

The County-Level View of Unauthorized Immigrants and Implications for Executive Action Implementation



Webinar
January 15, 2015



Presenters

Randy Capps, Director of Research for U.S. Programs,
Migration Policy Institute (MPI)

Charles Kamasaki, MPI Resident Fellow and Senior
Cabinet Adviser, National Council of La Raza

Jeanne Atkinson, Executive Director, Catholic Legal
Immigration Network, Inc. (CLINIC)

Moderated by **Michael Fix**, MPI President



Logistics

- The unauthorized immigrant population profiles from today's webinar along with the national and state profiles are available on our website at bit.ly/unauthdata.
- Slides and audio from today's webinar will be available at: www.migrationpolicy.org/events
- If you have any problem accessing this webinar or the slides, please contact us by email at events@migrationpolicy.org or call 202-266-1929.
- Use chat function throughout webinar to write questions. Questions written in the chat function may be visible to other participants.
- Or send an email to events@migrationpolicy.org with your question.



Acknowledgments

- James Bachmeier at Temple University, Philadelphia analyzed the data on legal status of immigrants that provide the basis for these estimates.
- Jennifer Van Hook at Pennsylvania State University advised in developing the methodology.
- Jeanne Batalova and Marc Rosenblum at MPI also advised on the methodology.



Populations Eligible for Deferred Action

- **5.2 million** unauthorized immigrants nationally:
 - **1.5 million** are eligible for DACA (**1.2 million** under original program plus **300K** with expansions).
 - **3.7 million** are eligible for DAPA.
- Eligible populations are highly concentrated:
 - **4 million (76%)** live in the 10 states with the largest eligible populations.
 - **3.5 million (68%)** live in the 117 counties with the largest populations (which we estimated).

10 States with Largest Estimated Deferred Action Populations (000s)

State	Total Unauthorized	Eligible for Deferred Action Programs			Deferred Action as% of Total
		DACA	DAPA	Total	
United States	11,403	1,490	3,712	5,201	46%
California	3,166	456	1,116	1,572	50%
Texas	1,464	183	560	744	51%
New York	873	104	234	339	39%
Illinois	560	81	199	281	50%
Florida	632	90	163	252	40%
New Jersey	528	67	137	204	39%
Georgia	398	48	122	170	43%
North Carolina	354	38	117	155	44%
Arizona	274	39	97	136	50%
Washington	214	28	77	105	49%
Subtotal Top 10 States	8,463	1,134	2,822	3,958	47%

Source: Analysis of data from the 2008-12 ACS, pooled, and 2008 Survey of Income and Program Participation by James Bachmeier and Jennifer Van Hook of the Pennsylvania State University, Population Research Institute.

Deferred Action Estimates for Southern California Counties (000s)

County (national rank)	Total Unauthorized	Eligible for Deferred Action Programs			Deferred Action as% of Total
		DACA	DAPA	Total	
California	3,166	456	1,116	1,572	50%
Los Angeles (1)	979	135	331	466	48%
Orange (3)	313	49	109	157	50%
San Diego (8)	181	29	62	91	50%
Riverside (9)	150	24	60	84	56%
San Bernadino (11)	125	19	48	67	54%
Ventura (17)	85	12	33	45	53%
Southern CA subtotal	1,833	268	643	910	50%

Source: Analysis of data from the 2008-12 ACS, pooled, and 2008 Survey of Income and Program Participation by James Bachmeier and Jennifer Van Hook of the Pennsylvania State University, Population Research Institute.

Deferred Action Estimates for Bay Area California Counties (000s)

County (national rank)	Total Unauthorized	Eligible for Deferred Action Programs			Deferred Action as% of Total
		DACA	DAPA	Total	
California	3,166	456	1,116	1,572	50%
Santa Clara (12)	118	16	37	53	45%
Alameda (21)	88	11	26	38	43%
Contra Costa (35)	54	6	18	25	46%
San Mateo (48)	49	6	14	21	42%
Sonoma (72)	25	3	9	13	51%
Solano (75)	26	3	9	12	48%
San Francisco (81)	36	4	7	11	30%
Bay Area subtotal	396	49	120	173	44%

Source: Analysis of data from the 2008-12 ACS, pooled, and 2008 Survey of Income and Program Participation by James Bachmeier and Jennifer Van Hook of the Pennsylvania State University, Population Research Institute.

