



DREAM Act-Eligible Poised to Build on the Investments Made in Them

Donald Kerwin
Center for Migration Studies

Robert Warren
Center for Migration Studies

Executive Summary

This paper presents the results of a study by the Center for Migration Studies (CMS) on potential beneficiaries of the DREAM Act of 2017 (the “DREAM Act” or “Act”). The study reveals a long-term, highly productive population, with deep ties to the United States. In particular, it finds that:

- More than 2.2 million US residents would qualify for conditional residence under the DREAM Act.
- An additional 929,000 — who are now age 18 and over — arrived when they were under 18, but have not graduated from high school and are not enrolled in school and, thus, would not currently qualify for status under the Act.
- The DREAM Act-eligible can be found in large numbers (5,000 or more) in 41 states and more than 30 counties, metropolitan areas, and cities.
- Potential DREAM Act recipients have lived in the United States for an average of 14 years.
- Sixty-five percent (age 16 and above) participate in the labor force, with far higher rates in Wisconsin, Massachusetts, Utah, Arkansas, Illinois, Tennessee, and Oregon.
- This population works heavily in sales and related occupations; food preparation and serving; construction and extracting; office and administrative support; production; transportation and material moving; and building/grounds cleaning and maintenance.
- Many of the DREAM Act-eligible are highly skilled and credentialed.
- 70,500 are self-employed.
- Eighty-eight percent speaks English exclusively, very well, or well.

- 392,500 have US-citizen children, and more than 100,000 are married to a US citizen or lawful permanent resident.
- Twenty-nine percent has attended college or received a college degree.
- The DREAM Act-eligible include 50,700 Temporary Protected Status (TPS) recipients from El Salvador, Haiti, and Honduras, 45 percent of whom live in the Miami metro area, Los Angeles County, the Washington, DC area, Houston, New York City, the San Francisco metro area, and the City of Dallas.

The study also underscores the immense investment — \$150 billion — that states and localities have already made in educating these young Americans. It argues that over time and with a path to citizenship the return on this investment will increase by virtually every indicia of integration — education levels, employment rates, self-employment numbers, US family members, and English language proficiency.

Introduction

The acrimony over a potential immigration “compromise” has drawn attention away from the overriding merits of legalizing the young immigrants known as the Dreamers. A study by the Center for Migration Studies (CMS) on potential beneficiaries of the DREAM Act of 2017 (the “DREAM Act” or “Act”) reveals a long-term, highly productive population with deep ties to the United States, a large presence in the overwhelming majority of states, and significant populations in diverse counties, metropolitan areas and cities. The study underscores the immense investment that states and localities have made to educate the Dreamers and argues that the potential return on this investment will depend, in large part, on whether Congress and the administration create a path to citizenship for them. Finally, the study estimates that 50,700 Temporary Protected Status (TPS) recipients from El Salvador, Haiti, and Honduras would qualify for conditional permanent residence under the DREAM Act. This finding assumes heightened importance in light of the recent termination of TPS for several national groups and the damage that loss of status would cause for their families and communities (Warren and Kerwin 2017).

The DREAM Act and CMS’s Estimates

The DREAM Act of 2017 would extend “conditional permanent residence” to undocumented young immigrants, recipients of Deferred Action for Childhood Arrivals (DACA), and TPS beneficiaries who entered the United States prior to age 18, if they have lived in the country for at least four years prior to the Act’s passage. In addition, to qualify, applicants must: (1) be admitted to college, a university, or other institution of higher learning; (2) have received a high school diploma or general education development certificate (GED); or (3) be enrolled in a program to obtain a high school diploma or GED. They must also pay a fee and pass rigorous criminal, security, background checks. After eight years, conditional residents can adjust to (nonconditional) lawful permanent resident (LPR) status if they

DREAM Act-Eligible Poised to Build on the Investments Made in Them

have not abandoned US residence and have: (1) obtained a degree from an institution of higher education or completed two years towards a bachelor’s or higher degree; (2) completed two years of military service; or (3) been employed for at least three years and been authorized to work for at least 75 percent of that time. In addition, they must pay a fee, meet English language and civics requirements, and undergo national security and law enforcement screening.

