



A Statistical and Demographic Profile of the US Temporary Protected Status Populations from El Salvador, Honduras, and Haiti

Robert Warren
Center for Migration Studies

Donald Kerwin
Center for Migration Studies

Executive Summary

This report presents detailed statistical information on the US Temporary Protected Status (TPS) populations from El Salvador, Honduras, and Haiti. TPS can be granted to noncitizens from designated nations who are unable to return to their countries because of armed conflict, environmental disaster, or other extraordinary and temporary conditions. In January 2017, an estimated 325,000 migrants from 13 TPS-designated countries resided in the United States. This statistical portrait of TPS beneficiaries from El Salvador, Honduras, and Haiti reveals hardworking populations with strong family and other ties to the United States. In addition, high percentages have lived in the United States for 20 years or more, arrived as children, and have US citizen children. The paper finds that:

- The labor force participation rate of the TPS population from the three nations ranges from 81 to 88 percent, which is well above the rate for the total US population (63 percent) and the foreign-born population (66 percent).
- The five leading industries in which TPS beneficiaries from these countries work are: construction (51,700), restaurants and other food services (32,400), landscaping services (15,800), child day care services (10,000), and grocery stores (9,200).
- TPS recipients from these countries live in 206,000 households: 61,000 of these households (about 30 percent) have mortgages.
- About 68,000, or 22 percent, of the TPS population from these nations arrived as children under the age of 16.
- TPS beneficiaries from these nations have an estimated 273,000 US citizen children (born in the United States).

- Ten percent of El Salvadoran, nine percent of the Haitian, and six percent of the Honduran TPS beneficiaries are married to a legal resident.
- More than one-half of El Salvadoran and Honduran, and 16 percent of the Haitian TPS beneficiaries have resided in the United States for 20 years or more.
- The six US states with the largest TPS populations from these countries are California (55,000), Texas (45,000), Florida (45,000), New York (26,000), Virginia (24,000), and Maryland (23,000).
- Eighty-seven percent of the TPS population from these countries speaks at least some English, and slightly over one-half speak English well, very well, or only English.
- About 27,000, or 11 percent, of those in the labor force are self-employed, having created jobs for themselves and likely for others as well.

TPS status should be extended until beneficiaries can safely return home and can successfully reintegrate into their home communities. Most long-term TPS recipients should be afforded a path to lawful permanent resident (LPR) status and ultimately to US citizenship.

Introduction

This article provides social and demographic information on Temporary Protected Status (TPS) beneficiaries from the three countries with the largest numbers of TPS recipients — El Salvador, Honduras, and Haiti.

Under the law, the Secretary of the Department of Homeland Security (DHS) “may designate” a foreign state or part of a foreign state for TPS upon a finding that:

- “there is an ongoing armed conflict within the state and due to such conflict,” the return of its nationals “would pose a serious threat to their personal safety”;
- “there has been an earthquake, flood, drought, epidemic, or other environmental disaster in the state,” the state is “unable, temporarily, to handle adequately the return” of its nationals, and the state has “officially” requested TPS; or
- “there exist extraordinary and temporary conditions” in the state that prevent its nationals from safely returning, unless allowing them to stay would be “contrary to the national interest.”¹

To be eligible for TPS, nationals of designated states must: (1) satisfy continuous presence (from the date of designation or re-designation) and continuous residence requirements;

1 Immigration and Nationality Act (INA) § 244 (b)(1).

A Statistical and Demographic Profile of US TPS Populations

(2) register for TPS during a set period; (3) pay a fee; and (4) meet other requirements.² At least 60 days before the end of a TPS designation, extension or re-designation period, the DHS Secretary is required to “determine” whether the conditions that gave rise to the designation “continue to be met.”³ If so, he or she can either extend the designation period, allowing existing TPS beneficiaries to re-register, or can redesignate the nation for TPS, which extends TPS eligibility to members of the designated nation who arrived *after* the original designation date.⁴ If the DHS Secretary decides that the state “no longer meets the conditions for designation,” he or she is required to terminate the designation through a notice in the Federal Register. The termination is effective no “earlier than 60 days after notice is published or, if later, the expiration of the most recent previous extension.”⁵

Table A in the appendix provides basic information about cutoff dates for continuous residence and estimated numbers of TPS recipients from each of the 13 TPS-designated countries. For El Salvador, Honduras, and Haiti, these dates are respectively February 13, 2001, December 30, 1998, and January 12, 2011.⁶

