

RESPONSE TO A PRESIDENTIAL DETERMINATION OF 45,000 REFUGEES FOR 2018

The Trump administration is poised to set a 2018 refugee admissions level of 45,000, **the lowest ceiling in history at a time of historic need**. Refugee admissions has long had bipartisan support, with the average admissions ceiling at 95,000 and historic highs under the Reagan and George H.W. Bush administrations. To justify a position out of synch with the history of this program, the Trump administration has relied on a series of false arguments around security, cost, capacity, and community support. The Administration has also excluded critical national security and foreign policy equities related to refugee resettlement and enshrined in the 1980 Refugee Act. Critical US interests at stake are being ignored at a time when **displacement crises are destabilizing allies and regions where US troops are deployed**.

The Trump Administration has proposed a 45 percent cut in humanitarian assistance, which, together with drastic cuts to refugee admissions, represents a breathtaking retreat from humanitarian leadership that has long demonstrated US values and served US interests.

Here's what the administration has said to justify 45,000 refugees, and the facts you should know:

1. *"There is no way to securely vet all refugees who come to the U.S."*

- The integrity of security procedures in the U.S. resettlement program is evidenced by the fact that, while over 3 million refugees have been admitted to the U.S. since 1980, not a single refugee has committed a lethal terrorist attack on U.S. soil.
- The resettlement program is sophisticated and secure. There is no more demanding legal entry point to the U.S. A planned and predictable program, the U.S. resettlement is wholly incomparable to the large-scale and spontaneous arrivals of refugees, asylum seekers, and migrants to Europe.
- The Administration has every reason to be confident in the competency of the world's most sophisticated intelligence and security agencies. Refugee security vetting is so rigorous that the process can take up to three years. As intelligence and security agencies have verified, due to the rigorous and lengthy process, refugee resettlement is an utterly impractical and undesirable mode for terrorists seeking to slip through the cracks to enter the U.S.
- Every refugee is hand-selected for admission by the Department of Homeland Security after in-person interviews and extensive security checks conducted in partnership with all relevant U.S. intelligence, law enforcement, and security agencies.
- For decades, our agencies have successfully validated the histories and identities of refugees whose documentation has been lost or left behind during flight. Before a refugee is approved for resettlement, intelligence and security agencies establish confidence in who refugees are through sophisticated biometrics, forensic document testing, and interagency checks. If there is any doubt at any point throughout the process, the refugee in question is not admitted to the U.S.
- The most powerful country on earth should not be afraid of the world's most vulnerable people.

2. *"Refugees are a security risk as demonstrated by the fact that the FBI is investigating 300 refugees for connections to terrorism."*

- Counter-terrorism investigations are not an accurate indicator of involvement in terrorist activity. Investigations are not the same as criminal charges or convictions. They focus on the mere possibility of a crime being committed in the future. Only a fraction of investigations lead to prosecutions and a fraction of those prosecutions result in convictions. According to the CATO Institute, only about 0.3% of terrorism investigations end in convictions.¹
- The threat of terrorism is serious both at home and abroad, but the domestic threat posed by homegrown radicalization isn't and never was a refugee issue. The profiles of individuals who radicalize vary widely, and there is no clear path to radicalization. There is no evidence to

¹ <https://www.cato.org/blog/supposed-fbi-investigations-refugees-shouldnt-scare-you>

suggest that refugees or children of refugees are particularly or disproportionately prone to radicalization as compared to any other category of American citizen or resident.

- 300 refugees is an immensely small fraction of resettled refugees in the U.S. and is not representative of the population writ large. According to CATO, 300 refugees represents less than 0.009 percent of all refugees admitted to the U.S. since 1975. It is a far cry from a statistically significant portion of the refugee population and should not have any bearing on our understanding the resettled refugee population. Even if all of the 300 refugees were resettled to the U.S. in a single year, they would represent less than 1% of the total number of refugees accepted on average per year since 1980.²
- Refugees are not terror threats; they are fleeing terror. Refugees are civilians who have fled their country due to fear of persecution or violence. By definition, refugees have not engaged in violence, persecution of others, or serious criminality. Persons believed to have engaged in war crimes, crimes against humanity, or serious non-political crimes are disqualified from refugee status.