CMS derived its estimates of the DREAM Act-eligible from data on the foreign-born population collected in the US Census Bureau’s American Community Survey (ACS). Warren (2014) details the methods used to estimate the undocumented population. CMS classified noncitizens as undocumented residents at the microdata level, and compiled estimates for its study from these detailed data sets. The statistics cited and shown (below) cover undocumented residents — which in CMS’s data include TPS recipients — who arrived before 2013, arrived when they were under age 18, and either graduated from high school or are enrolled in school.

Findings

The size and dispersion of potential DREAM Act beneficiaries suggest the importance of this issue. CMS estimates that more than 2.2 million US residents would qualify for conditional residence under the Act (Table 1). An additional 929,000 (who are now 18 and over) arrived when they were under age 18, but have not graduated from high school and are not enrolled in school. Thus, they would not currently qualify for status under the Act.

Table 1. Estimated Number Eligible under the DREAM Act, by State and Selected Area

States with fewer than 5,000 not shown.

State or area	Number	State or area	Number
US total	2,235,600	Massachusetts	26,300
Alabama	10,500	Michigan	17,000
Arizona	57,900	Minnesota	19,800
Phoenix	42,900	Mississippi	5,300
Arkansas	11,800	Missouri	11,200
California	553,000	Nebraska	7,800
Los Angeles County	183,900	Nevada	34,400
Orange County	63,300	Las Vegas metro area	28,900
San Francisco metro area	51,200	New Jersey	89,000
San Diego County	34,500	Hudson County	14,000
Riverside County	31,300	Essex County	11,600
San Bernardino County	30,100	Middlesex County	11,600
Fresno County	17,700	Bergen County	10,400
Colorado	38,700	New Mexico	16,900

Connecticut	24,700	New York	140,600
Delaware	5,200	New York City	100,700
DC and surrounding areas	50,600	Queens	35,300
Montgomery County	15,000	Brooklyn	31,200
Prince Georges County	13,900	Bronx	22,000
Fairfax County	14,900	Manhattan	9,700
Alexandria and Arlington	5,400	Staten Island	2,400
Florida	153,500	North Carolina	55,700
Miami metro area	88,200	Ohio	12,400
Miami	41,000	Oklahoma	21,900
Ft. Lauderdale	32,400	Oklahoma City metro area	12,400
West Palm Beach	14,800	Oregon	30,200
Orlando metro area	20,800	Pennsylvania	27,500
Georgia	71,900	Rhode Island	5,100
Atlanta metro area	55,200	South Carolina	14,400
Hawaii	9,300	Tennessee	20,500
Idaho	7,300	Texas	368,400
Illinois	111,200	Houston (city)	97,100
Chicago (city)	69,500	Dallas (city)	59,100
Indiana	19,600	McAllen metro area	21,400
Indianapolis (city)	4,900	El Paso metro area	14,200
Iowa	10,300	Utah	21,600
Kansas	13,800	Virginia	45,700
Kentucky	7,900	Washington	49,000
Louisiana	9,600	King County	15,700
Maryland	51,200	Wisconsin	16,600

Source: Center for Migration Studies.

The DREAM Act-eligible can be found in large numbers (5,000 or more) in 41 states, both blue and red. The highest numbers live in California (553,000), Texas (368,400), Florida (153,500), New York (140,600), Illinois (111,200), New Jersey (89,000), Georgia (71,900), Arizona (57,900), North Carolina (55,700), and Maryland (51,200) (Table 1).

Dreamers constitute a concentrated and significant presence in many sub-state areas, including Los Angeles County (183,900), New York City (100,700), Houston (97,100), the Miami metropolitan area (88,200), the City of Chicago (69,500), Orange County (63,300), the City of Dallas (59,100), the Atlanta metropolitan area (55,200), the San Francisco metropolitan area (51,200), Washington, DC and surrounding areas (50,600), Phoenix (42,900), San Diego County (34,500), Ft. Lauderdale (32,400), Riverside County (31,300), San Bernardino County (30,100), Las Vegas metropolitan area (28,900), the McAllen metropolitan area (21,400), the Orlando metropolitan area (20,800), Fresno County (17,700), and King County (Washington) (15,700) (Table 1).