As the Trump administration considers whether to terminate TPS for El Salvador, Honduras, and Haiti, this paper answers two important questions: (1) from a demographic perspective, who are TPS beneficiaries and how are they faring in the United States; and (2) what would be the major negative consequences, for the United States and for TPS recipients, if the program were discontinued for these three nations? This paper recognizes — although does not describe at length — the inability of TPS recipients from the three nations to reintegrate safely and productively in their home communities, and the way expatriate communities benefit their home states.⁷

The paper focuses on TPS beneficiaries from El Salvador, Honduras, and Haiti because they account for more than 90 percent of all TPS beneficiaries, DHS will decide whether to extend or terminate TPS to each of these nations over the next six months, and TPS populations from these nations are large enough to generate useful estimates (see Table A). Even though TPS recipients have a status similar to nonimmigrants (i.e., noncitizens admitted temporarily for specific reasons), they have usually been included in estimates of the undocumented, along with asylum seekers and certain other legally present noncitizens

2 INA § 244(c). The Act allows a waiver for many grounds of inadmissibility, except for two or more crimes of “moral turpitude” and most controlled substance and national security offenses. Likewise, Temporary Protected Status (TPS) is not available to those who have persecuted others, or who have committed a felony or two or more misdemeanors.

3 INA § 244(b)(3)(A).

4 US Citizenship and Immigration Services (USCIS) (2017) stipulates that a nation may be designated for TPS — or TPS may be extended or redesignated — “in certain circumstances, where the country is unable to handle the return of its nationals adequately.”

5 INA § 244(b)(3)(B).

6 The Department of Homeland Security (DHS) must determine whether to extend or terminate TPS for these populations at least 60 days prior to these dates.

7 In a May 16, 2017 letter to DHS Secretary John F. Kelly and Secretary of State Rex Tillerson, Boston Mayor Martin J. Walsh outlines the benefits of this program to sending and receiving communities. He argues that “failure to extend TPS for Haiti would have a negative impact on the US and Haitian economies, endangering lives, further destabilizing Haiti, and potentially separating families” (Walsh 2017). The letter highlights the contributions of Haitian TPS recipients to their US communities, including in “key industries such as health and elder care” (ibid.).

(Warren 2017, 502, note 11). The Center for Migration Studies (CMS) has continued to include them in its annual series of undocumented population estimates to maintain consistency with other national population totals. The fact that they are included in those estimates makes it possible to compile the information shown in this report.

The CMS estimates are based on detailed statistics on the foreign-born population collected in the Census Bureau's American Community Survey (ACS), as described in detail in Warren (2014). A summary of the procedures used to derive estimates of the TPS population and the undocumented population is presented in the appendix.

Even though the information presented here essentially overlaps with the TPS population, the fit is not exact and CMS's estimates of El Salvadorans, Hondurans, and Haitians residing in the United States by the TPS designation dates — or, in the case of Haiti, by the redesignation date — are slightly larger than the US Citizenship and Immigration Services (USCIS) and the Congressional Research Service (CRS) estimates of TPS beneficiaries. In addition, data limitations include imperfect matches of the CMS data with TPS residency requirements,⁸ as well as sampling and possible non-sampling errors. However, even with these limitations, the CMS estimates provide a well-defined and useful profile of the TPS population. In fact, this is the *only* detailed information available about this population.

Estimates of the TPS Population by Country

Table 1 shows the CMS estimates of the population by period of arrival compared to the estimated number eligible for TPS in January 2017, as compiled by USCIS and reported by the CRS. As would be expected, the CMS totals are higher than the number of TPS beneficiaries shown in Table 1. The CMS estimates include some migrants who did not register for TPS, and the CMS estimate for Haiti probably includes an unknown number who were approved for asylum but have not adjusted to lawful permanent resident (LPR) status. Despite the differences shown in Table 1, the overlap between the CMS estimates and TPS beneficiaries is sufficient to produce a reliable statistical description of the TPS population from these three countries.

The estimates of the TPS population described below were derived by combining the detailed characteristics data from the CMS estimates (top panel, Table 1) with the total estimated TPS beneficiaries (lower panel, Table 1). We can illustrate the estimation of the TPS population using Honduras as an example. The CMS estimates for 2015 show that about 67,000 Hondurans entered the United States before 1999.⁹ That figure encompasses the estimated 57,000 TPS recipients from Honduras shown in Table 1. First, we compiled CMS year-of-entry data (at the microdata level) for Honduras that overlaps with the period of eligibility for TPS. Then we controlled the detailed characteristics to the total number of TPS recipients from Honduras. The same procedure was used for each country.

