and involvement in the resettlement process, both by the refugee's stateside family and community-based volunteers.

All HIAS affiliates receive Reception and Placement grant funds through HIAS to assist in meeting the needs of refugees in their initial phase of resettlement. Communities also make available supplemental outlays of private funds and human resources to their resettlement programs to enhance their ability to assist refugees attain the language, vocational, and social skills necessary to become employed and achieve early economic self-sufficiency. For this reason, many HIAS affiliates have elected to participate in the ORR Voluntary Agency Matching Grant Program as a way of further enhancing their ability to serve their clients through the provision of extended services. HIAS national and local policy has been to place virtually all refugees considered to be employable into the Matching Grant Program.

HIAS performs its monitoring responsibilities by maintaining an ongoing open dialogue with its affiliates regarding the progress of resettlement programs and by providing a staff of trained professionals who are available to provide consultation, technical assistance, and training. HIAS field representatives travel to resettlement sites throughout the year to perform program audits, train staff, assess local needs, and assist in the provision of a consistently high level of services.

Although HIAS clients are placed in a community of resettlement primarily on the basis of relative reunion, matching job skills and employability to current labor markets trends is also utilized as a factor in the placement process. Consequently, HIAS encourages the creation of unique programmatic initiatives to take advantage of a resettlement network characterized by a healthy diversity in programming. Therefore, the nature and extent of core services such as vocational training and English language instruction may evolve differently in each community as a function of available internal and external resources. Such factors as local job markets, availability of transportation, housing costs, and the ability to encourage the formation of self-help groups may play a role in shaping the refugee service delivery system in each affiliated community.

While ideally, refugees are placed in communities that offer a high probability of success for early employment and economic self-sufficiency, the lack of available entry-level jobs in many major resettlement sites has made attaining this goal increasingly difficult. In addition, refugees from the former Soviet Union, who make up the bulk of the HIAS caseload, are often highly skilled, especially in the scientific and technical fields, but their frequently low levels of English proficiency and the need to update their skills for the American job market make early employment difficult to achieve. In addition, despite an improving economy, there is increased competition for the kinds of entry-level positions sought by newly-arriving refugees. Welfare reform may well make the situation worse, since it is likely that

the labor market will be flooded by more individuals seeking entry-level positions.

During FY 1996, HIAS conducted a series of initiatives to improve employment outcomes. Through an ORR Preferred Sites grant, HIAS established three enhanced Free Case placement sites (Tucson, AZ; Richmond, VA and Greensboro, NC) in areas of expanding economic opportunity. These sites allowed newly arrived refugees enriched services and unique opportunities to quickly enter the labor market and achieve early economic self-sufficiency.

For arrivals beginning in April 1996, ORR began making available an additional \$400 per capita in Federal funds through the Matching Grant Program. This increase of 40%, the first since the Program began in 1978, was used by HIAS affiliates to implement a variety of new services which will reduce their clients' dependence upon government support while developing and reinforcing economic self-sufficiency at the earliest time.

Many affiliates have used the additional funds for improved ESL services, by hiring more full-time or part-time teachers, adding classes to existing programs, or introducing vocational ESL in coordination with the basic ESL program.

Another major area of improvement focused on job development efforts. Affiliates hired additional full-time or part-time job developers or provided on-site job support. The funds have also allowed affiliates to provide intensive job workshops, purchase vocational materials, individualize and customize their job development programs, as well as to run ESL-in-the-workplace programs.

A number of HIAS affiliates introduced innovative incentives programs in order to encourage their clients to accept early employment in entry-level positions. These are usually cash incentives, but the money has also been used to provide to clients specific items, such as: eyeglasses, health insurance, child care, extended vocational services, driving lessons and assistance to purchase tools, uniforms for work, cars and car insurance. Affiliates adjusted these programs

during the year to identify the best mix of cash and other incentives which will influence refugees to take an entry-level job.

During 1996, HIAS launched an intensified effort to assist its affiliates promote the naturalization of former clients. The program, entitled Citizenship Across America, includes training for professionals and volunteers to help them prepare emigres for the naturalization exam and interview.

The following table presents, by region, the refugees resettled by HIAS during FY 1996:

Near East	388
Southeast Asia	26
Former Soviet Union/Eastern Europe	20,315
Total	20,729

Immigration and Refugee Services of America

Immigration and Refugee Services of America is the country's oldest and largest nonsectarian network of nonprofit organizations serving the foreign-born and non-English speakers, especially immigrants, refugees, and their descendants. IRSA's mission is to address the needs and rights of persons in forced or voluntary migration worldwide through advocating for fair and humane public policy, facilitating and providing direct professional services, and promoting the full participation of migrants in their new communities. The national office, located in Washington D.C., coordinates refugee and immigration assistance programs, develops new programs, provides linkages to other national organizations and federal agencies, provides public information, and educates public policy makers.

IRSA's thirty-six independent member agencies and affiliates, located in small cities as well as major metropolitan areas, provide a wide range of services at 125 sites throughout the U.S. IRSA member agencies are firmly grounded in their communities, with staff, clients, and constituents representing the full spectrum of ethnic and linguistic diversity in America. In 1996, IRSA member agencies, with a combined budget of nearly \$60 million, served more than 325,000 individuals through the efforts of 1,200 staff and 5,000 volunteers. Twenty-nine affiliates are active in the direct resettlement of refugees from overseas. These agencies provide refugees with reception and placement and other services including job placement, case management and counseling, assistance with immigration matters, educational services, and a range of community information and cultural activities.

Since 1975, the IRSA network has directly resettled over 140,000 refugees from Southeast Asia, Eastern Europe, the Soviet Union, the Near East, South Asia, Africa, and Latin America, assisting them to become productive members of American society. In addition to serving refugees directly resettled by IRSA, all member agencies provide services to the larger refugee and immigrant communities in their areas.