Table 2. Estimated Total Expenditures for Education (Grades 1 through 12) for the DREAM Act Population, by State.

<i>Numbers rounded independently.</i>				<i>All calculations based on unrounded numbers.</i>			
State of residence	Eligible for DREAM Act	Expenditures*		State of residence	Eligible for DREAM Act	Expenditures*	
		Annual, per student	Total (in millions)			Annual, per student	Total (in millions)
	(1)	(2)	(3)		(4)	(5)	(6)
US total	2,235,600	n/a	\$149,515				
Alabama	10,500	\$8,800	\$580	Missouri	11,200	\$9,700	\$685
Alaska	2,300	\$18,300	\$270	Nebraska	7,800	\$11,800	\$580
Arizona	57,900	\$7,600	\$2,755	Nevada	34,400	\$8,100	\$1,760
Arkansas	11,800	\$9,600	\$710	NH	1,900	\$13,800	\$170
California	553,000	\$9,300	\$32,245	New Jersey	89,000	\$18,700	\$10,485
Colorado	38,700	\$8,800	\$2,140	NM	16,900	\$9,200	\$980
Connecticut	24,700	\$17,200	\$2,675	New York	140,600	\$19,600	\$17,305
Delaware	5,200	\$13,700	\$450	NC	55,700	\$8,400	\$2,945
DC	1,400	\$21,100	\$180	ND	200	\$12,000	\$10
Florida	153,500	\$8,700	\$8,400	Ohio	12,400	\$11,200	\$875
Georgia	71,900	\$9,200	\$4,165	Oklahoma	21,900	\$8,000	\$1,100
Hawaii	9,300	\$11,900	\$700	Oregon	30,200	\$9,500	\$1,805
Idaho	7,300	\$6,900	\$315	PA	27,500	\$13,400	\$2,310
Illinois	111,200	\$12,400	\$8,655	RI	5,100	\$14,900	\$475
Indiana	19,600	\$9,400	\$1,160	SC	14,400	\$9,600	\$865
Iowa	10,300	\$10,400	\$670	SD	1,200	\$8,800	\$70
Kansas	13,800	\$10,100	\$875	Tennessee	20,500	\$8,500	\$1,100
Kentucky	7,900	\$9,300	\$460	Texas	368,400	\$8,400	\$19,485
Louisiana	9,600	\$10,700	\$640	Utah	21,600	\$6,600	\$895
Maine	200	\$12,500	\$15	Vermont	900	\$17,200	\$100
Maryland	51,200	\$14,200	\$4,565	Virginia	45,700	\$11,000	\$3,170
Mass.	26,300	\$15,300	\$2,540	Washington	49,000	\$9,800	\$3,010
Michigan	17,000	\$10,400	\$1,110	WV	600	\$11,300	\$40
Minnesota	19,800	\$11,100	\$1,385	Wisconsin	16,600	\$11,200	\$1,170
Mississippi	5,300	\$8,200	\$270	Wyoming	1,900	\$16,000	\$195

Source: Center for Migration Studies.

n/a = not applicable

* Estimates of annual expenditures per student were computed using data on expenditures and enrollment, by state, in fiscal year 2011, from the US Department of Education, National Center for Education Statistics. Expenditures in column 3 = column 1 x column 2 x 7.4, rounded to 5 million. The figure of 7.4 — the average number of years DREAM Act beneficiaries would attend school from arrival through high school graduation — was derived based on estimates of the DREAM Act population under 18, by single years of age. The estimates for each state were reduced by 15 percent to account for students that have not yet finished their education. Thus, the total expenditures will increase over time. The table does not include the state of Montana given its low number of potential DREAM Act recipients.

CMS estimates that “states” — meaning their sub-state jurisdictions — have already invested \$150 billion in educating potential DREAM Act recipients from the time of their arrival through high school (Table 2). These estimates are based on data on annual expenditures on students by state and the average number of years that the DREAM Act-eligible attend US schools through high school.