8 For example, to be eligible for TPS from El Salvador, applicants had to have continuously resided in the United States since before February 13, 2001. The CMS estimates by year of entry for El Salvador are in whole years, so the CMS data shown in this report is for “entered before 2001.” The CMS data for Honduras and Haiti were estimated as closely as possible to the entry dates for eligibility for those countries.

9 This is the appropriate period of entry because Hondurans were eligible to apply for TPS if they entered the United States before December 30, 1998.

Table 1. CMS Estimates of the Population in 2015 Compared to the Estimated Number of TPS Beneficiaries in January 2017

Source	El Salvador (1)	Honduras (2)	Haiti (3)
CMS estimates (2015)	Entered before 2001 242,900	Entered before 1999 67,000	Entered before 2011 93,500
Estimated TPS beneficiaries Jan. 2017 (see appendix)	Entered before Feb. 13, 2001 195,000	Entered before Dec. 30, 1998 57,000	Entered before Jan. 12, 2011 50,000

Characteristics of the TPS Population

Table 2 on the next page shows demographic characteristics of the TPS population. Caution should be exercised in interpreting the data because the numbers involved are small in some of the cells, and the estimates are subject to sampling and other possible errors. Except as noted otherwise, the estimates described in this section are from Table 2.

Households

The population from El Salvador, Honduras, and Haiti shown in Table 2 resided in 205,900 households. Median household income was \$50,000 for Salvadorans, \$40,000 for Hondurans, and \$45,000 for Haitians. In 2015, US median household income was about \$56,000 (Posey 2016).

More than three-quarters of the households with TPS recipients had incomes above the poverty level — El Salvador, 83 percent; Honduras, 76 percent; and Haiti, 81 percent.

TPS beneficiaries from these three countries have a total of 273,200 US-born children, including 192,700 from El Salvador, 53,500 from Honduras, and 27,000 from Haiti.

About 61,100 (30 percent) of the 205,900 households with TPS recipients have mortgages, including roughly one-third of the Salvadoran households, and nearly one-quarter of the Honduran and Haitian households.

Demographics

As is true with most refugee-like populations, a sizeable proportion of the TPS population was age 15 or under when they arrived: El Salvador, 20 percent; Honduras, 23 percent; and Haiti, 30 percent. More than one-half of those from El Salvador and Honduras have resided in the United States for more than 20 years. About 16 percent of Haitians have lived in the United States 20 years or more.

Nearly all of the TPS population from El Salvador and Honduras are age 25 or older (97 and 98 percent, respectively) compared to 87 percent for the total foreign-born population. About 78 percent of the Haitian TPS population are 25 years old and over. These differences are mostly due to differences in TPS eligibility dates.

Table 2. Characteristics of the TPS Population from El Salvador, Honduras, and Haiti

* The totals for the three countries shown here might not agree with totals shown elsewhere because of rounding.

Population characteristics	El Salvador (1)	Hon- duras (2)	Haiti (3)
Total population	195,000	57,000	50,000
Households			
Number of households	135,400	43,400	27,100
Median household income	\$50,000	\$40,000	\$45,000
Percent at or above the poverty level	83%	76%	81%
Number of US-born children	192,700	53,500	27,000
Number of households with a mortgage	45,500	9,500	6,200
Percent of households with a mortgage	34%	22%	23%
Demographic information			
Age 15 or under <i>at arrival</i>	39,300	13,400	15,100
Percent age 15 or under at arrival	20%	23%	30%
Percent in the US 20 years or more	51%	63%	16%
Percent who are age 25 and over	97%	98%	78%
Ability to speak English (age 5+)			
Percent who speak at least a little English	85%	85%	96%
Percent who speak English well, very well, or only English	48%	44%	75%
Education (age 18+)			
Percent completed high school or more	37%	38%	71%
Percent with some college or a degree	13%	12%	37%
Labor force (age 16+)			
Percent in the labor force	88%	85%	81%
Percent unemployed	5%	4%	10%
Percent of labor force self-employed	10%	17%	4%
Health insurance			
Percent with health insurance	56%	40%	57%

Source: Center for Migration Studies.

English language ability (ages five and over)

A high proportion of the TPS population speak *at least a little* English: El Salvador, 85 percent; Honduras, 85 percent; and Haiti, 96 percent. About 48 percent of Salvadorans and 44 percent of Hondurans report speaking English well, very well, or only English. Three-quarters of Haitian TPS beneficiaries report speaking English well, very well, or only English.