3. ***“It is more cost-effective to help refugees in the region, in their first countries of asylum.”***

- The comparison between the costs of resettlement assistance is a false one: the vast majority of refugees in the Middle East and other host countries receive little or no international assistance. Further, refugees in host countries generally do not have access to naturalization or a pathway to a permanent legal status. Resettlement requires a short-term investment, but allows refugees to become full-fledged members of our society and economy, providing the refugee with a path to self-sufficiency and benefiting the American economy.
- There is no equivalence between the cost of temporary assistance to a refugee in the region and the cost of offer a permanent solution to a refugee through resettlement. For most refugees in situations of protracted displacement, the reality is that “temporary” assistance can last for decades. In contrast, refugee resettlement is a solution with one-time, up-front costs that ultimately result in net fiscal gain to the U.S. as refugees become taxpayers. There is no evidence to suggest that long-term aid is more cost-effective than resettlement.
- Humanitarian aid is not a substitute for refugee resettlement. Refugee resettlement is only available to the world’s most at-risk refugees. It is a lifesaving solution available only to those whose protection needs or special situations cannot be resolved in their current host country, regardless of how much humanitarian aid is provided locally. Refugees in need of resettlement typically have certain safety, medical, or family reunification concerns that cannot be addressed in the region, making resettlement to a third country their only option. Nonetheless, the Trump Administration proposed **a 45 percent cut to humanitarian assistance**, undercutting arguments about supporting refugees overseas.
- In 2016, over 72 percent of refugees resettled to the U.S. were women and children.³ Many are single mothers, survivors of torture, or in need of urgent medical treatment. Women and girls are subject to heinous forms of persecution in wartime (such as gang rape) and suffer severe trauma that cannot be addressed in camps or difficult urban environments. Survivors of rape are often ostracized in their host countries, making them priorities for resettlement. For these women, resettlement is the only solution. No amount of aid could guarantee their safety and psychosocial recovery.
- Retreating from resettlement as a critical component of a larger humanitarian strategy would be the equivalent of eliminating the hospital emergency room in order to fund only primary care clinics. No matter how well-funded primary care is, an ER is still necessary for emergency situations.

² https://www.washingtonpost.com/news/fact-checker/wp/2017/03/06/trumps-claim-that-more-than-300-refugees-are-the-subject-of-counterterrorism-investigations/?hpid=hp_hp-more-top-stories_trumpban-1017a-tabphonenews%3Ahomepage%2Fstory&utm_term=.d45fb285bc24

³ U.S. Department of State, Bureau of Population, Refugees and Migration. “Fact Sheet: Fiscal Year 2016 Refugee Admissions.” January 2017. <https://www.state.gov/j/prm/releases/factsheets/2017/266365.htm>