CMS’s study illustrates that not only are potential DREAM Act beneficiaries deeply vested in their communities, but their communities have extensively invested in them as well and can realize the full benefit of their investment only if the Dreamers are afforded a path to citizenship. Eighty-eight percent of Dreamers speak English exclusively, very well, or well (Table 3). Twenty-nine percent have attended college or received a college degree, including 40 percent of Dreamers in Massachusetts and Kansas (Table 3). Their college graduation rates will increase with time and (particularly) with permanent status. Past US legalization programs led immigrants to invest substantially in their education, English language classes, and job training, which improved their economic standing and led to increased entrepreneurial activity (Orrenius and Zavodny 2012; Kerwin 2013). The DREAM Act’s educational requirements for conditional permanent residence and adjustment to LPR status incentivize educational attainment. Moreover, legal status through the DREAM Act would create similar incentives (to past legalization programs) for beneficiaries to invest in themselves. According to a recent study, the legalization of potential DREAM Act beneficiaries who meet the age, residence, and educational requirements for conditional permanent residence would increase US gross domestic product (GDP) in the short-term by \$7.6 billion a year, rising to \$13.6 billion over time, with particularly striking gains to the industries in which beneficiaries are concentrated and to the incomes of average Americans (Ortega, Edwards, and Wolgin 2017).

Table 3. Characteristics of the DREAM Act Population: States with 10,000 or More

State of residence	Total (1)	Parts might not sum to total because of rounding.				
		Have a US-citizen child (2)	Married to a US citizen (3)	Married to an LPR (4)	Speak English very well* (5)	Some college or a degree** (6)
US total	2,235,600	392,500	44,200	58,100	88%	29%
Alabama	10,500	1,400	-	-	82%	30%
Arizona	57,900	11,200	1,200	800	92%	26%
Arkansas	11,800	3,500	200	200	75%	27%
California	553,000	102,000	14,400	17,300	87%	33%
Colorado	38,700	9,000	1,000	1,600	91%	20%
Connecticut	24,700	2,400	400	200	92%	24%
Florida	153,500	18,000	1,000	2,800	88%	32%

DREAM Act-Eligible Poised to Build on the Investments Made in Them

Georgia	71,900	11,100	1,300	1,600	88%	23%
Illinois	111,200	24,100	2,300	3,000	83%	28%
Indiana	19,600	4,700	800	200	81%	30%
Iowa	10,300	3,300	100	700	94%	19%
Kansas	13,800	2,700	100	100	94%	40%
Maryland	51,200	8,600	800	1,500	90%	33%
Massachusetts	26,300	2,100	-	100	88%	40%
Michigan	17,000	2,600	100	400	95%	25%
Minnesota	19,800	5,300	-	1,100	91%	24%
Missouri	11,200	1,500	100	100	89%	21%
Nevada	34,400	7,300	500	1,200	88%	29%
New Jersey	89,000	11,500	600	3,700	90%	30%
New Mexico	16,900	2,900	200	100	96%	26%
New York	140,600	18,400	1,200	4,000	88%	35%
N. Carolina	55,700	11,600	1,100	1,800	90%	22%
Ohio	12,400	1,700	300	-	94%	18%
Oklahoma	21,900	3,900	700	800	93%	28%
Oregon	30,200	7,600	500	1,500	91%	30%
Pennsylvania	27,500	4,300	1,100	600	92%	30%
S. Carolina	14,400	3,100	700	300	91%	21%
Tennessee	20,500	3,300	-	800	92%	24%
Texas	368,400	68,300	9,800	5,300	87%	26%
Utah	21,600	5,900	400	1,600	95%	33%
Virginia	45,700	4,200	100	1,000	94%	30%
Washington	49,000	10,400	600	1,300	91%	30%
Wisconsin	16,600	3,100	-	200	91%	30%
All other	68,100	11,500	2,600	2,200	90%	27%

Source: Center for Migration Studies.

“-” refers to fewer than 100

* Percent who reported speaking English well, very well, or only English.

** The variability in these percentages is partly the result of small sample sizes.

Although the DREAM Act-eligible have lived in the United States for an average of 14 years, they are a hard-working, relatively young population in a rapidly aging country: each day between 2011 and 2030, 10,000 US residents will reach age 65 (Cohn and Taylor 2010). The Dreamers' labor force participation rate (those age 16 or above) is 65 percent, with far higher rates in Wisconsin (84 percent), Massachusetts (83 percent), Utah (81 percent), Arkansas (79 percent), Illinois (74 percent), Tennessee (71 percent), and Oregon (70 percent) (Table 4).