Educational attainment (ages 18 and over)

Less than 40 percent of the TPS population from El Salvador and Honduras has a high school education, well below the average of 68 percent for the total foreign-born population. About 12 percent from those two countries attended college compared 46 percent of the total foreign-born population. However, the educational attainment of Haitians with TPS is comparable to the total foreign-born population. Seventy-one percent of Haitians with TPS completed high school, and 37 percent attended college.¹⁰

Labor force (ages 16 and over)

The TPS population from these three countries has high labor force participation rates, ranging from 88 percent for Salvadorans, to 81 percent for Haitians. By contrast, about 63 percent of the total US population was in the labor force in May 2017 (US Bureau of Labor Statistics 2017).

The unemployment rate for Salvadorans and Hondurans is low — five and four percent, respectively, which is about the same rate as that of the total US population. The rate for Haitians is about 10 percent.

Health insurance

More than one-half of TPS beneficiaries from El Salvador and Haiti have health insurance (56 and 57 percent, respectively). Only 40 percent of Hondurans with TPS have health insurance.

Industry

Table 3 shows the five leading industries for the TPS population from each of the three countries. For El Salvador, the leading industry is construction. More Haitians work in restaurants and other food services than in any other industry. For the three countries taken together, the five leading industries are: construction (51,700), restaurants and other food services (32,400), landscaping services (15,800), child day care services (10,000), and grocery stores (9,200).

¹⁰ Because these percentages are so high relative to the figures for Salvadorans and Hondurans shown here, we compiled statistics for *all* Haitian noncitizens who entered the United States from 1982 to 2010 — without regard to legal status. The results are consistent with, and support, the figures shown here: 69 percent graduated from high school, and 38 percent attended college.

Table 3. Estimated TPS Population in the Labor Force: Top Five Industries for Each of the Three Countries

El Salvador	
In the labor force (16+)	171,100
Construction	36,900
Restaurants and other food services	22,400
Landscaping services	11,700
Traveler accommodations	7,900
Grocery stores	6,100
All other industries	86,100
Honduras	
In the labor force (16+)	48,500
Construction	13,700
Child day care services	3,900
Landscaping services	3,700
Restaurants and other food services	3,300
Hospitals	800
All other industries	23,100
Haiti	
In the labor force (16+)	38,600
Restaurants and other food services	6,700
Grocery stores	2,400
Elementary and secondary schools	1,900
Construction	1,000
Hospitals	800
All other industries	25,800

Source: Center for Migration Studies.

Geographic Distribution

Estimates by state and country of origin

Table 4 shows estimates for the US states that have 5,000 or more TPS beneficiaries, by country of origin. For those from El Salvador, the largest numbers are in California (49,100), the areas of Maryland and Virginia around Washington, DC (41,300), Texas (36,300), and New York (16,200). For Honduras, the largest numbers are in Texas (8,500), Florida (7,800), North Carolina (6,200), and California (5,900). Haitians are concentrated in Florida (32,500) and New York (5,200).

Table 4. Estimates of the TPS Population from El Salvador, Honduras, and Haiti, for States That Had 5,000 or More TPS Beneficiaries

	El Salvador (1)	Honduras (2)	Haiti (3)
US total	195,000	57,000	50,000
California	49,100	5,900	-
Florida	-	7,800	32,500
Georgia	5,700	-	-
Maryland	19,800	-	-
Massachusetts	5,000	-	-
Nevada	5,700	-	-
New Jersey	6,800	-	-
New York	16,200	-	5,200
North Carolina	5,900	6,200	-
Texas	36,300	8,500	-
Virginia	21,500	-	-

Source: Center for Migration Studies.

Estimates for cities and PUMAs¹¹

The three largest numbers in Table 4 above are for Salvadorans in California (49,100) and Texas (36,300), and Haitians in Florida (32,500). Table 5 below shows estimates and selected characteristics of the population in four cities within those states, that have the largest TPS populations. Haitians in the Miami area have relatively fewer US-born children than those from El Salvador, most likely because the Haitians arrived more recently.¹² Just over half of the TPS recipients in each city are male. Between 80 and 90 percent of the TPS population in these four cities are in the labor force.

11 PUMAs are a specialized geography created by the US Census Bureau in partnership with states, so that microdata samples can be used to create user-defined data sets. PUMAs have 100,000 or more total population.

