

PROJECTING IMMIGRANT VISAS: REPORT ON AN EXPERTS MEETING

October 2006

by

B. Lindsay Lowell and Micah Bump*
Institute for the Study of International Migration
Georgetown University

3307 M Street, NW, Suite 302
Washington, DC 20007
Tel: (202) 687-2602, -2258
Fax: (202) 687-2541
Email: lowellbl@georgetown.edu

* The authors would like to acknowledge the insights of expert participants in a workshop on the issues presented here (see appendix). Discussion in that workshop was not for attribution and, of course, all conclusions in this paper reflect the opinions of the authors and of no one else. This work was undertaken with a grant from the Alfred P. Sloan Foundation.

ABSTRACT

The U.S. Congress continues to debate immigration reform. In May 2006, Senate S.2611 legislation included historical increases in the number of immigrants who could be admitted in the future. When projections of immigrants generated by S.2611 were interjected late into the debate, the wide variation in numbers alternatively surprised and confounded policymakers. This paper reports on a workshop that brought together the authors of the S.2611 projections, as well as experts from academia, government and non-government organizations. The purpose of the workshop was to evaluate the assumptions that caused different projections and to lay the groundwork for a better understanding of visa projections. The workshop was funded by the Alfred P. Sloan Foundation.

The U.S. Congress has been considering historic legislation on the admission of immigrants. Yet, the House's enforcement-only approach and the Senate's approach of enforcement plus generous admission numbers stalemated forward momentum in the 109th Congress. It seems likely, however, that legislation of some sort will pass in the near future given long-standing commitments and the all too evident need for reform.

The Senate legislation included significant increases in the numerical caps on family and employment-based admission, as well as uncapped visas for specific visas and/or automatic cap escalators for other visas. Yet, in its early debate about S.2611 the Senate did not analyze the number of immigrants these various increases could generate. When projections were finally interjected into the debate, the wide variation alternatively surprised and confounded policymakers.

Clearly it is prudent to evaluate the numerical consequences of proposed increases in visa numbers for future admissions; the Congress has now begun to engage in that process. However, the variation in projections by different organizations is confusing. There is clearly a need to evaluate the projections, their methodologies, assumptions, and the quality of the available data. This report is an initial evaluation and draws upon a meeting of experts that was held in September 2006 at Georgetown University. That workshop brought together the authors of the S.2611 projections, as well as experts from academia, government and non-government organizations. The purpose of the workshop was to evaluate the assumptions that went into the different projections and to lay the groundwork for a better understanding of visa projections. The workshop was funded by the Alfred P. Sloan Foundation.¹

WIDE DISPARITIES BETWEEN PROJECTIONS OF S.2611

In May 2006, as Senate bill S.2611 came up for a final vote, Senator Sessions' staff projected that it would lead to an increase of between 78 million and 217 million over the course of the next 20 years.² At the same time, the Heritage Foundation's Robert Rector

projected that the visa caps then under debate would lead to an increase of 103 million immigrants over 20 years. The *San Francisco Chronicle* described the projections as “a perfectly timed statistical bomb.”³

The result was the Bingaman amendment which passed on the Senate floor and reduced the annual number of guestworkers from 325,000 to 200,000. The amendment also removed an automatic escalator of 20 percent annually if the available guestworker visas were over-subscribed.⁴ The resulting decrease in guestworkers, in turn, led Senator Sessions to reduce his projections from between 73 million and 92 million, and Rector to reduce his projections to 66 million over the next 20 years.

Then the National Foundation for American Policy (NFAP) came out with a report the following month, projecting a much lower total of 28.5 million new immigrants over the next 20 years. Still, the Heritage and NFAP projections are more than the 8 million over 10 years (later amended to 24 million over 20 years) projected by the Congressional Budget Office (CBO). A White House Office of Media Relations email to opinion-leaders on May 18, 2006, however, asserted the strength of the CBO estimates.⁵

The Congressional Research Service (CRS), like the CBO, conducted its own estimates projected only 10 years out. The CRS report does not estimate how many individuals might adjust to permanent residency. It undertakes simple linear trends of future admissions and of temporary visa holders, including a projection for a restructured H-1B visa.