4. ***According to the Center for Immigration Studies (CIS), “12 refugees can be helped in the region for everyone refugee resettled to the U.S.”***
- The Center for Immigration Studies (CIS) bases this comparison off of costs it calculates over a five-year period, both for resettlement and for temporary assistance in the Middle East. The reality is, however, that 5 years of temporary assistance is not equivalent to the up-front costs associated with resettlement over the same period, which offers a permanent solution.
 - Refugees displaced for 5 years often have no solution in sight— spending an average of 10 years away from their homes. For those refugees displaced for more than five years, the average soars to an astonishing 21 years. **In stark contrast to the 21 years that some refugees spend in host countries dependent on temporary assistance, over the same period, resettled refugees rebuild their lives and contribute \$21,000 more to the US economy than they receive in benefits.**
 - In FY2016, the Office of Refugee Resettlement (ORR) served over 212,000 new arrivals on an appropriated budget of \$700 million – coming out to roughly \$3,300 per person. This small initial cost provides a permanent solution for refugees like Sergey Brin and Madeleine Albright who have gone on to show their worth to the United States in ways that no dollar amount could quantify.
 - The Center for Immigration Studies is not a reliable source of data or information. The Southern Poverty Law Center (SPLC) designates CIS as a hate group for its nativism and blatant xenophobia. SPLC has documented CIS’s nativist and anti-immigrant roots and in recent years the group has promoted research by white nationalists and anti-Semites ⁴
5. ***“The aim of U.S. refugee policy is for refugees to return home.”***
- Resettlement is not a choice. Most refugees would prefer to return to their home country and therefore remain nearby in the region until it is safe to do so. Resettlement is a final solution that acts as a safety valve, available only to those refugees for whom staying in neighboring countries, such as Jordan, Lebanon or Turkey, is not a safe option.
 - Of the world’s 22.5 million refugees, less than 1% have access to resettlement. In 2018, 1.2 million face extreme vulnerabilities or family reunification needs for which they are in need of resettlement. Yet fewer than 200,000 resettlement slots are available annually. To be considered for resettlement, refugees must fall into certain vulnerable categories, for example LGBTI individuals, survivors of sexual violence or torture, children with medical emergencies, and individuals fleeing religious or political persecution. Resettlement is their only option to live in safety.
 - Refugee resettlement of a few is necessary for the successful local integration or return of the majority of refugees. Refugee resettlement relieves pressures on host communities and contributes to overall regional stability—contributing to the conditions necessary for the majority of the refugees that remain in the region to either integrate locally in their host countries or return home when it is safe to do so. In 2016, when wealthy countries like the U.S. and Canada resettled over 19,300 refugees from Jordan, it provided critical relief to an ally whose generosity has mitigated the regional and global consequences of the Syrian crisis.
 - Conversely, retreating from resettlement commitments can have dramatic consequences for the eventual safe return of refugees—prolonging and sometimes even reigniting conflict. For example, the current civil war in Burundi can be traced in part to the forced return of thousands of Burundian refugees from Tanzania in 2006 and 2007. Those refugees returned to homes overtaken by rival factions and they were once again driven away by brutal violence, rekindling a conflict that continues to this day. Today, this risk is in the premature return of Syrian, Afghan, and Somali refugees, which could further destabilize fragile and conflict-ridden countries. Over 600,000 Afghan refugees were induced to return from Pakistan in 2016—a six-fold increase from 2015—as Afghanistan struggles with growing insecurity, instability, and gains by terrorist organizations. Such premature returns come at a time when growing instability in Afghanistan has required an increase in U.S. troop levels to reverse gains by terrorist organizations.

⁴ <https://www.splcenter.org/hatewatch/2017/03/23/hate-groups-center-immigration-studies-want-you-believe-they%E2%80%99re-mainstream>

6. “The number of refugees resettled is of no consequence to American interests abroad.”