12 Salvadorans with TPS entered before February 13, 2001, and Haitians with TPS entered before January 12, 2011 (see Table A).

Table 5. Estimated Characteristics of the TPS Population, by Country of Origin and City of Residence

Country of origin/ City of residence	Estimated TPS pop.	US-born children	Percent male	Percent in labor force (16+)	Percent above poverty level	Percent with health insurance
	(1)	(2)	(3)	(4)	(5)	(6)
Haiti/Miami metro area	24,000	10,600	52%	80%	76%	47%
El Salvador/Los Angeles	29,400	26,500	55%	86%	78%	52%
El Salvador/Houston	19,000	20,300	51%	84%	74%	47%
El Salvador/Dallas	9,700	13,200	54%	90%	83%	57%

Source: Center for Migration Studies.

Table 6 shows the estimated TPS population, by PUMA, for Haitians in the Miami area. Estimates are shown for PUMAs that have 1,000 or more estimated TPS population. Honduran TPS beneficiaries cannot be found in large numbers – as many as 1,000¹³ – in any PUMA. The estimates shown in Tables 6 and 7 (below) should be used with caution because the relatively small numbers are subject to sampling variability and other possible errors.

Table 6. Estimated Haitian TPS Population in Miami Metro Area, for PUMAs with 1,000 or More

Area of residence	TPS pop.
Total, Miami metro area	24,000
Total Miami-Dade	7,900
Miami-Dade County North Miami City (Southwest) & Golden Glades (West)	2,800
Miami-Dade County (Northeast)—Greater North Miami Beach City (West)	1,400
Miami-Dade County (North Central)—Miami Gardens City (North & West)	1,100
Total Broward County/Ft. Lauderdale	9,100
Broward County (Central)—Lauderhill & Lauderdale Lakes Cities	2,200
Broward County (Central)—Tamarac, Oakland Park & North Lauderdale Cities	1,900
Broward County (Central)—Plantation & Sunrise Cities	1,100
Broward County (East Central)—Fort Lauderdale City (Central)	1,100
Total Palm Beach	7,000
Palm Beach County (East Central)—Lake Worth City, Lantana Town & Atlantis City	1,400
Palm Beach County (East)—West Palm Beach City (Southeast) & Palm Beach Town	1,300
Palm Beach County (Northeast)—Palm Beach Gardens & Riviera Beach Cities	1,300
Palm Beach County (East Central)—Greater Boynton Beach City (North)	1,200

Source: Center for Migration Studies.

13 The PUMA with the largest number of TPS beneficiaries from Honduras is Jefferson Parish in New Orleans with 700.

Table 7 shows the estimated TPS population, by PUMA, for Salvadorans in Los Angeles County and Houston. Estimates are shown for PUMAs that have 1,000 or more TPS beneficiaries. These two cities have the largest concentrations of Salvadoran TPS recipients in the country. An interesting feature of Table 7 is that so few PUMAs have 2,000 or more TPS recipients. The two cities shown in Table 7 have almost 50,000 residents with TPS, but there are only three PUMAs that have 2,000 or more with TPS, which indicates that the TPS population is widely dispersed within the two cities.

Table 7. Estimated Salvadoran TPS Population in Los Angeles and Houston, for PUMAs with 1,000 or More

Area of residence	TPS pop.
Total Los Angeles County	29,400
Los Angeles County (Central)—LA City (Central/Koreatown)	2,100
Los Angeles County (North)—LA City (North Central/Mission Hills & Panorama City)	2,100
Los Angeles County (South Central)—LA City (South Central/Watts)	2,000
Los Angeles County (Central)—LA City (Southeast/East Vernon)	1,900
Los Angeles County (Northwest)—LA City (N. Central/Van Nuys & North Sherman Oaks)	1,800
Los Angeles County—LA City (East Central/Silver Lake, Echo Park & Westlake)	1,800
Los Angeles County (South Central)—LA City (South Central/Westmont)	1,700
Los Angeles County (Central)—Huntington Park City, Florence-Graham & Walnut Park	1,300
Los Angeles County LA (North Central/Arleta & Pacoima) & San Fernando Cities	1,300
Los Angeles County (Central)—LA City (East Central/Hollywood)	1,000
Total Houston	19,000
Houston City (Southwest)—Between Loop I-610 & Beltway TX-8	1,600
Houston City (West)—Westpark Tollway, Between Loop I-610 & Beltway TX-8	1,600
Harris County (East)—Deer Park, La Porte (North) Cities & Channelview	1,400
Houston (Southwest) & Bellaire (SE) Cities—Between Loop I-610 & Beltway TX-8	1,400
Houston City (North)—West of Aldine & Inside Beltway TX-8	1,100
Houston City (Northwest)—Between Loop I-610 & Beltway TX-8	1,100
Houston City (North)—South of Aldine & Inside Beltway TX-8	1,100
Harris County (North)—Houston City (North)—I-45, Between Beltway TX-8 & FM-1960	1,000

Source: Center for Migration Studies.