Another projection made at the Center for Immigration Studies (CIS) focuses on how many people will benefit from the “three amnesties.” Indeed, the debate over amnesty has been front and center to the debate. The CIS projected 9.9 million individuals in the amnesty/guestworkers provisions of Hagel-Martinez under S.2611, 7.4 of eligible illegal residents and 2.6 million fraudulent applicants. A total of 14.4 million future immigrants are estimated by including a multiplier for family members. Clearly,

the CIS projections cannot be easily compared with the foregoing projections because it focuses on a limited set of visas.

Likewise, a S.2611 projection by the Institute for the Study of International Migration (ISIM) focuses on future workers in specified occupations, i.e. computing and engineering. This introduces a further level of complexity because it requires data and assumptions about occupational composition, and the labor force participation of different visa classes. It estimated 1.9 million computer and engineering (C&E) workers over one decade or about one-fifth more than projections of the future C&E employment by the Bureau of Labor Statistics (BLS).

In short, the existing projections vary substantially and offer conflicting guidance on the outcome of Congressional intent under S.2611—other than the obvious fact that the number of future immigrants would most likely be significantly larger than it would be without S.2611. The projections vary for a number of reasons; they make varying assumptions; they draw on different data; and they attempt either to project something in line with the visas made available under S.2611, or instead to project (lower) numbers that are assumed to be more realistic. This state of affairs may reflect individual biases in reading the legislation and a desire to err one way or the other, but it also reflects a lack of pre-existing consensus on how such projections should be made.

IMMIGRATION VERSUS VISA PROJECTIONS

The standard approaches to projecting immigration—and there are several—are different in method and purpose than projections of visas. Almost all standard approaches typically project *all* future immigration and make assumptions about the factors affecting that flow.⁶ Most methods rely heavily on extrapolations or models based on *current trends*, as well as incorporating scenarios about the future demand for immigrant labor.

In contrast, “visa-class” projections start not from assumptions about the state of the future economy or foreign development, but rather from the actual number of visas

that policy sets in place. The visa-class projection then extrapolates these numbers into the future and it is here that some problems arise, especially in the context of S.2611:

- Under S.2611 it is not always completely clear what number of visas are set aside for specific classes of admission; and
- There are specified visa-classes and occupations that are exempted from any numerical cap on admission; and
- The bill permits escalators whereby annual numbers for specified visas are increased if the visa is over-subscribed in the previous year.

For example, the employment-based visas are increased about five fold over today's legislated admission levels, but there are exemptions from selected visa caps for certain occupations. So what is *the* right visa number to project into the future? Then, visa escalators permit annual compounding of future numbers on yet other visas. All experts agree that yearly compounding is at some point wholly unrealistic, but the visas permit that and some evaluation must be made for the upside clearly spelled out in the legislation.

On the one hand, the visa-class projection should incorporate all of the visa numbers that legislation permits. One of the purposes of visa projections is to evaluate what a given number of annual visas would generate in terms of future foreign-born residents. The entire logic of numerical caps on visas is that immigration will be permitted to grow to a certain level but no further. At any rate, the logic of a visa-class projection requires a full evaluation of the possible, i.e., not so much as a prognostication but as a *de facto* extrapolation of the numbers in the legislation.

On the other hand, it can be argued that caps may be set unrealistically high, e.g., the potential supply of immigrants and/or the number of sponsors may never combine to generate the numbers permitted. Why Congress would choose to legislate meaningless caps is unclear, but this critique suggests that judgment or modeling of the actual supply needs to take place if a realistic projection is to be made. However, the more one moves

toward this viewpoint, the more one ends up advocating a standard projection of all immigration that has little value for evaluating the potential outcome of legislation.

We will return to this duality – visa projections for the purpose of evaluating the downstream impact of visa numbers as given in legislation, and visa projections that take into account factors that may determine the number of visas actually used. But first we consider the technical issues having to do with the inputs to a projection, e.g., the quality of data inputs and assumptions about factors that affect the number of future residents.