Deferred Action Estimates for Other California Counties (000s)

County (national rank)	Total Unauthorized	Eligible for Deferred Action Programs			Deferred Action as% of Total
		DACA	DAPA	Total	
California	3,166	456	1,116	1,572	50%
Fresno (21)	74	11	27	38	51%
Monterey/San Benito (23)	71	10	28	38	54%
Kern (25)	66	9	26	35	53%
San Joaquin (26)	61	8	23	31	51%
Sacramento (32)	56	8	19	27	48%
Tulare (39)	42	6	18	24	57%
Stanislaus (51)	35	6	14	20	57%
Santa Barbara (52)	41	5	14	19	46%
Merced (63)	25	4	10	14	56%
Imperial (94)	15	3	7	10	64%
Santa Cruz (98)	17	3	6	9	50%
Madera (113)	15	2	5	7	48%

Source: Analysis of data from the 2008-12 ACS, pooled, and 2008 Survey of Income and Program Participation by James Bachmeier and Jennifer Van Hook of the Pennsylvania State University, Population Research Institute.

Deferred Action Populations (000s) in Houston and Dallas Metro Areas

County (national rank)	Total Unauthorized	Eligible for Deferred Action Programs			Deferred Action as% of Total
		DACA	DAPA	Total	
Texas	1,464	183	560	743	51%
Houston metropolitan area					
Harris (2)	357	42	130	172	48%
Fort Bend (67)	24	9	4	13	53%
Montgomery/ Chambers/ Liberty (80)	26	9	3	11	44%
Houston subtotal	407	60	137	196	48%
Dallas metropolitan area					
Dallas (5)	227	25	87	111	49%
Tarrant (15)	100	11	39	50	50%
Collin (66)	27	3	10	13	49%
Denton (79)	24	2	9	11	47%
Dallas subtotal	378	41	145	185	49%

Source: Analysis of data from the 2008-12 ACS, pooled, and 2008 Survey of Income and Program Participation by James Bachmeier and Jennifer Van Hook of the Pennsylvania State University, Population Research Institute.

Deferred Action Populations (000s) in Other Texas Counties

County (national rank)	Total Unauthorized	Eligible for Deferred Action Programs			Deferred Action as% of Total
		DACA	DAPA	Total	
Texas	1,464	183	560	743	51%
Southwest border counties					
Hidalgo (14)	88	13	37	51	58%
Cameron (30)	46	6	21	27	59%
El Paso (31)	49	7	20	27	55%
Webb (77)	24	4	9	12	51%
Other counties					
Travis (Austin) (15)	80	9	27	36	45%
Bexar (San Antonio) (34)	52	8	18	25	49%

Source: Analysis of data from the 2008-12 ACS, pooled, and 2008 Survey of Income and Program Participation by James Bachmeier and Jennifer Van Hook of the Pennsylvania State University, Population Research Institute.

Deferred Action Populations (000s) in Chicago Metropolitan Area

County (national rank)	Total Unauthorized	Eligible for Deferred Action Programs			Deferred Action as% of Total
		DACA	DAPA	Total	
Illinois	560	81	199	280	50%
Cook (4)	322	46	109	155	48%
Lake (44)	36	7	15	22	60%
Kane (46)	39	5	17	21	54%
DuPage (59)	36	4	12	16	46%
Will (82)	23	3	8	11	50%
Subtotal Chicago area	456	65	161	225	49%

Source: Analysis of data from the 2008-12 ACS, pooled, and 2008 Survey of Income and Program Participation by James Bachmeier and Jennifer Van Hook of the Pennsylvania State University, Population Research Institute.

Deferred Action Populations (000s) in New York Metropolitan Counties

County (national rank)	Total Unauthorized	Eligible for Deferred Action Programs			Deferred Action as% of Total
		DACA	DAPA	Total	
New York	873	104	234	338	39%
New York City					
Queens (7)	246	30	61	91	37%
Kings (Brooklyn) (10)	181	20	51	71	39%
Bronx (18)	117	11	32	43	37%
New York (Manhattan) (38)	83	8	17	25	30%
Richmond (Staten Island) (106)	16	2	6	8	50%
City subtotal	643	71	167	238	37%
Suburban New York counties					
Westchester (43)	53	7	16	23	43%
Suffolk (57)	42	5	11	17	40%
Nassau (61)	34	5	10	15	44%

Source: Analysis of data from the 2008-12 ACS, pooled, and 2008 Survey of Income and Program Participation by James Bachmeier and Jennifer Van Hook of the Pennsylvania State University, Population Research Institute.