- Refugee resettlement is not just a humanitarian program and a moral choice. It is a strategic imperative that promotes regional stability and global security in some of the most challenging parts of the world. Refugee resettlement is a critical foreign policy and national security tool—alleviating pressures on critical allies, helping ensure the international community maintains its humanitarian obligations, encouraging responsibility sharing, maintaining cooperation with allies for U.S. diplomatic and intelligence operations, and sending the message to terrorist groups that the U.S. welcomes those who reject terrorist ideologies.
- Refugee resettlement alleviates pressures on our allies and offers them critical support:
 - Welcoming refugees offers critical support to our allies, hosting more than their fair share of refugees. Just 10 countries, with 2.5 percent of global GDP, host over half of all refugees; the 6 wealthiest countries host fewer than 9 percent.
 - In Jordan, for example, the strain on infrastructure, social services (schools in Jordan have moved to double shifts to accommodate refugee children), water supplies, and the economy have, in the words of King Abdullah, pushed the country to the “boiling point.”⁵ In 2016, over 19,300 refugees, mostly Syrian, were resettled from Jordan to other countries like the U.S. and Canada, including widowed mothers, orphaned children, and severe medical cases—populations whom Jordan would be challenged to support. In doing so, the U.S. and other resettlement countries have provided critical relief to a strategic ally whose generosity has mitigated the regional and global consequences of the Syrian crisis.
 - The U.S. refusal to do its fair share risks a global retreat from humanitarian obligations, with countries closing their borders, shutting down camps and forcing refugees to return to unsafe and unstable regions. These actions have catastrophic consequences for regional stability and security.
- U.S. leadership on resettlement encourages others to do more:
 - Last year, anchored by U.S. commitments, wealthy nations agreed to double resettlement slots globally. Conversely, the U.S. retreat from resettlement in 2017 has prompted a nearly 60 percent decline in global resettlement as of June 2017.
 - Refugee resettlement has already been slashed from key frontline states, including global resettlement from Jordan by 64 percent and Lebanon by 35 percent, with U.S. resettlement from Turkey falling nearly 79 percent.
 - Without U.S. leadership, global resettlement capacity will likely fall in 2018 as well—potentially to around 80,000 to 90,000 for the year—a level that would represent a global decline of 52 to 58 percent from 2016.
 - The resettlement of refugees from Africa has, for example, fallen sharply. While the resettlement need for African refugees was determined to be 441,523 for 2017, resettlement countries have pledged only 7000 places—far below what had been anticipated late last year. This lack of resettlement places leaves refugees stranded at a time when, UNHCR has explained, their vulnerability is exacerbated by the often-difficult environments they face in host countries and the growth of new emergencies.
 - The refugees most affected by this decline are women and children, including those who have suffered sexual and gender-based violence, as well as survivors of torture.²⁰ Half of all refugees are children, despite accounting for less than a third of the global population, and the overwhelming majority of refugees resettled to the United States are women and children.
- Maintaining resettlement commitments is critical to the effectiveness of military, diplomatic, and intelligence operations abroad and the safety of U.S. troops. Tens of thousands of Iraqi and Afghan nationals have put their lives on the line to support intelligence gathering, operations planning, and other essential services, especially translation. These individuals and their families are often targeted by terrorist groups as a direct result of their cooperation with Americans.

⁵ BBC News. “Syria Conflict: Jordanians ‘at boiling point’ over refugees.” February 2, 2016. <http://www.bbc.com/news/world-middle-east-35462698>

Resettlement is instrumental in ensuring their safety—a testament to the U.S. military's commitment to leave no one behind.

- Refugee resettlement signals support for those who seek liberty and reject ideologies antithetical to American values. Just as the U.S. offered refuge to those fleeing communist regimes during the Cold War, so too must the U.S. open its arms to those standing against terrorist ideologies, many of whom refused to join or be conscripted into terrorist groups, militias, and state security forces persecuting fellow citizens. Conversely, shutting down or limiting resettlement of refugees is a propaganda gift to terrorist organizations. The last thing that terrorist organizations like ISIS want is for the US to be a beacon of hope, acceptance and inclusion for Muslims.

7. “DHS (Department of Homeland Security) cannot safely vet more than 45K given that improved security vetting being put in place during the 120-day ban is more resource-intensive.”

- Maintaining the integrity of the United States Refugee Admissions Program (USRAP) through secure vetting is of the utmost importance, and we support good-faith efforts to improve security, versus changes intended to grind the program to a halt.
- The U.S. has historically made security improvements to the resettlement program while maintaining a steady level of admissions. Such improvements took place under both the Bush and Obama administration.
- Even in the face of the worst terrorist attack on our nation's soil on Sept. 11, 2001, President George W. Bush set an admissions ceiling of 70,000 refugees and continued to do so in the years that followed. Doing so signaled that the U.S. would remain a humanitarian leader and demonstrated that the Administration understood the critical role resettlement plays in supporting our allies.
- In 2016, the U.S. safely resettled nearly 85,000 refugees. With current capacity in the Refugee Corps (197 officers and 29 supervisors), the resettlement program is equipped to safely and securely resettle over 75,000 refugees. Inefficiencies in the refugee vetting system are constantly being addressed, with the implementation of new technologies and systems, only increasing the capacity of the program.
- DHS must present to Congress and the U.S. public the changes and costs associated with security improvements. Given recent upgrades under both the Obama and Bush administrations, and the fact that refugee processing was already the gold standard in security, Congress must evaluate whether DHS resources are being used efficiently and effectively.