Discussion

This statistical portrait reveals a hard-working population with strong ties to the United States. In addition, high percentages have lived in the United States for 20 years or more, arrived as children, and have US citizen children. Among other findings:

- The labor force participation rate of the TPS population from all three countries (81 to 88 percent) is well above the rate for the total US population (63 percent).
- About 273,200 of their children are US citizens (born in the United States), and about 67,800, or 22 percent of the total, arrived as children under age 16.
- High percentages — particularly of El Salvadorans and Hondurans — have lived in the United States for 20 years or more.
- Eighty-seven percent speak at least some English, and slightly over one-half speak English well, very well, or only English.
- About 27,100, or 11 percent, of those in the labor force are self-employed, having created jobs for themselves and likely for others as well.
- Of the 205,900 households from these three countries, 61,100 have mortgages.

Two aspects of the population from Haiti are especially noteworthy: (1) nearly all of them speak at least some English, and three-quarters report speaking English well, very well, or only English; and (2) they are relatively well-educated — 71 percent are high school graduates and 37 percent have attended at least some college.

Recommendations

For 27 years, the TPS program has successfully protected persons who would have suffered substantial hardship and faced great risk in their home countries, and whose nations could not safely and productively accommodate their return. TPS has been criticized as a program that traps its (often long-term) beneficiaries in a legal limbo, denies them most federal public benefits, and prevents them from adjusting to LPR status (Bergeron 2014, 29-31). In addition, it denies coverage to imperiled persons from designated nations that arrive after the date of designation and those from undesignated states or sub-state groups, does not allow beneficiaries to petition for the admission of close family members, requires re-registration (leading to attrition) following an extension or redesignation, and does not offer durable solutions following termination or withdrawal of TPS status (Kerwin 2014, 50-51).

These issues have all come to a head as the Trump administration weighs whether to terminate designations for several national groups. To assess the consequences of this decision, this paper has focused on two questions. First, from a demographic perspective, who are TPS beneficiaries and how are they faring in the United States? The analysis found that about 30 percent of TPS beneficiaries from the three nations are homeowners and they are the parents of 273,200 US-born children. About 68,000, or almost one-quarter, were childhood arrivals. A very high percentage is in the labor force, and they have low unemployment rates. Relatively few live in poverty. About 27,000 are self-employed job creators. A high percentage speaks English, and 16 percent have attended college. Many have lived in the United States for 20 years or more.

Second, what would be the major negative consequences if the program were discontinued for these three groups? The paper reports that the United States would lose hundreds of

thousands of migrants who have been productive, tax-paying, law-abiding residents for many years. About 61,000 mortgages would suddenly be in jeopardy. Ending the TPS program could also force hundreds of thousands of long-term US residents, including 273,200 US-born children and 67,800 who were brought here as children, to move to a country that cannot safely and successfully reintegrate them.

Commentators have recognized that the “extraordinary” conditions that give rise to a TPS designation often persist well beyond an initial TPS designation period. This analysis illustrates that long-term TPS beneficiaries have settled into productive lives in the United States.

The United States has several options for addressing their situation. Given the extensive ties and contributions of TPS recipients to the United States and the violence and poverty in their home states, the worst solution would be to terminate TPS status, without a plan for current beneficiaries other than stripping them of legal status and exposing them to possible deportation. This option would only add to the large undocumented population, the great majority of whom — as the authors and many others have argued — should be legalized (Warren and Kerwin 2015, 98-99; Kerwin and Warren 2017, 320-23).