Consider that immigration starts with the issuance of a visa, but the number of residents some years out is the result of other factors. A beginning, simple equation tells us that:

$$\text{Residents} = \text{Visas} - \text{Deaths} - \text{Emigration} + \text{Family},$$

where the number of future residents is the accumulated number of individuals issued visas who come to the United States, minus the number who die or emigrate.

Additionally, the original immigrant can sponsor family members and a visa projection logically may include a “multiplier” for these immigrants. Thus, there are two major components of a visa-class projection: (a) the nature of the assumptions on the number of original visas available or to-be-used; and (b) the quality of data and assumptions on death, emigration, and future family reunification.

EMIGRATION AND MORTALITY

Emigration is known to be significant with 20 percent or more of the foreign born leaving over time. However, the U.S. does not count emigrants and all estimates of rates of emigration are indirect. One typical estimate is that 3.2 percent of immigrants leave the United States annually. With time in the United States, it is also typically assumed that the rate of emigration declines.

But there are recent estimates of emigration that corroborate the expectation that emigration is fairly high for children, declines for young adults, peaks again for middle-

aged adults, and only then declines steeply in the older ages. Further, males are twice as likely as females to emigrate, and Mexicans are twice as likely as other nationalities to emigrate. Hence, emigration rates should be assumed to vary for different visas dominated by immigrants of known age and place-of-birth, e.g., lower rates of emigration apply to highly skilled green carders but higher rates to the Mexican immigrants in temporary work programs. Most projections fail to make allowance for such differences and often assume emigration rates that are too low.

In contrast, the lack of immigrant-specific mortality estimates is generally not considered to be problematic because mortality varies least of all the demographic processes. This is particularly the case if mortality rates are applied to an entire population and not to age and race/ethnic specific subpopulations. Further, while the foreign born enter the country with known differentials in health habits, over time they assume the exercise and diet habits of natives. In other words, eventually their mortality rates tend to look more like those of natives.

FAMILY MULTIPLIERS AND NATURALIZATION

Immigrants typically wish to reunite with their families in the United States, primarily their spouses and children, but also parents and even siblings. Historically, a new immigrant will, ultimately, sponsor 1.2 dependents. For the most part, the chain ends with the sponsorship of immediate family members, although if they are of marriageable age with strong ties back home reunification can spur further migration.⁷ However, the number of new visas issued to people from a given country can escalate rather rapidly even with such an apparently small multiplier. Therefore, if one assumes multipliers larger than 1.2 it will generate markedly larger numerical projections.

The magnitude and timing of the multiplier matter. The visa holder who wants to legally sponsor an immediate family member is initially limited to family preference visas that are numerically capped, and for which eligibility is further delayed by per-country caps that create issuance queues. After five years an immigrant may choose to become a naturalized citizen after passing a citizenship exam. Citizenship confers the

ability to sponsor spouse and children with no delays, as well as to sponsor numerically limited parents and adult siblings. Estimates by the Office of Immigration Statistics indicate that 50 to 60 percent of Legal Permanent Residents (LPRs) naturalize over time. Of course, applying a multiplier before 5 years have passed will increase greater numbers, as will an assumption of rates of transition to naturalization that are higher than historical trends.

PATHWAYS: INTRA-VISA TRANSITIONS

Foreign persons often come to the United States with one legal status only to transition through one or more statuses before they ultimately become LPRs. Data on in-country adjustments to green card status indicate that approximately 20 percent of those who applied between 1998 and 2004 were already illegally resident. Many others awarded legal permanent residency in any given year had already long been present as, for example, legal temporary students or workers.

Indeed, many of the workers that S.2611 would offer earned amnesty to are already long-term residents in the country and it would be somewhat misleading to count them as “new” immigrants. At the least, projections for future residents should distinguish between immigrants resident at the start of the projection period; they should not label them new or attributable to the proposed legislated visas. Clearly, assumptions have to be made about the rate at which currently illegal residents transition to legal work or resident status, but these transition rates should govern their inclusion in the projections.