IRSA Refugee Programs

IRSA's Department of Refugee Services operates six refugee-serving programs:

- **JVA Saudi Arabia:** Screen, prepare, and present Iraqi cases in Rafha camp to INS for U.S. refugee adjudication and outprocess approved refugees to the U.S.
- **Reception and Placement:** Facilitate transition from overseas to the U.S. and provide initial resettlement services to over 5,500 IRSA-sponsored refugees through a network of 29 local affiliate sites.
- **Match Grant:** Provide four months of initial resettlement services to 1,100 refugees at 9 sites through a match of private and Federal resources to ensure that early family self-sufficiency is attained and need to access public assistance is eliminated.
- **Vermont Field Office:** Provide initial resettlement services to 257 refugees through R&P program and ongoing social services to three years of refugee arrivals under contract to the State of Vermont.
- **Preferred Communities:** Increase refugee placements in five local sites, establish satellite communities, and engage in national contingency planning activities.
- **Community Relations Service (Dept of Justice):** Resettle Cuban parolees from Guantanamo in the Miami area providing 90 days of initial support and social services.

In addition, at the end of FY 96, IRSA was awarded a contract to operate JVA-Guam, a program to provide asylum processing activities to Kurdish evacuees from Northern Iraq.

Resettlement Program

During FY 1996, IRSA and its member agencies resettled the following numbers of refugees:

Southeast Asian	1,947
Eastern European	1,712
Former Soviet Union	934
Near Eastern	284
Africa	581
Western Hemisphere Cubans:	166
Total	5,624

The IRSA national office, which oversees the allocation of refugees to local agencies, promotes effective resettlement by providing local agencies with guidance on new program initiatives, technical assistance on resettlement practices, information on international refugee movements, and, through monitoring, periodic assessments of the agencies' resettlement programs.

While in many cases relatives or interested groups assist in providing some resettlement services for new arrivals, member agencies, as sponsors for all IRSA refugees, 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, provided by either agency staff or volunteers, are used. Although a combination of services such as English language training or counseling are usually needed and provided, a major focus is on appropriate job placement as quickly as possible for all employable refugees.

Most IRSA agencies employ staff specifically for job counseling and placement. Job counselors discuss both the prospects for employment and benefits of work over public assistance. Refugees are helped to develop a realistic plan for finding and retaining appropriate employment. The staff plans individually with each new arrival and closely monitors progress toward the achievement of mutually agreed upon objectives directed toward early and lasting employment.

In an attempt to maintain quality resettlement among its affiliates, IRSA carried out on-site

monitoring of twelve local agencies. These visits helped IRSA to meet its Cooperative Agreement requirements with the Department of State and also to appreciate the practical, human problems of local resettlement.

Related Activities

JVA-Guam: IRSA began implementation of a processing post on Guam to assist Kurdish evacuees from Northern Iraq to apply for asylum in the United States.

International Rescue Committee, Inc.

The International Rescue Committee was founded in 1933 to help refugees fleeing Nazi persecution. For the past sixty-five years, IRC has been serving refugees in need around the world -- a population now estimated at over 18 million, 13 million of them women and children. IRC helps victims of racial, religious, and ethnic persecution and strife to rebuild their shattered lives.

The response of the IRC to refugee emergencies is a two-fold one. A major effort is made domestically to assist 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.

IRC carries out its domestic resettlement responsibilities from its New York headquarters, one affiliate office, and a network of 15 regional resettlement offices around the United States. IRC also maintains offices in Madrid, Rome, and Vienna 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 and the United States Refugee Resettlement Office in Croatia which, under contract to the Department of State, carry out the interviewing, documenting and processing of refugees in those countries destined for resettlement in the United States.

Overseas IRC is one of the leading agencies dealing with the refugee crisis in the Great Lakes region of Africa. In Burundi and Tanzania, IRC has been conducting emergency water and sanitation projects, latrine projects, primary health programs, economic self-reliance programs and activities to reduce sexual violence. In Rwanda, IRC will continue to focus on helping the Rwandan Government meet the overwhelming challenge of the repatriation and resettlement of the Rwandan refugees returning from Tanzania, Zaire and Burundi, by developing a stable environment in Rwanda.

Goals and Mission

The IRC's overriding goal and mission is to provide relief, protection, and resettlement services for refugees and victims of oppression or violent conflict by whatever means are most effective. This commitment is reflected in well-planned resettlement assistance, global emergency relief rehabilitation and advocacy for refugees.

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 attain this end are basically the provision of adequate housing, furnishings, 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 15 regional offices. They are staffed by professional caseworkers and supported by volunteers from the local community.

In addition to the network of regional offices, IRC works with one affiliated organization, the Polish Welfare Association in Chicago, Illinois. Working in close cooperation with IRC's New York Headquarters, the Polish Welfare Association provides resettlement services to a limited number of IRC-sponsored cases going to join relatives or friends in the Chicago area.

The number of refugees and the ethnic groups each office resettles are determined by an ongoing

consultation process between each office and the national headquarters.

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, as needed, the 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 conjunction with these services, IRC also provides 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 act as the fiscal agent for such Federally funded programs in New York, San Francisco, Seattle, and West New York, New Jersey, Phoenix, and Salt Lake City.

Each IRC local office participates in local refugee forums and advisory committees. Coordination is maintained also with the other resettlement agencies, the National Governor's Association, the U.S. Conference of Mayors, the National Association of Counties, and other refugee-related groups.

The IRC regional resettlement offices are located in Boston, Massachusetts; Washington, D.C.; Atlanta, Georgia; Dallas, Texas; New York, New York; San Diego, Orange County, Los Angeles, San Francisco, and San Jose, in California; Phoenix, Arizona; Salt Lake City, Utah and Seattle, Washington. Two new proposed sites include Tucson, Arizona and Charlottesville,

Virginia. Offices primarily assisting Cuban refugees are maintained in West New York, New Jersey and Miami, Florida. The average number of permanent staff in each office is six to seven.

Recent years have brought the challenge of resettling new refugee groups: Somalis, Iraqis, Bosnians and most recently, Benadir. The United States resettled some 2700 Benadir in FY 1996 and IRC placed 378 of those. IRC resettlement offices have established links with local ethnic communities, hired interpreters or bi-lingual caseworkers, and became sensitive to the special needs of each of these groups.

The Bosnians come directly from an area of violent conflict; many are victims of torture and rape and all have suffered sudden and unexpected loss- home, country, relatives, friends, a way of life which can never be recaptured. IRC is especially sensitive to the mental health needs of this group and tries to make counseling and other mental health services available to them. In spite of the stress most of the Bosnians are suffering, IRC's experience with them has been a very positive one. Large numbers have started working soon after arrival here, seeing this option as the most effective way to start rebuilding their lives.