Among other, more productive options, the DHS Secretary could extend TPS for as long as adverse conditions persist in these countries. Congress could also pass a law that allowed TPS program beneficiaries to apply for LPR status after one extension of status or after a set term of years (Zavodny and Orrenius 2017, 190; Bergeron 2014, 39). It could also permit TPS recipients, who are eligible for a family-based visa or some other immigration benefit under current law, to adjust to LPR status in the United States (Bergeron 2014, 35-37).¹⁴ Congress could also pass a legalization bill that covers TPS beneficiaries, advances the qualifying date for “registry” (an existing program to legalize long-term residents), or amends the criteria for “cancellation of removal” to allow TPS recipients to apply affirmatively (rather than in removal proceedings) for this status (Kerwin 2014, 65-66). Finally, it could combine these measures, with substantial investments in the development of TPS-designated states so that program beneficiaries could be safely repatriated (Bergeron 2014, 39-40; Kerwin 2014, 63-64).

Each of these responses would recognize the strong ties of TPS beneficiaries to the United States, facilitate their continued contributions to US communities, preserve their US families, and benefit their countries of origin.

Appendix

CMS Estimates of the TPS Population

Overall approach

As noted above, TPS beneficiaries have been included as undocumented residents — even though their status is more comparable to nonimmigrants — in CMS’ annual series of estimates. This is partly to maintain consistency with other national population totals, but also because sufficiently detailed administrative data have not available for the TPS

¹⁴ This would require that a grant of TPS be treated an “admission” to the United States.

population. Because TPS beneficiaries *are included* in the CMS estimates of undocumented residents, we were able to estimate the TPS population for this report by (1) compiling CMS's estimates of the undocumented population by country of birth and year of entry, (2) tabulating detailed year-of-entry data that overlaps as closely as possible with the period of eligibility for TPS for each country (see Table A below), and (3) controlling the characteristics from the CMS estimates to the USCIS totals shown in Table 1.

CMS estimates of undocumented residents

CMS used the procedures below (Steps 1 to 5) to derive estimates of the undocumented resident population in 2010. The same steps¹⁵ were followed to derive estimates for 2015. The classification of noncitizens as undocumented residents was done at the microdata level. The CMS estimates shown here were compiled by country of origin and single year of entry from those data sets. Warren (2014) provides a detailed description of the methodology and compares the CMS estimates based on this methodology to estimates derived using the residual method.

Step 1. The first step in the estimation procedure was to compile data from the 2010 ACS for all noncitizens who entered the United States from 1982 to 2010. It was assumed that nearly all undocumented residents are in the category “noncitizens who entered the U.S. after 1981.” Very few who entered before 1982 would still be residing here as undocumented residents in 2010 because: (1) a large percentage of those who entered before 1982 obtained legal status under the Immigration Reform and Control Act of 1986 (IRCA);¹⁶ and (2) those who entered before 1982 and did not apply for legalization have had more than 25 years in which to leave the undocumented resident population — that is, to secure legal status, be removed, leave voluntarily, or die.

Step 2. A series of edits, referred to as “logical edits,”¹⁷ were used to identify and remove as many legal residents as possible based on responses in the survey.

Step 3. Separate population controls were estimated for 145 countries or areas for undocumented residents counted in the 2010 ACS. For each country or area, the ratio of the population control to the logically edited population (from Step 2) was computed.

Step 4. The country-by-country ratios derived in Step 3 were used to make final selections of individual respondents in the ACS to be classified as undocumented residents.

Step 5. The estimates of those counted in the ACS (from Step 4) were adjusted for undercount.

15 Actually, the country-by-country selection ratios for 2010, computed in Step 3, were used in Step 4 for every year; independent population controls were computed *only for 2010*.

16 The Immigration Reform and Control Act of 1986 (IRCA) went into effect in 1987. Two main groups were eligible for legalization, each with their own residency requirements: (1) legalization applicants who continuously resided in the United States since before January 1, 1982; and (2) Special Agricultural Workers (SAWs) who had 90 days of seasonal agricultural work experience in qualifying crops from May 1985 to May 1986. About 1.6 million legalization applicants and 1.1 million SAW applicants were approved.

17 The term “logical edit” refers to the process of determining probable legal status by examining survey data. For example, respondents were assigned to the legal category if they worked in occupations that generally require legal status, had the characteristics of legal temporary migrants, were immediate relatives of US citizens, received public benefits restricted to legal residents, were from countries where most arrivals would be refugees, or were age 60 or older at entry.