This calculation also needs to be made for legal temporary workers so they are not double counted and to estimate specific classes of future visas. For example, S.2611 would streamline and permit without caps the admission of temporary students with a STEM degree to permanent residency. An estimate of the proportion of students that stay after graduation suggests that more than two-thirds of all foreign Ph.D. graduates stay; and most transition first through the H-1B visa. In turn, and several years later, perhaps 50 percent of H-1Bs transition to permanent resident status. So it is reasonable to

separately estimate the number of temporary students and workers in addition to permanent residents, as well as their transition(s) to other statuses.

EMPLOYMENT DEMAND AND DEMAND FOR IMMIGRANT VISAS

It is possible to argue that caps may not be reached if the future demand for visas—by potential immigrants or sponsoring employers—is less than the capped numbers permit. That might be the case if the U.S. became less attractive to potential immigrants or if, for some reason, immigrants sponsored fewer family members. The S.2611 also increases the number of employment-based visas five to six fold, but employers may not sponsor immigrants unless there are shortages of domestic workers. These possibilities raise the question of whether caps should be set in line with expectations about future demand.

Indeed, the historical value of caps has been that they are assumed to be loosely in line with the national interest and market demand while, at the same time, they can dampen escalating demand for immigrants that may depress domestic wages. The Immigration Act of 1990 raised caps on skilled immigration in anticipation of increased demand. And, an increase in foreign workers can address shortages and/or lower inflationary pressures when labor markets are tight. Former Federal Reserve Chairman Alan Greenspan supported expansion of the H-1B cap during a period of low unemployment in Information Technology during the dot.com bubble.

Apparently, the framers of S.2611 believe that there will be future shortages of domestic workers and the legislation specifically increases visas for both highly skilled and low-skilled foreign workers. Indeed, many groups have used projections by the BLS to assert that there will be a great labor shortage in the future. The Hudson Institute, Time Magazine, David Ellwood, and Larry Summers have all predicted a large labor shortage over the next 25 years as baby boomers retire. There are, nevertheless, reasons to be skeptical of these claims.

Yes, the supply of domestic U.S. labor will slow in coming years, especially as the population ages. Yet, it is not clear that younger workers will be needed to replace the

retirees. Many boomers are retiring from jobs that do not need replacement, say railway engineers. Further, theory on replacement has already proven wrong. For example, today's smaller supplies of young generation X cohorts have not experienced a wage increase as was expected. Occupational projections are tricky not only due to shifts in the size of different age groups, but also due to new technologies and business strategies like outsourcing. New ways of doing work will emerge and the demand for skilled, domestic workers will be tempered by a ready supply from abroad.

Domestic demographics surely play a role, but the potential supply of workers from abroad will continue to outpace any domestic growth, particularly as today's mostly youthful populations enter their working ages. In addition, all indicators are that the wage differentials between the U.S. and the developing world will remain large. It is more likely that there will be surpluses of global labor in the future, not shortages. There will be more highly skilled people in the developing world because of the advance of higher education around the globe. The U.S. only has 6 percent of the world's population, so the supply of highly skilled workers abroad will be disproportionately greater. At the least, it is possible and even probable that the supply of immigrants will increase and may readily fill uncapped visa classes or those with built in escalators.⁸

How can we then either set caps appropriately and/or make reasonable projections about the demand for visas? One consideration is the employment and occupational projections made by the BLS. It regularly estimates future labor force numbers that take into account trends in employment, economic growth, population growth, and industry employment. Final demand is comprised of consumption, investment, trade, and government expenditures (600 endogenous and exogenous values). This produces estimates of industry output which is converted to productivity numbers and industry employment which is converted, via a staffing matrix, to occupational demand. Approximately every five years the BLS conducts an evaluation of its labor force, industry, and occupation projections to see where they can improve. The projections have done well for the macro labor market, but less well in specific occupations.

It may be prudent for Congress to consider the BLS projections and other, competing theories about future demand before arbitrarily setting caps. But for visa class projections the issue of demand is more problematic. While there is the argument that some maximal projection of the legislated visas should be made, it is reasonable to make alternative projections assuming some level of visa demand. However, there is little guidance on an appropriate level of assumed future demand, other than the BLS projections or levels of future immigration consistent, for example, with Census Bureau projections. Further, some observers believe that economic demand or assumed trend lines in immigrant numbers are only part of the story. For example, bureaucratic inefficiency may limit the number of visas that can be issued which, indeed, limited the number of visa admissions during most of the 1990s.