During FY 1996, the International Rescue Committee resettled the following number of refugees:

Eastern Europe/Former Soviet Union	3,101
Near East	620
Africa	1,550
Latin America	577
East Asia/ODP	2,809
Total	8,657

Iowa Department of Human Services

Bureau of Refugee Services

The State of Iowa's resettlement program was founded in 1975, when former Iowa Governor Robert D. Ray created the Governor's Task Force for Indochinese Resettlement. For the past 21 years, the state government and the people of Iowa have continued their commitment to helping victims of persecution as they rebuild their lives.

Iowa's response to the urgent needs of refugees has been two-fold. The first major effort is directed toward helping refugees who have been accepted for resettlement in the United States by serving as a voluntary reception and placement agency under contract with the Department of State. The second major effort is serving as the state social service provider in which Iowa strives to address the employment, social and acculturation needs of refugees who resettle in or migrate to Iowa.

Mission

The mission of the Bureau of Refugee Services is to:

- offer a home and a future to those who have been persecuted by offering resettlement in Iowa, and
- assist refugees in becoming self-sufficient as quickly as possible, thereby, enabling them to enrich our state through the sharing of their talents, skills, gifts and culture.

Organization

The mission of the Bureau of Refugee Services is carried out by a team of individuals, 65% of whom are bilingual or multilingual, representing various disciplines such as reception and placement, sponsor recruitment, immigration assistance, job development, job placement, case management, social adjustment and administration. Department of Human Services Director, Charles Palmer, serves as Iowa's State Coordinator for Refugee Affairs and Wayne Johnson, Chief of the

Bureau of Refugee Services, is Deputy Coordinator and program manager.

Philosophy of Self-Sufficiency

The BRS maintains the philosophy that refugees need to become self-sufficient as quickly as possible. Our focus is on placing refugees into jobs which promote economic independence, generate tax dollars, and help local economies. We discourage the use of welfare-type funds, except in emergency situations or for the purpose of temporary transition support leading to economic self-sufficiency.

BRS Reception and Placement Activities

Initial reception and placement of refugees in the State of Iowa is carried out by the Bureau of Refugee Services through a cooperative agreement with the Bureau of Refugee Programs of the Department of State. The BRS carries out its resettlement efforts from its headquarters in Des Moines, Iowa and a sub-office located in Sioux City, Iowa.

Core services provided under the cooperative agreement include pre-arrival preparation, reception services for refugees during their first 30 days after arrival, counseling and referral services.

During FY 1996, the Bureau resettled 612 refugees. The breakdown by ethnic group of the refugees resettled was as follows.

Lao	22
Hmong	6
Bosnian	319
Vietnamese	265
Total	612

The refugee sponsor model has always been the cornerstone of Iowa's resettlement program. During FY 1996, the Bureau continued to focus its recruitment efforts in those areas that were

identified as having strong employment possibilities and sponsor potential.

Even though funding for Former Political Prisoners (FPP) from Vietnam has expired, the State continues to provide social services money to a local mutual assistance association for services to supplement those provided by Bureau staff.

Cumulative Arrivals

The 1996 arrivals brought the cumulative resettlement totals of the Bureau of Refugee Services to the following levels:

BRS Resettlement FY1975 - 1996

Cambodian	368
Hmong	452
Laotian	1,895
Tai Dam	2,375
Vietnamese	3,089
Bosnian	1,034
Other	61
Total	9,274

Related Activities

The Bureau receives funds from the DHHS Office of Refugee Resettlement to serve all refugees in the state regardless of agency affiliation. These services are provided by Bureau staff and via contracting. Through the efforts of all involved, 740 job placements were made during FY 96.

FY 1995 Targeted Assistance 10% Discretionary Program - Iowa was the recipient of three awards under the targeted assistance program. The funds are for services to refugees in localities most heavily impacted by an influx of refugees and which have a demonstrated need for supplementation of resources for services to the refugees. Ninety-five percent of the amount of grant awards received by the state were made available to the county or other local entity.

FY 1995 Omnibus Discretionary Social Services Grants Program - Iowa was awarded two separate grants under the Community and Family Strengthening initiative. The Bureau also received funding under the Unanticipated Arrival rubric to assist with the influx of Sudanese refugees. These projects are designed to advance the attainment of economic self-sufficiency and social self reliance among refugees in Iowa.

Lutheran Immigration and Refugee Service

Opening doors for uprooted newcomers has been a Lutheran tradition in the U.S. since the 18th century. In 1939, the work was organized on a national scale to help World War II refugees, thus making the beginning of **Lutheran Immigration and Refugee Service (LIRS)**.

Since then, LIRS has resettled more than 240,000 refugees, including more than 5,000 unaccompanied minors since 1979. The agency has done this by mobilizing Lutheran social service organizations, 6,000 church congregations and thousands of individual volunteers for the task. This system of private and public partnership works well, giving solid and practical support so that refugees can become self-sufficient as soon as possible.

LIRS's mission is based on principles of hospitality, justice, and community. It is a cooperative non-profit agency of the Evangelical Lutheran Church in America, the Lutheran Church-Missouri Synod, and the Latvian Evangelical Lutheran Church in America. These member church bodies include 95% of all Lutherans in the U.S.

The agency has a proven track record and reputation for excellence in boosting newcomer adjustment and early employment. Coordination with related church, public, and private organizations prevents duplication of services. Public cash assistance is not assumed, but serves as a backup for emergency, temporary or unusual situations while newcomers learn a marketable trade or skill.

LIRS resettles refugees where sponsors, housing, and jobs are available and where the population includes people from the refugees' ethnic background. "Free" cases--those without family or other contacts in the U.S.--are not placed in impacted areas where refugee services are stretched, and employment and other resettlement opportunities are not as prevalent.

The immediate goal for LIRS partners is to help refugees survivors of war and oppression to heal and re-establish their lives here. Both refugees and

their neighbors can be transformed by this process for the good of the whole community. LIRS's program therefore builds bridges between new Americans and their neighbors, while equipping and encouraging the newcomers for self-sufficiency and participation in civic life.