8. “DHS resources must be diverted to address the 270,000 asylum backlog.”

- Diverting resources away from refugee resettlement to the asylum backlog is neither smart nor necessary.
- The protections offered by the U.S. through resettlement and asylum are not a zero-sum game. One at-risk population must not be pitted against another. The asylum backlog must be addressed, but not at the expense of refugees in need of resettlement. Both programs support critical national security objectives.
- DHS already has the resources it needs to hire more asylum officers without taking away resources from the resettlement program. **DHS has allocated funding for 625 asylum officers, yet there are currently only approximately 515 officers.** DHS should use the funding it has to hire more asylum officers. Doing so will position DHS to efficiently work toward diminishing the asylum backlog.
- Asylum officers and refugee officers receive different training and it is inefficient to divert officers from one function to another. Officers in the Refugee Corps are specifically trained to conduct refugee resettlement interviews overseas, whereas asylum officers are trained to conduct asylum interviews in the U.S. It was proven under the Obama Administration that reassigning officers in the Asylum Division and Refugee Corps generates more problems than it solves. The Trump Administration must not make the same mistake.
- Diverting Refugee officers to the Asylum Division is analogous to diverting Immigration and Customs Enforcement (ICE) officers to Customs and Border Protection (CBP). When more CBP

officers are needed, DHS *does not* turn to ICE resources, it requests more funding to hire additional CBP agents.⁶

9. “Refugees are too costly; they are a drain on local economies and take jobs away from Americans.”

- All evidence points to the fact that refugees benefit local economies and fill empty jobs in the workforce.
- A July 2017 report by the Department of Health and Human Services commissioned by the Trump Administration, found that over the past decade refugees have contributed \$63 billion more in government revenues over the past decade than they cost. The Trump Administration rejected this report demonstrating the tremendous positive economic impact that refugees have in the U.S.⁷
- According to research conducted by the National Bureau for Economic Research, refugees who enter the country between the ages of 18 and 45 pay on average \$21,000 more in taxes to all levels of government than they receive in benefits over a twenty year period.
- According to research by the bipartisan group New American Economy (NAE), the U.S. was home to more than 180,000 refugee entrepreneurs, 13 percent of the refugee population in 2015. By comparison, only 9 percent of the U.S.-born population are entrepreneurs.⁸ Refugees have gone on to become CEOs, ambassadors, and influential economic and cultural figures, including Google co-founder Sergey Brin. The notable list also includes former CEO of Intel Andrew Grove, former Secretary of State Madeleine Albright, former Secretary of State Henry Kissinger, former CEO of Coca-Cola Roberto Goizueta, and painter Marc Chagall.
- Resettled refugees are filling critical gaps in the work force and revitalizing cities and rural communities across the U.S., filling empty jobs in industries such as hospitality, food service, and meat-packing. Demographics indicate at least one reason why this is so: 77 percent of refugees are working age compared to just 50 percent of U.S.-born Americans.
- Hundreds of employers around the country work closely with resettlement agencies to hire refugees because they are reliable and hard-working. Businesses, faith institutions, and local communities are deeply invested in welcoming refugees and helping them achieve success in their new homes. Private sources contribute \$1 for every \$2 in government grants for early employment programs. More broadly, private contributions—including volunteer hours, in-kind donations and private philanthropic support—account for a significant share of the costs of integrating refugees. One study estimates that 61 percent of the costs were provided by private funds, while only 39 percent were covered by federal dollars.⁹
- A recent report released by the office of the chief economist of the Department of State found “robust causal evidence that there is no adverse long-run impact of refugees on the U.S. labor market.”¹⁰
- The U.S. refugee resettlement program is designed to help refugees achieve self-sufficiency quickly. In 2016, over 80 percent of refugees in the International Rescue Committee’s early employment program were economically self-sufficient within six months. This statistic should not come as a surprise: Refugees who have spent years unable to provide for their families, are