COMPARING S.2611 PROJECTIONS

How do the S.2611 projections compare on the criteria above? Table 1 compares the projections and makes it clear that only three of six projections can be meaningfully compared. The latest versions of the Heritage, NFAP and CBO projections are for 20 years into the future and for all visa classes. The CRS does not make population projections; rather it evaluates the potential S.2611 impacts. Projections by CIS and ISIM are, respectively, specific to low-skilled and highly skilled visa classes. The table includes specific figures when possible, bullets when the projections include assumptions/estimates for an element, and is left blank when the projection simply does not address a listed element.

At first glance, it appears that the Heritage projections are more than twice those of either the NFAP or the CBO. But the NFAP and CBO estimates are similar more by chance than because of shared assumptions. The NFAP appears to assume that visa demand will simply be some fraction of what S.2611 permits, e.g., it extrapolates only the number of stated visas and makes no allowance for uncapped classes or escalators. It does not include uncapped foreign student numbers or temporary H-1B workers; then it subtracts from the projections the number of immigrants who would be admitted at today's levels of admission. While this may estimate the number of "additional"

immigrants generated by S.2611, it has the disadvantage of arbitrarily reducing the future resident population and not fully reflecting all immigration under the proposed system.

Comparison of Elements of Different Projections of S.2611

	Heritage	NFAP	CBO	CRS	CIS	ISIM
PROJECTION (millions)	66	29	24	na	14.4	1.9
New above old levels	47	•	14.5		4.5	1.5
Resident/or at old levels	19		9.5		9.9	0.4
YEARS IN THE FUTURE	20	20	20	10	na	10
VISA TYPES						
All visa classes	•	•	•	•		
Earned Amenity					•	
Employment based						•
BENCHMARK COMPARISONS						
Low and high estimate	•					
New to old levels						•
New to alternative projections						•
MULTIPLIERS						
Unification (newly sponsored)	0.6	1.2	1.2		1.45	
Reproduction (fertility)			0.8			
EMIGRATION			•		0.50%	3.20%
MORTALITY			•		0.40%	•
TRANSITIONAL VISAS				•	•	•
LABOR FORCE						•
PROJECTION TYPE						
Optimal visas available	•				•	•
Forecast likely number		•	•			
COMMENTS	Uses half the rate (10 %) of permitted escalators, includes current illegal residents	Assumes low levels of family migration and subtracts current trends	Assumes administrative brakes on growth	Makes limited population estimates	Limited to legal temporary programs	Limited to computing and engineering workers

On the other hand, the CBO estimates assume that the U.S. bureaucracy will remain inefficient and under funded; therefore, the number of visas that will actually be processed and issued will be low compared to what S.2611 permits. This is a strong assertion that seems partly reasonable based on historical performance, but it overlooks the fact that the bureaucracy ramped up successfully to process legalization applicants in 1987, naturalizations in the mid-1990s, and more recently legal permanent admissions. The S.2611 also builds in visa processing fees for applicants which hold out the promise of adequate funding. At any rate, the CBO estimate ranks well for solid assumptions and modeling of several visa classes, emigration and timed citizen/non-citizen multipliers, etc.; albeit the assumption of administrative bottlenecks is subjective as there are no known data on the dampening effect of administrative inefficiency.

The Heritage projections, in contrast to the NFAP and CBO, do not subtract out current residents, include all of the visas implied by S.2611, and build in assumed escalators on visas where S.2611 permits them. The Heritage projections generate low escalators (0 percent), medium escalators (10 percent), and high escalators (20 percent as permitted by S.2611). The favored Heritage figure, the one shown in the table and reported in the press, is the medium projection. If one takes the low projection and subtracts out the currently resident illegal population, the numbers are reasonably comparable with the NFAP and CBO projections. The stated assumption is that 20 percent seems unreasonable, but then again while 10 percent may seem “more” reasonable, it can also be argued that it is unreasonable to compound the 10 percent each year into the future. In short, the Heritage figure is better than the NFAP and CBO projections in terms of what S.2611 “*could produce*,” although by including the currently illegally resident population it overstates “S.2611” impacts by nearly 30 percent.