In FY 1996, LIRS resettled 7,615 refugees:

African	1,072
European	4,120
East Asian	1,636
Latin American/Caribbean	370
Near East	417
Total	7,615

LIRS also resettled into Florida 750 entrants, all of them Cuban nationals. LIRS reunited them with family in Miami, Orlando, Tampa, under contract with the Department of Justice's Community Relations Service.

The LIRS network functions through a strong three-tiered partnership of **national administration, professionally staffed regional offices, and local church and community volunteers.**

National administration takes place at 390 Park Avenue South, New York, New York 10016-8803. The national office manages the refugee resettlement program through 26 regional offices and 16 suboffices; the unaccompanied minor refugee program through 10 regional offices; and the match grant program. The agency also manages a number of non-government funded programs not reflected in this report.

From New York, contacts are maintained with government agencies, other voluntary agencies, the Refugee Data Center, and international counterparts. Arrangements are made for refugee welcome at ports of entry and final destinations. Regional office work is monitored through on-site visits and regular contact. New programs are developed and technical assistance is given. Tracking and monitoring requirements are fulfilled. Travel loans are collected.

Careful planning, monitoring and coordination undergird the entire system. The national office works closely with the affiliate resettlement programs to ensure the highest standards of service, to expand program opportunities, and to explore creative new ideas.

Professionally staffed affiliate offices provide regional support throughout the country. These offices recruit and train local sponsors, then ensure and document that all core services have been provided. The staff members are experienced resources for planning, problem solving, intercultural communication, English as a Second Language training, referrals, and employment. They also coordinate with State and local government officials, for example, through community refugee forums.

These offices are usually a part of the broader Lutheran Social Service agency network. As such, they offer refugee clients a natural entree into a wide range of social service programs that address community needs. Even after reception and placement has been completed, professional services are available to refugees as a part of the ongoing work of such social service agencies.

LIRS also works through thousands of dedicated **church and community volunteers** as local sponsors and mentors who provide direct assistance to the refugees. They arrange for cultural orientation, housing, food, clothing, transportation, health care, schooling, and jobs for the refugee family immediately after arrival. Newcomers therefore receive material and emotional support, to boost their adjustment to life here.

While church sponsorships are emphasized, LIRS also uses agency models, in which community volunteers support staff efforts; anchor relative models, in which former refugees sponsor family members with agency or church back-up support; and group clusters, in which several groups or congregations pool their resources for the tasks. In any case, sponsors and refugees meet early on to clarify expectations and set goals toward becoming self-supporting.

FY 1996 Highlights

- **Diversity of caseload.** Currently, most of our arrivals are European, with a growing number of Africans also being welcomed by LIRS. We processed a final group of Hmong out of Thailand during the summer, along with a few lowland Lao. Our agency continues to adapt our experience in 20 years of Southeast Asian resettlement to achieve similar success with other populations.
- **LIRS's children's services** illustrates this diversity well. While numbers of unaccompanied minors have declined, caseload diversity has risen dramatically. LIRS provided foster care for minors from Cuba, Haiti, Liberia, Sudan, Rwanda, Ethiopia, Somalia, Kurdistan, Guatemala, Honduras and Bosnia as well as Vietnam, Cambodia and Laos. LIRS also reunited Chinese minors with family in cooperation with the U.S. Immigration and Naturalization Service.
- **Bosnian resettlement**, both family reunions and free cases, throughout the LIRS system. We have reunited sizeable families in our original resettlement sites of Utica, N.Y. and Jacksonville, Fla. LIRS also resettles Bosnians in Detroit, Mich; New York, N.Y.; Washington, D.C.; Tampa, Fla.; Chicago, Ill.; Milwaukee, Wis.; Fargo, N.D.; and Denver, Colo. The Minneapolis, Minn. affiliate also offers special support through services with the Center for Victims of Torture.
- **New African group: the Benadir.** LIRS resettled 300 Benadir Somali refugees in 52 family units in Greensboro, N.C.; Phoenix, AZ; Washington, DC; Atlanta, GA; Cedar Rapids, IA; Minneapolis, MN; Utica, NY; Fargo, ND; and Houston, TX. This was 10% of the total number of refugees putting down new roots in 24 U.S. cities.
- **Swift response for Kurds.** In September, LIRS was notified that the United States sought immediate processing for 2,100 Kurds who had worked for the U.S. government,

LIRS mobilized its network so quickly that within one day, we had identified 600 places for Kurds, with a promise of 150 more places should they be needed.

- **More Montagnard family reunions** in the Carolinas. Matching grant funding was supplied by ORR..
- **Excellent employment outcomes** with LIRS's management of ORR-funded matching grant program in the National Capital area. LIRS' affiliate there continues to generate enthusiastic community support, with Muslim and Lutheran volunteers working together. Similar success may be found in LIRS's matching grant program in Detroit.
- **Conflict management assistance.** In July, LIRS met with the mayor and city officials of Westfield, Mass., to support a local partner in smoothing over tensions regarding refugees from the former Soviet Union and their impact on the community.
- **Steady progress with groups previously resettled,** such as former political prisoners from re-education camps in Vietnam; the **Hmong** in Minnesota, Wisconsin and Michigan and people from the **former Soviet Union,** mainly Pentecostals and other Christian dissidents, in Oregon, Washington state, Western Massachusetts and upstate New York.
- **Ellis Island Exhibit.** Invited by the Ellis Island Immigration Museum and the U.S. Department of State's Bureau of Population, Refugees and Migration, LIRS helped plan a summer exhibit on refugees, to contribute to public understanding of refugee work.

United States Catholic Conference

The United States Catholic Conference (USCC) is the public policy and social action agency of the Catholic bishops in the United States. Within USCC, Migration and Refugee Services (MRS) is the lead office responsible for developing Conference policy on migration, immigration and refugee issues, as well as providing program support and field coordination for a network of 119 diocesan refugee resettlement offices throughout the United States. In national and international arenas, USCC/MRS is a strong proponent of serving the pastoral and human needs and promoting the human dignity of migrants, immigrants, refugees, asylum seekers, persons displaced within their own countries, and people on the move.