⁶ <http://www.humanrightsfirst.org/sites/default/files/hrf-refugee-admissions-and-the-asylum-division-backlog.pdf>

⁷ <https://www.nytimes.com/interactive/2017/09/19/us/politics/document-Refugee-Report.html?smid=tw-share>

⁸ New American Economy. “From Struggle to Resilience: The Economic Impact of Refugees in America.” June 19, 2017. <http://www.newamericaneconomy.org/research/from-struggle-to-resilience-the-economic-impact-of-refugees-in-america/>

⁹ Lutheran Immigrant and Refugee Service. “The Real Cost of Welcome: A financial analysis of local refugee reception.” 2009. <http://lirs.org/wp-content/uploads/2012/05/RPTREALCOSTWELCOME.pdf>

¹⁰ U.S. Department of State, Office of the Chief Economist. Working Paper 2017-04. “The Labor Market Impact of Refugees: Evidence from the U.S. Resettlement Program.” August 2017. <https://www.state.gov/documents/organization/273699.pdf>

eager to work. While refugee resettlement is first and foremost a humanitarian program, its long-term economic benefits are undeniable

- In addition to long-term gains refugees provide to the economy, the resettlement program itself benefits entire communities, bringing millions of federal dollars to states, creating jobs and stimulating local business. Moreover, federal funds for resettlement enable health screenings, pay for health coverage, and assist schools with refugee students as they adjust to a new culture.

10. “The Administration is already extremely generous, doing more than we even need to, as evidenced that ORR served 270,000 people last year”

- Providing protection to the world’s most vulnerable people is not a zero-sum game. A country such as the United States should not choose between saving the lives of refugees fleeing war and persecution vs. providing care and protection to unaccompanied children arriving to our southern border vs. providing safety to Iraqis and Afghans who faithfully served alongside U.S. troops to keep them safe. This is a false choice. Further, **the Trump Administration proposed a 45 percent cut in humanitarian assistance, which, together with draconian cuts to refugee admissions, represents a breathtaking retreat from humanitarian leadership that has long demonstrated US values and served US interests.**

11. “Even with an admissions ceiling of 45,000 refugees, the U.S. will remain the world leader in refugee resettlement.”

- Leadership in refugee resettlement is not simply measured in the gross number of refugees accepted. Leadership is about accepting a fair share and responding to global needs.
 - While the U.S. has historically accepted the largest gross numbers of refugees, other countries have done more to accept a fair share of refugees relative to their population. In 2016, the United States resettled nearly 85,000 refugees, ranking 4th in per capita global resettlement, behind Canada, Norway and Australia. If the U.S. accepts 45,000 refugees in 2018, it would fall to 9th place in per capital global resettlement, falling behind New Zealand, Sweden, Iceland, Finland, and Monaco. This is no demonstration of leadership.
 - As a demonstration of its leadership, the U.S. traditionally resettles over half of all cases submitted for resettlement by the UN Refugee Agency. In 2016, for example, the U.S. resettled 62% of all cases submitted by the UN Refugee Agency. If the U.S. had only accepted 45,000 submissions in 2016, this would have amounted to only 35%, far less than half of UN refugee submissions.
- The average annual admissions ceiling since 1980 has exceeded 95,000. A refugee admissions ceiling of 45,000—the lowest level ever set—is a drastic departure from historic tradition, signaling a retreat in leadership on the world stage. Presidents from both parties in the past two decades have set robust refugee ceilings as a demonstration of leadership and as a proud humanitarian tradition of welcome. Setting the annuals admissions ceiling at the lowest level in history is to send the signal that the U.S. is no longer a leader on this issue and that others can also renege on their commitments to refugees.