Deferred Action Populations (000s) in Washington, DC, Metropolitan Area

County (national rank)	Total Unauthorized	Eligible for Deferred Action Programs			Deferred Action as% of Total
		DACA	DAPA	Total	
Washington, D.C. (N/A)	23	3	4	7	28%
Maryland counties					
Montgomery (MD) (28)	77	9	19	28	36%
Prince George's (MD) (47)	68	6	15	21	31%
Virginia counties					
Fairfax (VA) (36)	65	8	16	25	38%
Prince William (VA) (88)	23	3	5	8	36%
Subtotal Washington, DC, metro area	256	30	60	91	36%

Source: Analysis of data from the 2008-12 ACS, pooled, and 2008 Survey of Income and Program Participation by James Bachmeier and Jennifer Van Hook of the Pennsylvania State University, Population Research Institute.

Deferred Action Populations (000s) in Atlanta Metropolitan Area

County (national rank)	Total Unauthorized	Eligible for Deferred Action Programs			Deferred Action as% of Total
		DACA	DAPA	Total	
Georgia	398	48	122	170	43%
Gwinnett (27)	71	8	22	30	42%
Fulton (62)	37	4	10	14	38%
Cobb (65)	34	4	9	13	39%
DeKalb (78)	42	3	8	11	27%
Hall (111)	16	2	5	7	45%
Subtotal Atlanta area	200	21	54	75	38%

Source: Analysis of data from the 2008-12 ACS, pooled, and 2008 Survey of Income and Program Participation by James Bachmeier and Jennifer Van Hook of the Pennsylvania State University, Population Research Institute.



Where Are the Highest Shares of Unauthorized Immigrants Eligible?

- Higher shares of unauthorized immigrants are eligible for DACA or DAPA in the Southwest than other regions.
 - Higher shares correlate with states with predominantly Mexican populations (especially Texas and California).
 - The highest shares (over 1/2) are generally in interior California counties and Texas border counties.
 - These regions are poor and often agricultural.
- In most metro areas, higher shares are eligible in suburbs than central city counties.
 - This is most likely due to concentration of families in suburbs where housing is less expensive.



Where Are the Lowest Shares of Unauthorized Immigrants Eligible?

- Lower shares of unauthorized immigrants are eligible for DACA or DAPA in the Northeast and Florida.
 - On the East Coast generally, Mexicans are a relatively small share of the unauthorized population.
 - In some areas, there are more unauthorized immigrants from Asia or the Caribbean than Mexico and Central America.
- The lowest shares (1/3 or less) are in high-cost city centers (Manhattan, San Francisco, Washington, DC) and suburbs (Montgomery County, Maryland), Florida counties.
 - These areas often have the highest cost of housing (and hence have few low-income families).



How Many People Will Come Forward?

- 57% of MPI's estimated DACA immediately eligible population came forward in 2 years (as of Sept. 2014)
 - About 50% came forward in the first year.
 - Our estimates do NOT account for individuals who are ineligible due to criminal convictions or who cannot show continuous U.S. residence for 5 years.
- Immigrants from Honduras, Mexico, and Peru had the highest application rates.
- Application rates were highest (over 60%) in Southwestern states (AZ, TX, CO, NV) and NC, GA.



What Might the Economic Impacts of DACA & DAPA Be?

- Beneficiaries gain work permits:
 - A few women (10,000s) might enter the labor force.
 - But employment is already high for men.
 - Wages might increase—studies of 1986 IRCA legalization suggest by 10-15% on average.
 - Workers could be better matched to jobs based on skills, increasing productivity and overall output.
- Beneficiaries may spend more broadly in the economy, with lower barriers to travel and transportation.



What Might the Fiscal Impacts of DACA & DAPA Be?