USCC/MRS and its affiliates provide services to their clients without regard to race, religion, or national origin. Migration and Refugee Services is a multi-unit management entity comprised of the following program areas: Pastoral Care, Advocacy, and Refugee Programs.

USCC/MRS carries out its domestic resettlement activities from office in Washington, New York City, and Miami. The Executive Director and his key senior management staff are responsible for overall policy formulation and for maintaining contact with various governmental agencies, such as, the Department of State, the Department of Labor, the Department of Health and Human Services, the Department of Justice, and the Immigration and Naturalization Service. The New York office remains the hub for managing resettlement operations serving as the link between overseas processing and the domestic resettlement programs. Program support to diocesan resettlement offices is carried out primarily through MRS/Field Operations in Washington, DC. Field Operations' staff ensure effective implementation of USCC/MRS policies and that of governmental agencies with whom contracts are maintained through on-site reviews and ongoing telephone and written contracts. In addition, field staff monitor and evaluate the quality of services provided to refugees and provide technical assistance as needed, to strengthen the

performance of diocesan programs in such areas as employment services and program development.

Through its Special Programs Section, USCC/MRS administers several programs. By far the largest of these is the Matching Grant program. In 1996, 41 diocesan resettlement offices participated in this program whose goal is to promote and achieve early economic self-sufficiency of refugees through employment. From January to December 1996, 4,411 clients entered the program. Of the 4,437 that completed four months of services, 3,582 achieved self-sufficiency, for a success rate of 81%. Of those completing the four months of service, Vietnamese former re-education prisoners and their families represented the largest participating group at 28% of the total. Of the 1,243 re-eds completing the service period, 1,054 or 85% achieved economic self-sufficiency.

The Special Programs Section is also responsible for administering three Wilson/Fish programs, in San Diego, Kentucky, and Nevada, all funded by ORR. The first Wilson/Fish project was implemented in September, 1990 in San Diego as a demonstration project. The other two Wilson/Fish programs were instituted because the States decided to withdraw from the refugee resettlement program. Both of these programs are responsible for coordinating the provision of transitional cash assistance, medical assistance, and social services throughout their States.

Another notable program within Special Programs is Children's Services. A Children Services Specialist manages the unaccompanied refugee minors program, provides technical assistance to diocesan resettlement offices resettling minors, and helps develop the network's capacity to respond to any emergency resettlement needs of minors and to pursue other special initiatives. In FY 96 a total of 2 Cuban minors were resettled into USCC's foster care network. Both minors were reclassified as unaccompanied minors on account of sponsorship breakdowns. A total of 5 Haitian unaccompanied minors were placed in USCC's foster care network in FY 96. Also in FY 96, 13

unaccompanied refugee minors were placed with USCC's foster care network comprising of 6 Haitians, 5 Somalis, 1 Bosnian, and 1 Kurd minor.

A Preferred Communities grant was awarded by ORR in 1994 to provide support to four of MRS' exiting free case placement sites experiencing diminishing resources. This investment by ORR provides additional resources to improve resettlement opportunities for free cases in locations considered to be optimal resettlement sites. In 1996, under the management of the Special Programs Section, the award was extended yet again. The diocesan affiliates currently participating in the Preferred Communities program are Charlotte, North Carolina; Grand Rapids, Michigan; Lincoln, Nebraska; Mobile, Alabama; Nashville, Tennessee; and Richmond, Virginia.

MRS received supplement funding through the Preferred Communities grant to provide enhanced Benadir resettlement services. Ten (10) dioceses are currently participating in the Benadir program including: Charlotte, North Carolina; Grand Rapids, Michigan; Buffalo, New York; Dallas, Texas; Lansing, Michigan; Louisville, Kentucky; Memphis, Tennessee; Portland, Oregon; and Rochester, New York.

USCC/MRS also received an operating grant to enlist the services of 32 Americorps members in eight refugee resettlement programs nationwide. The program entitled, "Fostering Citizenship", responds to the varied needs of refugees and immigrants as they make the transition from newcomers to full participants in their communities. The diocesan affiliates participating in the AmeriCorps program include Boston, Massachusetts; Fresno, California; Hartford, Connecticut; Honolulu, Hawaii; Los Angeles, California; Orange, California; Portland, Oregon; and Syracuse, New York.

Resettlement Activities in FY 1996

USCC/MRS resettled 16,880 refugees. The regional breakdown is as follows:

East Asia	8,671
Eastern Europe	2,322
Near East and South Asia	1,423

Latin America and Caribbean	1,516
Africa	2,234
Soviet Union	714

Total 16,880

In addition, USCC/MRS affiliates resettled 79 "non-grant" cases. "Non-grant" cases are those admitted to the U.S. as immigrant visa beneficiaries or those paroled based on humanitarian considerations. While non-grant cases originate from refugee like conditions, they are not eligible for Reception and Placement services.

USCC/MRS also resettled 4,879 Cuban and Haitian entrants in FY 1996:

Cubans	4,699
Haitians	160

Total 4,879

The change in administration policy in late 1995 affected the arrival of Cubans trying to enter the United States. These changes and the closure of the Guantanamo camps in February 1996, forced the downsizing of the USCC/MRS office in Miami. The office still provides processing and resettlement services to visa parolees and those who make it to the U.S. coast unimpeded. USCC/MRS also provides secondary resettlement to Cubans and Haitians, but overall arrivals are much lower than previous years. In March 1996, an Inter-State Resettlement Program started funded by the State of Florida to relocate Cubans from impacted Miami to less impacted Orlando. A total of 89 clients were to have been resettled.

USCC/MRS held three convening of the refugee resettlement network in FY 96 to help the dioceses manage changes in refugee resettlement. Each convening was designed around the three main types of resettlement programs: (1) per capita programs serving less than 50 refugees; (2) prospective free case dioceses whose caseload includes more than 50 free case placements per year, as well as family reunification cases; and (3) family reunification dioceses whose caseload is made up entirely of relatives resettling with family members. The convening focused on implementing the particular strategies for adapting

to the changes in refugee resettlement that best suit each program type and provided diocesan staff with the opportunity to network with others facing similar challenges.