Table 4. Labor Force Status of the DREAM Act Population: States with 10,000 or More

Numbers rounded independently. *Parts might not sum to total because of rounding.*

State of residence	Total	Ages 16 and over	Employed, 16 and over	Percent employed 16 and over	Self-employed	Average years in US
	(1)	(2)	(3)	(4)=(3)/(2)	(5)	(6)
US total	2,235,600	1,760,800	1,140,100	65%	70,500	14
Alabama	10,500	8,600	5,000	59%	200	12
Arizona	57,900	44,800	28,700	64%	2,000	14
Arkansas	11,800	9,500	7,500	79%	-	16
California	553,000	450,500	291,500	65%	19,100	15
Colorado	38,700	29,900	19,400	65%	500	14
Connecticut	24,700	18,400	11,600	63%	900	11
Florida	153,500	121,000	76,100	63%	5,100	13
Georgia	71,900	58,500	34,400	59%	4,200	13
Illinois	111,200	92,700	68,300	74%	3,000	15
Indiana	19,600	15,700	10,200	65%	500	12
Iowa	10,300	8,500	5,700	66%	-	12
Kansas	13,800	9,400	6,100	65%	300	13
Maryland	51,200	40,400	25,400	63%	400	13
Massachusetts	26,300	22,500	18,600	83%	400	15
Michigan	17,000	13,400	7,700	58%	200	13
Minnesota	19,800	14,800	8,800	60%	-	13
Missouri	11,200	8,600	4,500	53%	300	11
Nevada	34,400	27,600	18,800	68%	1,400	16
New Jersey	89,000	64,000	38,000	59%	2,000	12
New Mexico	16,900	12,700	8,000	63%	100	13
New York	140,600	108,500	67,400	62%	5,900	13
N. Carolina	55,700	45,200	29,600	66%	2,200	13
Ohio	12,400	9,200	6,400	69%	200	12
Oklahoma	21,900	16,400	10,100	62%	100	14
Oregon	30,200	24,400	17,200	70%	300	15
Pennsylvania	27,500	20,300	12,500	62%	-	10
S. Carolina	14,400	10,700	7,000	66%	300	11
Tennessee	20,500	15,500	11,000	71%	1,100	13
Texas	368,400	287,000	176,800	62%	13,900	14
Utah	21,600	18,100	14,700	81%	400	15
Virginia	45,700	32,200	20,500	64%	1,500	11
Washington	49,000	38,600	24,600	64%	1,000	14
Wisconsin	16,600	12,300	10,300	84%	400	14
All other states	68,100	50,800	37,700	74%	2,500	13

Source: Center for Migration Studies.

“-” refers to fewer than 100

DREAM Act-Eligible Poised to Build on the Investments Made in Them

Potential DREAM Act recipients work heavily in the following occupations: sales and related (176,400), food preparation and serving (173,100), construction and extracting (151,700), office and administrative support (150,500), production (90,900), transportation and material moving (90,300), building/grounds cleaning and maintenance (84,400), and other occupations (Table 5). Large numbers of Dreamers are highly accomplished, including many employed in management, business, science, and the arts (67,300); as healthcare practitioners (14,600); in education, training, and library professions (14,000); in computer and mathematical occupations (12,900); in architecture and engineering (5,600); in life, physical, and social sciences work (5,400); and in legal occupations (3,200) (Table 5). In addition, 70,500 potential DREAM Act recipients are self-employed, meaning that they both work and create jobs for others (Table 4). These numbers will certainly grow as this population ages and if the Dreamers can secure permanent status.

Dreamers are not just students and workers, but also US family members. CMS estimates that 392,500 have US-citizen children, and more than 100,000 are either married to a US citizen (44,200) or lawful permanent resident (58,100) (Table 3).¹ Passage of the DREAM Act would greatly benefit the family members of program beneficiaries.

Table 5. Occupation of Potential DREAM Act Beneficiaries

Parts might not sum to totals because of rounding.