- Beneficiaries may earn more, raising tax revenues.
- Beneficiaries may be more likely to comply with payroll, income taxes.
 - But surveys suggest between 1/3 and 2/3 already comply.
 - Nearly 100% comply with other taxes, as status/social security numbers not needed to comply.
- Beneficiary eligibility for federal benefits does not change.
 - But more eligible children may participate.
- Eligibility for state benefits may change in some states.
 - E.g., Medicaid eligibility in CA and NY.



What Other Data Elements Are Available in MPI's County Profiles?

- Unauthorized immigrants' origins (countries/regions):
 - Mexicans predominate in almost all counties.
 - Notable exceptions are: Boston: Brazil; Miami: Colombia; Palm Beach (FL): Guatemala; Montgomery (MD): El Salvador.
- Their genders, ages, length of U.S. residence, language spoken at home, English proficiency, educational attainment, and school enrollment.
- The share living with U.S. citizen or other children:
 - Closely tracks share eligible for DAPA: highest in Southwest, lowest in Northeast and Florida.



What Other Data Elements Are Available in MPI's County Profiles?

- Unauthorized immigrants' employment rates
- Industries of employment:
 - Hospitality (arts, entertainment, recreation) is top industry in largest number of counties.
 - Construction is the top industry throughout the South, e.g., in counties in FL, GA, MD, NC, TN, TX.
 - Manufacturing is top industry in Los Angeles and some Midwest counties, e.g.: Chicago (Cook) and suburbs, Milwaukee.
 - Agriculture is top industry in inland California, Yakima (WA).
- Socioeconomic indicators: poverty, homeownership, health insurance coverage.



Next Steps for MPI Research

- Update the data to incorporate the 2013 American Community Survey.
- Track DACA and DAPA application trends using federal administrative data and comparing to estimates.
- Conduct a survey of people coming forward for application assistance.

Charles Kamasaki



Charles Kamasaki is Senior Cabinet Adviser for the National Council of La Raza (NCLR). In this capacity he serves as a senior member of the management team of NCLR, the nation's largest Hispanic civil-rights and advocacy organization, representing nearly 300 affiliated community-based organizations that serve millions of Hispanic Americans annually. He is also a Resident Fellow at the Migration Policy Institute, where he is working on a book about the *Immigration Reform and Control Act*, while on partial sabbatical from NCLR.

Mr. Kamasaki previously managed NCLR's research, policy analysis, and advocacy activity on civil rights, education, economic mobility, housing and community development, immigration, health, and other issues.

He has authored, co-authored, and supervised the preparation of dozens of policy and research reports, journal articles, and editorials, testified frequently at congressional and administrative hearings, coordinated pro bono litigation and legal analysis, and represented NCLR at research and policy conferences and symposia. He has served on numerous nonprofit boards of directors, advisory committees, and task forces.

Mr. Kamasaki was educated at Baylor University and Pan American University.

Jeanne M. Atkinson



Jeanne M. Atkinson is the Executive Director of the Catholic Legal Immigration Network, Inc. (CLINIC). Her passion for immigration was sparked while interning with Catholic Charities in 1987, during which time she focused on legalization. Ms. Atkinson served as the long-time Director of Catholic Charities' Immigration Legal Services (ILS) program for the Archdiocese of Washington, where she directed their highly active and successful legal services program, as well as the Catholic Charities' Refugee Center. Ms. Atkinson was a partner in establishing the Family Justice Center in Montgomery County and is a member of the board of directors of Catholics for Family Peace.. Ms. Atkinson holds a J.D. from American University's Washington College of Law and is a member of the Pennsylvania bar.



Q & A

- Use Q&A chat function to write questions
- Or email events@migrationpolicy.org with your questions
- Slides and audio will be available at: <http://www.migrationpolicy.org/events>



For More Information

Randy Capps

Director of Research, U.S. Programs

Migration Policy Institute

rcapps@migrationpolicy.org

(202) 266-1938

For **estimates of unauthorized immigrants eligible for DAPA and DACA at the national, state and county levels**, visit bit.ly/unauthdata

For **detailed U.S., state, and county profiles of unauthorized immigrants**, visit bit.ly/unauthdata.

For **more data on U.S. immigrants**, visit the MPI Data Hub:
www.migrationpolicy.org/datahub

To sign up for MPI updates: www.migrationpolicy.org/signup