World Relief Corporation

During FY 1996, World Relief, the international assistance arm of the National Association of Evangelicals, resettled over 8,300 refugees and immigrants through its network of affiliate offices and sponsoring churches. Participation in the resettlement of refugees is viewed as an extension of World Relief's mandate to empower the local evangelical church to minister to those in need.

Founded in 1944 to aid post-World War II victims, World Relief is now assisting self-help development projects around the world. The commitment of World Relief to refugees worldwide is evidenced by both its U.S. resettlement activities and its overseas involvement. In cooperation with the State Department and UNHCR, World Relief administered the Guantanamo Refugee Project from July 1994 to January 1996, which provided social services, medical services, public health services and vocational education to Haitian and Cuban detainees. World Relief is also responsible for the transportation of letters and packages to detainees and staff in the camp. World Relief continues to work with refugees and displaced persons in Asia, Africa, Central America, and Eastern Europe.

In the U.S., World Relief participates with the Bureau for Refugee Programs, Reception and Placement program, in the resettlement of refugees from all processing posts around the world. In addition to the Reception and Placement program, several World Relief affiliate offices receive grants and hold contracts to operate various programs serving the local refugee population, including services to Amerasians and their families, social adjustment programs, employment counseling and job placement services, and ESL classes. World Relief's first ORR Matching Grant program was begun in FY 1994 in Ft. Worth, Texas and has expanded to five additional sites in Miami, FL, Tampa, FL, Minneapolis, MN, Nashville, TN, and Boise, ID in FY 1996. World Relief affiliates in Ft. Worth, Texas; Chicago, and Miami have accredited immigration staff who provide a wide range of services.

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 47 member denominations, 26 individual congregations from other denominations and some independent churches as well.

The U.S. Resettlement Program of World Relief is administered through its U.S. Ministries office near New York City in Congers, New York. Under the supervision of a senior management structure, resettlement activities are carried out through a nation-wide network of 25 professional offices divided into four geographic areas. Area and affiliate offices are monitored through on-site visits and monthly reports. This office also provides liaison with InterAction, the Refugee Data Center, and the International Organization for Migration. In addition, it is responsible for all pre-arrival processing, post-arrival tracking, travel coordination, and travel loan collection.

World Relief placements are made through coordination between local and national staff and are expected to include opportunity for church involvement, favorable employment opportunities, accessibility of local service provision, coordination within the local resettlement community, and positive ethnic community support. All cases are monitored and tracked for 90 days and free cases for 180 days for employment.

From the inception of its refugee resettlement program in 1979, World Relief local offices have constructed 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 1996, this included sponsorships, cash contributions, gifts-in-kind, technical assistance, public relations assistance, and a variety of volunteer services.

Sponsorship Models

World Relief employs several kinds of sponsorships depending on the needs of the individuals being placed. In the **Congregational Model**, a local church plays the major role in delivery of services with World Relief local staff providing systematic professional guidance to the congregation. A World Relief caseworker initiates a resettlement employment plan and monitors progress to lead to early refugee self-sufficiency. Other staff provide assistance to the congregation including orientation, counseling, monitoring, and referrals.

World Relief also employs the **Family Model** of sponsorship. In these cases of family and friend reunification, World Relief staff work with the anchor relatives prior to arrival of the refugees. WR Staff provides orientation, training, and ongoing professional service during the pre- and post-arrival period. Supplemental funds, goods, and services are made available depending upon the need. From time to time, an American family, individuals, or church group will provide core services to an arriving family with World Relief staff providing professional assistance, monitoring, and tracking.

The **Office Model** is also used by World Relief in the resettlement of refugee cases. World Relief staff, supplemented by community volunteers and other service providers, provide direct core services to the refugee arrivals. Church assistance and involvement is sought in all cases regardless of the model employed.

Special Caseloads In FY 1996

The World Relief resettlement program assisted in the resettlement of approximately ten percent of the total refugees arriving to the U.S. during FY 1996. The majority of World Relief's caseload in this past year consisted of Vietnamese Former Political Prisoners and Soviet Evangelical Christians. Significant numbers of Bosnian Cuban, Somali, Iraqi, refugees comprised the remainder of the caseload. Due to a large influx of Bosnian refugees to Chicago, World Relief's Chicago affiliate was designated as the Bosnian service center and receives ORR funding through the

Illinois Department of Public Aid to provide employment and adjustment services to Bosnian refugees.

World Relief FY 96 Arrivals

Indochina:	
Amerasians	22
Former Political Prisoners	2,059
First Asylum	290
Near East:	251
Africa:	773
Eastern Europe:	1433
Latin America:	352
Former Soviet Union:	
Evangelical Christians	606
Others	2491
Total:	8,277

APPENDIX D

STATE REFUGEE COORDINATORS

State Refugee Coordinators

Alabama

Mr. Tim Shedd
State Refugee Coordinator
Department of Human Resources
Gordon Persons Building
50 Ripley Street
Montgomery, Alabama 36130
Fax:(334) 242-0513
Tel.(334) 242-1773

Alaska

Rev. Charles Eddy
St. Mary's Church
2222 E. Tudor Road
Anchorage, Alaska 99507
Fax:(907) 563-3341
Tel.(907) 561-0246

Arizona

Mr. Tri H. Tran
Refugee Program Coordinator
Community Services Administration
P.O. Box 6123- Site Code.086Z
3rd Floor, Northwest Corner
Phoenix, Arizona 85005
Fax:(602) 542-6400
Tel.(602) 542-6600

Arkansas

Ms. Betty Hodson
Refugee Resettlement Coordinator
Division of Human Services
Slot No. 1224 , P.O. Box 1437
Little Rock, Arkansas 72203-1437
Fax:(501) 682-1597
Tel.(501) 682-8263

California

Ms. Eliose Anderson, Director
Department of Social Services
744 P Street, MS 17-11
Sacramento, California 95814
Fax:(916) 654-6012
Tel.(916) 657-2598

Mr. Robert A. Barton
Refugee Coordinator
Refugee Program Bureau
744 P Street, MS 6-646
Sacramento, California 95814
Fax:(916) 654-7187
Tel.(916) 654-6379

Colorado

Ms. Laurie Bagan
State Refugee Coordinator
Department of Social Services
Colorado Refugee Services Program
789 Sherman, Suite 250
Denver, Colorado 80203
Fax:(303) 863-0838
Tel.(303) 863-8216