Occupation	Ages 16 and over*
All occupations	1,202,300
Construction, production, and maintenance	454,500
Construction and extracting	151,700
Production	90,900
Transportation and material moving	90,300
Building/grounds cleaning and maintenance	84,400
Installation, maintenance, and repair workers	37,200
Business and financial activities	429,000
Sales and related	176,400
Office and administrative support	150,500
Management, business, science, and arts	67,300
Farming, fishing, and forestry	27,200

¹ CMS's data assumes that the *only* US undocumented residents who could be married to US citizens are from Mexico, El Salvador, Honduras, or Guatemala, and arrived after 2000. This is because anybody married to US citizens, and not in that group, could have adjusted to LPR status in the United States as immediate relatives of US citizens. However, undocumented persons from these four countries overwhelmingly enter the country without inspection and, if their family-based visa petitions were filed after April 30, 2001, could not have adjusted to LPR status in the United States (Kerwin, Meissner, and McHugh 2011, 11-12). They would have had to leave the country to apply for their visas through consular processing and would either have returned (or not) as LPRs.

Financial specialists	4,500
Legal	3,200
Personal service activities	294,900
Food preparation and serving	173,100
Personal care and service	37,800
Healthcare support	29,300
Healthcare practitioners and technical	14,600
Education, training, and library	14,000
Arts, design, entertainment, sports, and media	13,400
Protective service	7,500
Community and social service	5,300
Computer, science, and technical activities	23,900
Computer and mathematical	12,900
Architecture and engineering	5,600
Life, physical and social science	5,400

Source: Center for Migration Studies.

* Note: The estimate of 1,202,300 shown here exceeds the total number employed (1,140,100) shown in Table 2 because it includes both employed and unemployed.

In recent months, the US Department of Homeland Security (DHS) has terminated TPS for El Salvador, Haiti, Nicaragua, and Sudan. It will likely terminate TPS for Honduras later this year. Persons who lose TPS status will need to secure legal status through another program, leave the country, or remain and risk deportation. Seventeen percent of TPS recipients from El Salvador, Haiti, and Honduras — countries that account for 94 percent of all program beneficiaries (Warren and Kerwin 2017) — would qualify for conditional residence under the DREAM Act, with all the resulting benefits for their families, employers, and communities (Table 6).

As with the larger DREAM Act population, a high percentage of DREAM-eligible TPS recipients are concentrated in select counties, metropolitan areas, and cities. Forty-five percent live in seven geographic areas — the Miami metro area (7,700), Los Angeles County (4,700), the Washington, DC area (3,200), Houston (3,000), New York City (2,100), the San Francisco metro area (1,100), and the City of Dallas (1,000) (Table 7).

Table 6. Estimated TPS Beneficiaries from El Salvador, Honduras, and Haiti Who Would Be Eligible under the DREAM Act, by State of Residence

Parts might not sum to totals because of rounding. *Areas that round to fewer than 500 not shown.*

State of residence	Total TPS beneficiaries eligible under the DREAM Act <i>(1)=Sum of 3 to 5</i>	Column 1 as a percent of the total TPS population* <i>(2)</i>	TPS beneficiaries eligible under the DREAM Act		
			El Salvador <i>(3)</i>	Honduras <i>(4)</i>	Haiti <i>(5)</i>
US total	50,700	17%	26,900	8,400	15,400
Arkansas	500	22%	-	-	-
California	8,300	15%	7,600	700	-
Colorado	600	39%	-	-	-
Florida	10,300	23%	-	1,500	8,500
Georgia	2,300	25%	800	700	900
Illinois	500	27%	-	-	-
Louisiana	1,200	29%	-	1,200	-
Maryland	3,600	16%	3,100	-	-
Massachusetts	2,000	25%	800	-	1,100
Nevada	800	13%	500	-	-
New Jersey	2,900	21%	1,100	600	1,200
New York	5,700	22%	3,600	-	2,200
North Carolina	1,700	13%	-	1,200	-
Texas	5,200	12%	4,400	800	-
Utah	700	28%	700	-	-
Virginia	2,400	10%	2,200	-	-

Source: Center for Migration Studies

“-” refers to zero or rounds to zero

* Percent = (TPS beneficiaries who are eligible under DREAM Act / Total TPS beneficiaries) x 100. The CMS estimates of TPS beneficiaries are limited to El Salvador, Honduras, and Haiti because the numbers from other TPS countries are too small to yield reliable estimates.