Current TPS Countries (January 2017)

Table A. Countries Whose Nationals in the United States Currently Benefit from Temporary Protected Status

Country	Must have arrived before	Current expiration date	Estimated number
All 13 countries			325,500
El Salvador	February 13, 2001	March 9, 2018	195,000
Guinea	November 20, 2014	May 21, 2017	930
Haiti	January 12, 2011	[January 22, 2018] ¹⁸	50,000
Honduras	December 30, 1998	January 5, 2018	57,000
Liberia	November 20, 2014	May 21, 2017	2,160
Nepal	June 24, 2015	June 24, 2018	8,950
Nicaragua	December 30, 1998	January 5, 2018	2,550
Sierra Leone	November 20, 2014	May 21, 2017	1,180
Somalia	May 1, 2012	March 17, 2017	270
South Sudan	January 25, 2016	November 2, 2017	200
Sudan	January 9, 2013	November 2, 2017	450
Syria	August 1, 2016	March 31, 2018	5,800
Yemen	January 4, 2017	September 3, 2018	1,000

Source: Argueta (2017, Table 1). CRS compilation of USCIS data.

REFERENCES

- Argueta, Carla N. 2017. “Protected Status: Current Immigration Policy and Issues.” Washington, DC: Congressional Research Service. <https://fas.org/sgp/crs/homsec/RS20844.pdf>.
- Bergeron, Claire. 2014. “Temporary Protected Status after 25 Years: Addressing the Challenge of Long-Term ‘Temporary’ Residents and Strengthening a Centerpiece of US Humanitarian Protection.” *Journal on Migration and Human Security* 2(1): 22-43. <https://doi.org/10.14240/jmhs.v2i1.23>.
- DHS (US Department of Homeland Security). 2017. “Secretary Kelly’s Statement on the Limited Extension of Haiti’s Designation for Temporary Protected Status.” Washington, DC: DHS. <https://www.dhs.gov/news/2017/05/22/secretary-kellys-statement-limited-extension-haitis-designation-temporary-protected>.

18 The Congressional Research Service chart listed July 22, 2017 as the TPS expiration date for Haitians. On May 22, 2017, DHS Secretary John F. Kelly extended TPS for Haitians until January 22, 2018 (DHS 2017).

- Kerwin, Donald. 2014. "Creating a More Responsive and Seamless Refugee Protection System: The Scope, Promise and Limitations of US Temporary Protection Programs." *Journal on Migration and Human Security* 2(1): 44-72. <https://doi.org/10.14240/jmhs.v2i1.24>.
- Kerwin, Donald, and Robert Warren. 2017. "National Interests and Common Ground in the US Immigration Debate: How to Legalize the US Immigration System and Permanently Reduce Its Undocumented Population." *Journal on Migration and Human Security* 5(2): 297-330. <https://doi.org/10.14240/jmhs.v5i2.86>.
- Orrenius, Pia, and Madeline Zavodny. 2017. "Creating Cohesive, Coherent Immigration Policy." *Journal on Migration and Human Security* 5(1): 180-93. <https://doi.org/10.14240/jmhs.v5i1.79>.
- Posey, Kirby G. 2016. "Household Income: 2015." Washington, DC: US Census Bureau. <https://www.census.gov/content/dam/Census/library/publications/2016/demo/acsbr15-02.pdf>.
- US Bureau of Labor Statistics. 2017. "Labor Force Statistics from the Current Population Survey." Washington, DC: US Bureau of Labor Statistics. <https://data.bls.gov/timeseries/LNS11300000>.
- USCIS (US Citizenship and Immigration Services). 2017. "Temporary Protected Status." Washington, DC: USCIS. <https://www.uscis.gov/humanitarian/temporary-protected-status>.
- Walsh, Martin J. 2017. "Mayor Walsh's Letter Requesting to Extend Temporary Protected Status for Haiti." Boston: Boston city government. <https://www.boston.gov/news/mayor-walshs-letter-requesting-extend-temporary-protected-status-haiti>.
- Warren, Robert. 2014. "Democratizing Data about Unauthorized Residents in the United States: Estimates and Public-Use Data, 2010 to 2013." *Journal on Migration and Human Security* 2(4): 305-28. <http://dx.doi.org/10.14240/jmhs.v2i4.38>.
- _____. 2017. "Zero Undocumented Population Growth Is Here to Stay and Immigration Reform Would Preserve and Extend These Gains." *Journal on Migration and Human Security* 5(2): 491-508. <https://doi.org/10.14240/jmhs.v5i2.95>.
- Warren, Robert, and Donald Kerwin. 2015. "Beyond DACA and DAPA: Revisiting Legislative Reform in Light of Long-Term Trends in Unauthorized Immigration to the United States." *Journal on Migration and Human Security* 3(1): 80-108. <https://doi.org/10.14240/jmhs.v3i1.45>.