The CIS projections are only for those individuals who might participate in the low-skilled, temporary working visas, e.g., the triple program for already resident long- and medium-term inhabitants; and the so-called blue card program for new workers from abroad. Thus, it cannot be directly compared to the projections of total future immigration above. But CIS estimates for worker legalization is 9.3 million (after

emigration), while the CBO estimates about 4.9 million under S.2611's amnesty-path work programs, and the NFAP also estimates about 5 million. The CIS projections appear to be twice the size because they do not first portion out the current illegal resident population by period of entry, and they assume a high rate of fraud among applicants (e.g., inducing applications). Further, the CIS rates of emigration may be too low for this population and its assumed family multipliers too high. The CIS estimates, at least, explore the behavioral possibilities of S.2611 work legalization while the NFAP and CBO provide more mechanistic estimates. Given the widely divergent assumptions behind the projections, however, it is difficult to ascertain which tend to be more reasonable.

Finally, the ISIM projections are of a wholly different cloth than the foregoing. Not only are the projections for employment visas only, they are for those foreign workers in computing and engineering occupations. The projections transition foreign temporary STEM students into *uncapped* employment-based visas by projecting trends in foreign student enrollments (these numbers are fairly small). Separate projections are made for H-1B specialty workers with a phased escalation, as permitted under S.2611, to the approximate levels permitted during the dot.com heyday. Uncapped transitions, as permitted under S.2611, are estimated from H-1B to permanent status for STEM graduates of foreign universities. The ISIM projections are of visas permitted under S.2611, although the projections do not include every compounded multiplier permitted, and they reduce the future population for emigration, mortality, and labor force participation. Family multipliers are not included. Of significant technical value, the ISIM estimates explicitly compare total S.2611 projections with projections at today's levels of immigration. Additionally, the S.2611 projections are benchmarked against BLS employment projections.

RECOMMENDATIONS

Clearly, visa projections can, and should, affect Congressional debate on immigration reform. The quality of assumptions on emigration and family reunification strongly affect estimates, and the inclusion of current (illegal and legal) residents can make projected

numbers look artificially high. However, the major reason for the divergence in the current round of S.2611 projections has to do with whether or not the visas projected are:

- (a) “optimal” projections of S.2611 numbers assuming that most, if not all, visas will be issued, or
- (b) “realistic” forecasts of numbers making some assumption about limits to visa issuance.

The Heritage, CIS, and ISIM estimates assume (a) that some optimal number of the S.2611 visas will be used in the future. The CBO and NFAP estimates assume (b) that a realistic number is less than S.2611 would permit (which presumes that S.2611 sets unrealistically high visa numbers). Whatever one’s preference for one approach or the other, they accomplish different purposes. But there may be good reasons to evaluate how well either purpose is accomplished, as well as to recommend ways of presenting projections that makes it possible to arrive at more meaningful comparisons.

The strongest argument in favor of type (a) “optimal” estimates is that they evaluate the number of immigrants S.2611 could generate, which is a perfectly reasonable exercise in assessing the *potential impact and intent* of the legislation. Any objective reading of S.2611 indicates that the potential upside on visa numbers is many times greater than suggested by past trends.

The strongest argument in favor of type (b) “realistic” estimates is that they purportedly attempt to project what would actually occur in future immigration, assuming that very high S.2611 visa optimums will never be met. The careful projections by organizations like the CBO are oriented toward an assessment of one likely future, but they do not evaluate the possible upside of legislative intent.

The debate over immigration reform will continue and visa-class projections should play a role in the debate. Ideally, Congress will take projections into account when setting visa numbers, at the least to evaluate the potential consequences of legislation.

However, the value of the competing projections is lessened given the latitude in assumptions and the presentation of results. A next round of projections would be of greater value in the debate if they, at the least, include some minimal set of standards.