Connecticut

Mr. William Ruffleth
State Refugee Coordinator
Department of Social Services
25 Sigourney Street
Hartford, Connecticut 06106
Fax:(860) 424-4957
Tel.(860) 424-5381

Delaware

Ms. Celena Hill, Refugee Coordinator
Division of Social Services
P.O. Box 906, Lewis Building
Herman M. Holloway Sr. Campus
1901 North Dupont Highway
New Castle, Delaware 19720
Fax:(302) 577-4405
Tel.(302) 577-4453

District of Columbia

Ms. Darlene Herring
Acting Refugee State Coordinator
Office of Refugee Resettlement
Department of Human Services
65 I Street, S.W., Room 217
Washington, D.C. 20024
Fax: Not Available
Tel.(202) 724-4820

Florida

Mr. Gary Crawford
Acting, Refugee Programs Administrator
Department of Health and Rehabilitative
Services
1317 Winewood Boulevard
Building 2, Room 202
Tallahassee, Florida 32399-0700
Fax:(904) 487-4272
Tel.(904) 488-3791

Georgia

Mr. Everett Gill, Ed.D.
State Refugee Coordinator
DHR/DFCS Community Programs
Two Peachtree Street, 12th Floor, Suite 404
Atlanta, Georgia 30303-3180
Fax:(404) 657-3489
Tel.(404) 657-3428

Hawaii

Mr. John R. Sabas, Executive Director
Office of Community Services
830 Punchbowl Street, Room 420
Honolulu, Hawaii 96813
Fax:(808) 586-8685
Tel.(808) 586-8675

Idaho

Ms. Kathy James, Chief,
Bureau of Family Self Support
450 West State, 6th Floor, Towers Bldg.
P.O. Box 83720
Boise, Idaho 83720-0036
c/o T.A.F.I. Bureau
Fax:(208) 334-6664
Tel.(208) 334-6579

Illinois

Dr. Edwin Silverman, State Coordinator
Refugee Resettlement Program
Illinois Department of Public Aid
527 South Wells, Suite 500
Chicago, Illinois 60607-3922
Fax:(312) 793-2281
Tel.(312) 793-7120

Indiana

Mr. Jeffrey Campbell, Refugee Coordinator
FSSA, Family and Children's Division
402 West Washington Street, Room W-363
Indianapolis, Indiana 46204
Fax:(317) 232-4615
Tel.(317) 232-4919

Iowa

Mr. Wayne Johnson,
Chief, Bureau for Refugee Services
Iowa Department of Human Services
1200 University Ave., Suite D
Des Moines, Iowa 50314-2330
Fax:(515) 283-9224
Tel.(515) 283-7904

Kansas

Mr. Lewis Kimsey, State Refugee Coordinator
Department of Social and Rehabilitation
Services
Smith/Wilson Building
300 S.W. Oakley
Topeka, Kansas 66606
Fax:(913) 296-8378
Tel:(913) 296-5167

Kentucky

Father Pat Delahanty
Catholic Charities of Louisville
2911 South Fourth Street
Louisville, Kentucky 40208
Fax:(502) 637-9780
Tel:(502) 637-9786

Louisiana

Mr. Steve Thibodeaux
State Refugee Coordinator
Contracts Management and Evaluation
Department of Social Services
1001 Howard Avenue , Suite 1735
New Orleans, Louisiana 70113
Fax:(504) 599-0931
Tel.(504) 568-8958

Maine

Mr. Dan W Tipton
State Refugee Coordinator
221 State Street
Augusta, Maine 04333-0011
Fax:(207) 287-5065
Tel.(207) 287-5060

Maryland

Mr. Frank J. Bien, State Refugee Coordinator
Maryland Office for New Americans
Department of Human Resources
Saratoga State Center
311 West Saratoga Street, Room 222
Baltimore, Maryland 21201
Fax:(410) 333-0079
Tel.(410) 767-7021

Massachusetts

Mr. Nam Van Pham, Director
Office for Refugees and Immigrants
18 Tremont Street, Suite 600
Boston, Massachusetts 02108
Fax:(617) 727-1822
Tel.(617) 727-7888
Tel.(617) 727-8190

Michigan

Mr. Robert Cecil, Refugee Coordinator
Refugee Assistance Division
Department of Social Services
235 S. Grand Avenue, Suite 1013
P.O. Box 30037
Lansing, Michigan 48909
Fax:(517) 241-7826
Tel.(517) 241-7824

Minnesota

Ms. Quy Dam, State Refugee Coordinator
Department of Human Services
Human Services Building, 3rd Floor
444 Lafayette Road
St. Paul, Minnesota 55155-3837
Fax:(612) 297-5840
Tel.(612) 296-1383

Mississippi

Ms. Valerie Zadzielski
State Refugee Coordinator
Family and Children's Services
P.O. Box 352
Jackson, Mississippi 39202
Fax:(601) 359-4978
Tel.(601) 359-4982

Missouri

Ms. Regina Turley
Division of Family Services
Refugee Resettlement Program
2705 W. Main - P.O. Box 88
Jefferson City, Missouri 65103
Fax:(573) 526-5592
Tel.(573) 526-5605

Montana

Mr. James Rolando
State Refugee Coordinator
Department of Social Work
University of Montana
Missoula, Montana 59812
Fax:(406) 243-4076
Tel.(406) 243-2336

Nebraska

Ms. Maria Diaz
State Refugee Coordinator
Department of Health & Human Services
P.O. Box 95044
Lincoln, Nebraska 68504-5044
Fax:(402) 471-9455
Tel.(402) 471-9200

Nevada

Mr. Redda Mehari
Director, Refugee Program
Catholic Community Services of Nevada
1501 Las Vegas Boulevard North
Las Vegas, Nevada 89101
Fax:(702) 385-7748
Tel.(702) 383-8387

New Hampshire

Mr. Ed McNeal
Acting State Refugee Coordinator
Governor's Office of Energy and Community
Services
57 Regional Drive
Concord, New Hampshire 03301
Fax:(603) 271-2615
Tel.(603) 271-2611