Table 7. Estimated TPS Beneficiaries Who Would Be Eligible under the DREAM Act: Major Cities or Areas*

Parts might not sum to totals because of rounding. Areas that round to fewer than 500 not shown.

City or area of residence	Total TPS beneficiaries eligible under the DREAM Act (1)=Sum of 2 to 4	TPS beneficiaries eligible under the DREAM Act		
		El Salvador (2)	Honduras (3)	Haiti (4)
US total	50,700	26,900	8,400	15,400
Los Angeles County	4,700	4,200	500	-
New York City	2,100	-	-	1,800
Brooklyn	1,800	-	-	1,700
Houston (city)	3,000	2,600	-	-
Miami metro area	7,700	-	800	6,700
Miami	3,500	-	800	2,600
Ft. Lauderdale	2,400	-	-	2,300
West Palm Beach	1,800	-	-	1,800
Dallas (city)	1,000	700	-	-
San Francisco metro area	1,100	1,100	-	-
DC and surrounding counties	3,200	3,000	-	-
These seven cities or areas	22,800	12,100	1,900	8,800
Percent of total	45%	45%	23%	57%
All other areas	27,900	14,800	6,500	6,600

Source: Center for Migration Studies

“-” refers to zero or rounds to zero

* The CMS estimates of TPS beneficiaries are limited to El Salvador, Honduras, and Haiti because the numbers from other TPS countries are too small to yield reliable estimates.

Conclusion

It is often said that the Dreamers are American in everything but immigration status. The CMS study supports this observation. It highlights potential DREAM Act recipients' large numbers, prevalence throughout the country, high levels of employment and self-employment, long residence, US families, English language proficiency, and education levels. The study paints a portrait of a highly productive, integrated group, deeply embedded in the United States and poised to make — with status and time — even more substantial contributions to the communities that have invested in them. It illustrates why 79 percent of US voters believe the Dreamers should be allowed to apply for US citizenship.² More than 16 years after the introduction of the first DREAM Act, the study argues for expeditious passage of legislation to legalize and create a path to citizenship for these young immigrants.

2 See Quinnipiac University, “Dreamers Should Stay, American Voters Say 8-1,” January 11, 2018, <https://poll.qu.edu/national/release-detail?ReleaseID=2512>.

REFERENCES

- Cohn, D’Vera, and Paul Taylor. 2010. “Baby Boomers Approach 65 — Glumly.” Washington, DC: Pew Research Center. <http://www.pewsocialtrends.org/2010/12/20/baby-boomers-approach-65-glumly/>.
- Kerwin, Donald. 2013. “Does Respect for Migrant Rights Contribute to Economic Development? *MPI Policy Brief*. Washington, DC: Migration Policy Institute. <https://www.migrationpolicy.org/research/does-respect-migrant-rights-contribute-economic-development> .
- Kerwin, Donald, Doris Meissner, and Margie McHugh. 2011. “Executive Action on Immigration: Six Ways to Make the System Work Better.” Washington, DC: Migration Policy Institute. <https://www.migrationpolicy.org/research/executive-action-immigration-six-ways-make-system-work-better> .
- Orrenius, Pia M., and Madeline Zavodny. 2012. “The Economic Consequences of Amnesty for Unauthorized Immigrants.” *Cato Journal* 32(1): 85-106. https://papers.ssrn.com/sol3/papers.cfm?abstract_id=2245015.
- Ortega, Francesc, Ryan Edwards, and Philip E. Wolgin. 2017. “The Economic Benefits of Passing the Dream Act.” Washington, DC: Center for American Progress. <https://www.americanprogress.org/issues/immigration/reports/2017/09/18/439134/economic-benefits-passing-dream-act/>.
- 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. <https://doi.org/10.14240/jmhs.v2i4.38>.
- Warren, Robert, and Donald Kerwin. 2017. “A Statistical and Demographic Profile of the US Temporary Protected Status Populations from El Salvador, Honduras, and Haiti.” *Journal on Migration and Human Security* 5(3): 577-92. <https://doi.org/10.14240/jmhs.v5i3.99>.