- Projections should clearly state whether they are optimal projections or realistic type forecasts, e.g., do they intend to project what a proposed visa regime “*could*” produce or what “*will*” occur.
- Projections should generate a low and high range, and/or benchmark the projections against present levels of immigration or alternative projection (i.e., BLS employment or Census Bureau immigration projections, etc.).⁹
- The range/benchmarked estimates will be prominently included in the abstract or press release.
- Projections should not double count—they should not include the population of residents already here, but rather only the transitional population of those admitted under the proposed legislation (and clearly identify this population).
- By the same token, projections should not subtract out immigrants assumed to be admitted under old legislation as this is subtracting actual, future entrants.
- Projections should always subtract from future visas the various assumed rates of mortality, emigration, visa transition, fraudulent visa applications, etc.
- Preferably the assumed rates should be listed in a single table to facilitate comparison with other projections.
- Of the various rates in question, substantially more research is needed on emigration which is likely to play a greater role than assumed in many of the projections to date.

APPENDIX 1.

PROJECTION WORKSHOP

Congress & Tomorrow's Foreign-Born Population: Evaluating Immigration Projections

WORKSHOP INVITEES

Jeanne Batalova, Migration Policy Institute
Frank D. Bean, University of California at Irvine
Steve Camarota, Center for Immigration Studies
Paul Cullinan, Congressional Budget Office
Joel Feinleib, Social Security Advisory Board
Richard B. Freeman, Harvard University
Elizabeth Grieco, DHS, Office of Immigration Statistics
Chad Haddal, Congressional Research Service
Michael D. Hoefer, Chief, DHS, Office of Immigration Statistics
Frederick W. Hollmann, Census Bureau
Richard Jackson, Center for Strategic and International Studies
Guillermina Jasso, New York University
Rosemary Jenks, Numbers USA
Benjamin E. Johnson, Director, Immigration Policy Center
B. Lindsay Lowell, Institute for the Study of International Migration
Susan F. Martin, Institute for the Study of International Migration
Jeff Passel, Pew Hispanic Center
Rebecca Peters, American Council on International Personnel, Inc.
Robert Rector, Heritage Foundation
Michael S. Teitelbaum, Alfred P. Sloan Foundation
Mitra Toossi, Bureau of Labor Statistics
Alice Wade, Deputy Chief Actuary, Social Security Administration
Ruth Ellen Wassem, Specialist in Social Legislation, Congressional Research Service
Karen A. Woodrow-Lafield, Alexandria, VA

ENDNOTES

¹ Congress & Tomorrow's Foreign-Born Population: Evaluating Immigration Projections, September 26-27, Georgetown University. See appendix for participants who were academics and representatives of non-government organizations, as well as several relevant government agencies.

² <http://sessions.senate.gov/pressapp/record.cfm?id=255969>

³ Carolyn Lochhead, "Senate swayed by analyst's immigrant count: How conservative think tank's estimate led to changes in bill," *San Francisco Chronicle*, June 20, 2006, <http://www.sfgate.com/cgi-bin/article.cgi?file=/c/a/2006/06/20/MNGL4JH1A41.DTL>

⁴ However, the number of skilled admissions was unchanged by this debate.

⁵ Robert Rector, "Immigration numbers: Setting the record straight," Heritage Foundation Web Memo, May 26, 2006, <http://www.heritage.org/Research/Immigration/wm1097.cfm>

⁶ Separate projections by gender and/or race-ethnicity are simply an extension of this approach.

⁷ Citizens may sponsor adult brothers and sisters, as well as adult children, but these visa classes are relatively small and are not the major drivers of immigration growth.

⁸ The extent of any increase will also be partly governed by policies in foreign countries. For example, Chinese student immigration increased significantly after the Chinese government lifted restrictions on international travel. Future graduate student migration from India may result from India's increased financing programs for higher education, e.g., production of more students.

⁹ Projections should not subtract from S.2611 projections the number of future immigrants that would have otherwise entered at today's rate of immigration. That makes little sense as it mistakenly presumes those migrants are not part of the future and it misleads insofar as it reduces the size of the projection of the proposed visa regime.