New Jersey

Ms. Audrea Dunham
State Refugee Coordinator
Division of Youth and Family Services
CN 717 - 50 East State Street
Trenton, New Jersey 08625-0717
Fax:(609) 292-8224
Tel.(609) 984-3154

Ms. Jane Burger
Refugee Program Manager
Division of Youth & Family Services
Trenton, New Jersey 08625
Tel.(609) 292-8395

New Mexico

Ms. Teri Sena
State Refugee Coordinator
Department of Human Services
ISD-Community Assistance Section
P.O. Box 2348 - Pollon Plaza, Rm 127
Santa Fe, New Mexico 87504-2348
Fax:(505) 827-7203
Tel.(505) 827-7263

Scott Chamberlin Tel (505) 827-7254
Paul Lucero Tel (505) 827-1328

New York

Ms. Catherine Ryan, Associate Commissioner
Office of Refugee Immigration & Special Serv.
New York St. Department of Social Services
40 North Pearl Street 10th Fl., Section B
Albany, New York 12243
Fax:(518) 402-3029
Tel.(518) 402-3096

North Carolina

Ms. Marlene Myers
State Refugee Coordinator
Family Services Section
Department of Human Resources
325 North Salisbury Street
Raleigh, North Carolina 27603
Fax:(919) 715-0023
Tel.(919) 733-3677

North Dakota

Mr. Don Snyder
State Refugee Coordinator
Children and Family Services Division
Department of Human Services
600 East Boulevard Avenue, Judicial Wing
State Capitol, 3rd Floor
Bismarck, North Dakota 58505
Fax:(701) 328-2359
Tel.(701) 328-4934

Ohio

Ms. Erika Taylor
State Refugee Coordinator
Department of Human Services
65 East State Street - Fifth Floor
Columbus, Ohio 43215
Fax:(614) 466-0164
Tel.(614) 466-0995

Ms. Brenda Means
Refugee Program Manager
Fax:(614) 466-9247
Tel:(614) 752-6237 (ET)

Oklahoma

Mr. Ron Amos
Refugee Program Supervisor
Family Support Service Division
P.O. Box 25352
Oklahoma City, Oklahoma 73125
Fax:(405) 521-4158
Tel.(405) 521-4091

Oregon

Ms. Marge Reinhardt
State Refugee Coordinator
Department of Human Resources
500 Summer Street N.E., 2nd floor N.
Salem, Oregon 97310
Fax:(503) 378-3782
Tel.(503) 945-6093

Pennsylvania

Ms. Carolyn Chester, Refugee Coordinator
Department of Public Welfare
Office of Social Programs
1401 North 7th Street, 2nd Floor
Bertolini Building
Harrisburg, Pennsylvania 17105
Fax:(717) 772-1529
Tel.(717) 783-4505

Rhode Island

Ms.Gail Dunphy
State Refugee Coordinator
Department of Human Services
Contract Management
600 New London Avenue
Cranston, Rhode Island 02920
Fax:(401)464-3248
Tel.(401) 946-9128

South Carolina

Ms. Phane Phomsavanh
State Refugee Coordinator
Department of Social Services
P.O. Box 1520
Columbia, South Carolina 29202-1520
Fax:(803) 737-6093
Tel. 803) 737-5941
Mr. Phom Savanh Pao
Tel.(803) 737-5916

South Dakota

Ms. Pearl Stone
Refugee Resettlement Coordinator
Department of Social Services
Kneip Building
700 Governors Drive
Pierre, South Dakota 57501
Fax:(605) 773-4855
Tel.(605) 773-4678

Tennessee

Mr. Steven Meinbresse
State Refugee Coordinator
Department of Human Services
Community Assistance Services
400 Deaderick Street, 14th floor
Nashville, Tennessee 37248-9500
Fax: 615) 532-9956
Tel.(615) 313-4761

Texas

Mr. Terry Trimble, DHS Commissioner
Acting State Refugee Coordinator
Texas Department of Human Services
701 West 51st Street, Mail Code W-619
Austin, TX 78714-9030
Fax:(512) 438-3884
Tel.(512) 438-5545

Utah

Mr. Randy Wong
State Refugee Coordinator
Department of Work Force Services
Employment Development Division
1385 South State Street
Salt Lake City, Utah 84115
Fax:(801) 538-4212
Tel.(801) 538-4092

Vermont

Mr. Stephen F. Chupack
State Refugee Coordinator
Agency of Human Services
108 Cherry Street - P.O. Box 70
Burlington, Vermont 05402
Fax:(802) 865-7754
Tel.(802) 651-1874

Virginia

Ms. Kathy Cooper
State Refugee Coordinator
Virginia Department of Social Services
Office of Newcomer Services
730 East Broad St.
Richmond, Virginia 23219-1669
Fax:(804) 692-2215
Tel.(804) 692-1206

Washington

Dr. Thuy Vu, State Refugee Coordinator
Department of Social and Health Services
Office of Immigrant and Refugee Assistance
P.O. Box 45420
Olympia, Washington 98504-5420
Fax:(360) 413-3494
Tel.(360) 413-3213

West Virginia

Mrs. Cona H. Chatman
State Refugee Coordinator
Office of Family Support
DHHR, Capitol Complex
Building 6, Room 749
Charleston, West Virginia 25305
Fax:(304) 558-2059
Tel.(304) 558-8290

Wisconsin

Ms. Sue Levy
State Refugee Coordinator
Department of Workforce Development
131 West Wilson Street, Room 802
Madison, Wisconsin 53703
Fax:(608) 267-3652
Tel.(608) 266-0578

Wyoming

Mr. Steve Vajda
State Refugee Coordinator
Administrative Services Division
Department of Family Services
Hathaway Building, Room 352
Cheyenne, Wyoming 82002
Fax:(307) 777-7747
Tel.(307) 777-6081

Dr. Angel Gonzalez-Willis
Dr. Dina Birman
Office of Refugee Mental Health
Room #18C-07, Parklawn Bldg.
5600 Fishers Lane
Rockville, MD 20857
Fax: (301) 443-7790
Tel: (301) 443-4130

Office of Refugee Health
Room #18-35, Parklawn Bldg.
5600 Fishers Lane
Rockville, MD 20857
Fax: (301) 443-6347
Tel: (301) 443-4130