12. “Refugees are imposed upon unwilling and over-burdened communities by self-interested resettlement contractors.”

- The United States Refugee Admissions Program (USRAP) was created decades ago not by resettlement agencies but as a result of mobilization by local communities. The program continues to exist and thrive today because community members, faith congregations and local leaders/local officials support it.
- The refugee resettlement program is predicated on community support; this support is stronger now more than ever.
 - Resettlement agencies welcome and support the integration of refugees with the help of thousands of community volunteers, who engage on their own or through their faith congregation or community group, as a demonstration of their commitment to helping refugees recover and build a new life in America.
 - The numbers of Americans stepping up to volunteer to assist refugees has grown exponentially in the last few years, such that the demand for volunteer opportunities is greater than the number of refugees actually arriving.

- Before opening a resettlement office in a new community, resettlement agencies communicate extensively with a broad spectrum of stakeholders (including mayors, health and education officials, law enforcement, and faith communities). Resettlement agencies are required to demonstrate to their federal partners not only that refugee resettlement is viable (e.g. that the location offers affordable housing and employment opportunities, adequate social infrastructure, etc.) but also that refugee resettlement is welcomed and desired by the key community stakeholders.
- The initial government investment in refugee processing and post-arrival integration services is critical but limited and is supplemented by private donations and time/in-kind contributions of volunteers that help to ensure refugees' success.
- The private sector, faith institutions, and local communities are all deeply invested and involved in welcoming refugees and helping them achieve success in their new homes.
 - Hundreds of employers around the country work closely with resettlement agencies to systematically hire refugees (mainly in manufacturing, hotel and food industries). Employers look to hire refugees because they find refugees to be among their most stable, reliable employees.
 - For early employment programs, private sources contribute \$1 to every \$2 federal dollars given to resettlement agencies through government grants.
 - Thousands of volunteers and members of congregations donate tens of thousands of hours and in-kind contributions each year to support refugees, lowering costs to the federal government. Community members donate household items to help furnish a refugee family's first apartment, teach financial literacy and cultural orientation classes, help new arrivals prepare for job interviews, mentor refugee families to help them adapt to the American way of life, and much more.
- Resettlement agencies are responsive to the needs of the whole community.
 - Resettlement agencies convene private consultation meetings with appropriate stakeholders at least quarterly in compliance with federal contracts and cover a range of topics. These meetings are opportunities for refugee-serving organizations and their partners to productively address refugee and community needs.
 - Non-profit organizations serving resettled refugees often serve the needs of other native-born and other new Americans.

13. "Low refugee admissions is not unprecedented. President Bush only admitted approximately 28,000 each year in the two years following 9/11."

- The actual number of resettled refugees was low during the period immediately following 9/11 while the administration modified screening mechanisms and created the Department of Homeland Security, moving all refugee processing functions from INS to DHS. During that time, the program remained opened to all nationalities.
- While the number of refugees resettled was low in 2002 and 2003, the administration still set an ambitious goal. The Bush administration held ongoing conversations with Congress and resettlement agencies about strengthening the resettlement program and keeping it robust during procedural changes.
- As soon as changes under the Bush administration were implemented, arrivals began to increase and as you know, the program is secure to this day.
- The approach Bush took is the opposite of what this administration has done - shutting out its own staff, circumventing Congress, and ostracizing the charities that founded our tradition of resettlement long before the government was involved.
- The global context was different under President Bush. The global refugee population was nearly half what it is today (12million in 2001 vs.22.5 million in 2016).
- The global refugee population actually declined through 2005 down to 8.7 million.
- United Nations High Commission for Refugees (UNHCR) had not yet created a system to identify refugees most in need of resettlement until 2005. When the system was put in place President Bush exceeded global need.
- In contrast, President Trump is setting the lowest refugee admissions goal during the world's worst refugee crisis when global resettlement need tops one million.