



# REPORT

---

---

September 27, 2005

## RISE, PEAK, AND DECLINE: TRENDS IN U.S. IMMIGRATION 1992–2004

By

Jeffrey S. Passel  
Roberto Suro

Pew Hispanic Center  
A Pew Research Center Project  
[www.pewhispanic.org](http://www.pewhispanic.org)

1615 L Street, NW, Suite 700 • Washington, DC 20036-5610 • Phone: 202-419-3600 • Fax: 202-419-3608

# RISE, PEAK, AND DECLINE: TRENDS IN U.S. IMMIGRATION 1992–2004

By  
Jeffrey S. Passel  
Roberto Suro

## CONTENTS

<b>EXECUTIVE SUMMARY</b> .....	<b>i</b>
<b>INTRODUCTION</b> .....	<b>1</b>
<b>THE MIGRATION FLOW PEAKED IN 1999–2000</b> .....	<b>3</b>
<b>CHANGES IN THE COMPOSITION OF IMMIGRANT FLOWS</b> .....	<b>4</b>
Legal Status.....	4
National Origins, Race and Ethnicity .....	5
<b>CHANGES IN THE DESTINATIONS OF IMMIGRANTS</b> .....	<b>8</b>
<b>MEXICO-U.S. MIGRATION AND RELATED FACTORS</b> .....	<b>10</b>
<b>MEASUREMENT METHODS</b> .....	<b>12</b>
Problems with Existing Measures.....	12
Immigration Measures from the Census, ACS and CPS .....	15
Year/Period of Arrival .....	17
Residence 1 Year Ago .....	21
Combined Estimates .....	23
<b>REFERENCES</b> .....	<b>26</b>
<b>APPENDIX A. DETAILED TABLES</b> .....	<b>28</b>

## LIST OF FIGURES

Figure A. Annual Immigration to the United States based on Census 2000, ACS and CPS Data: 1991–2004.....	i
Figure 1. Annual Immigration to the United States based on Census 2000, ACS and CPS Data: 1991–2004.....	3
Figure 2. Annual Immigration to the United States by Legal Status based on Census 2000, ACS and CPS Data: 1991–2004.....	5
Figure 3. Annual Immigration to the United States for Hispanics and Non-Hispanic Whites based on Census 2000, ACS and CPS Data: 1991–2004.....	7

Figure 4. Annual Immigration to the United States for Selected Countries or Regions of Birth based on Census 2000, ACS and CPS Data: 1991–2004.....	8
Figure 5. Annual Immigration to California, New York and Other Areas based on Census 2000, ACS and CPS Data: 1991–2004 .....	9
Figure 6. Mexican Migration to the United States and U.S. Unemployment Rate: 1991–2004	10
Figure 7. Mexican Migration to the United States and Mexican Labor Force Growth: 1991–2004.....	12
Figure 8. Immigration by Decade—Number Levels and Percent of U.S. Population: 1821–1830 to 2001–2010 .....	13
Figure 9. Legal Admissions to the United States by Single Years: Fiscal Years 1820–2004 .....	14
Figure 10. Annual Immigration to the United States by Data Source and Estimation Method: 1991–2004.....	24
Figure 11. Annual Mexican Immigration to the United States by Data Source and Estimation Method: 1991–2004.....	25

## LIST OF TABLES

Summary Table A. Average Annual Immigration for 1992–2004 by Place of Birth, by Legal Status, by State, and by Race/Hispanic Origin based on CPS, ACS and Census 2000 Data .....	2
Detailed Table 1a. Average Annual Immigration for Calendar Years, 1990–2004, by Race/Hispanic Origin and by Legal Status based on CPS, ACS and Census 2000 Data .....	29
Detailed Table 1b. Average Annual Immigration for Calendar Years, 1990–2004, by Country or Region of Birth based on CPS, ACS and Census 2000 Data .....	31
Detailed Table 1c. Average Annual Immigration for Calendar Years, 1990–2004, by State and Region of Residence based on CPS, ACS and Census 2000 Data .....	33
Detailed Table 2a. Average Annual Immigration for Calendar Years, 1990–2004, by Race/Hispanic Origin and by Estimation Method based on CPS, ACS and Census 2000 Data .....	36
Detailed Table 2b. Average Annual Immigration for Calendar Years, 1990–2004, by Country or Region of Birth and by Estimation Method based on CPS, ACS and Census 2000 Data.....	39
Detailed Table 2c. Average Annual Immigration for Calendar Years, 1990–2004, by Legal Status and by Estimation Method based on CPS, ACS and Census 2000 Data .....	43
Detailed Table 2d1. Average Annual Immigration for Calendar Years, 1990–2004, by Region of Residence and by Estimation Method based on CPS, ACS and Census 2000 Data...	45
Detailed Table 2d2. Average Annual Immigration for Calendar Years, 1990–2004, for the Six Largest Immigration States by Estimation Method based on CPS, ACS and Census 2000 Data .....	47
Detailed Table 2d3. Average Annual Immigration for Calendar Years, 1990–2004, by Region of Residence for Smaller Immigration States and by Estimation Method based on CPS, ACS and Census 2000 Data.....	50


Detailed Table 3. Annual Legal Admissions and Foreign-Born Population, from March Current Population Survey and American Community Survey, by Year: 1991–2005 .....	53
Detailed Table 4. Immigration to the United States by Decade: 1820–2010 .....	54
Detailed Table 5a. Mexico-U.S. Migration and Labor Force and Unemployment for the United States and Mexico: 1990–2004 .....	55
Detailed Table 5b. Mexico-U.S. Migration and Gross Domestic Product for the United States and Mexico: 1990–2004 .....	56

# RISE, PEAK, AND DECLINE: TRENDS IN U.S. IMMIGRATION 1992–2004

By  
Jeffrey S. Passel  
Roberto Suro

## EXECUTIVE SUMMARY

### Annual Migration to the U.S. Peaked in 1999–2000



**Figure A. Annual Immigration to the United States based on Census 2000, ACS and CPS Data: 1991–2004**

The number of migrants coming to the United States each year, legally and illegally, grew very rapidly starting in the mid-1990s, hit a peak at the end of the decade, and then declined substantially after 2001. By 2004, the annual inflow of foreign-born persons was down 24% from its all-time high in 2000, according to the Pew Hispanic Center analysis of multiple datasets collected by the Census Bureau and other government agencies.

Rather than undergoing a continuous increase in immigrant levels as is commonly perceived, the United States experienced a sharp spike in immigration flows over the past decade that had a distinct beginning, middle and end. From the early 1990s through the middle of the decade, slightly more than 1.1 million migrants came to the United States every year on average. In the peak years of 1999 and 2000, the annual inflow was about 35% higher, topping 1.5 million. By 2002 and 2003, the number coming to the country was back around the 1.1 million mark. This basic pattern of increase, peak and decline is evident for the foreign-born from every region of the world and for both legal and unauthorized migrants.

In 2004, migration bounced back to exceed 1.2 million. Whether or not this move portends further increases is impossible to predict. But even with this recent increase in migration, the most recent data show that immigration flows are at levels comparable with those of the mid-1990s and still significantly below the peak levels of 1999–2000.

Both the run-up to the peak and the drop-off in immigration coincide with a variety of conditions known to influence such flows, most notably the performance of the U.S. economy. Immigration grew sharply during the rapid economic and job expansion of the 1990s and then declined as the economy went into a downturn after 2001. Measures of the change in the Mexican labor force—the largest single source of U.S. immigrants by far—follow trends closely related to the pattern of changes in U.S. immigration. In tracking some trends related to migration, this report does not attempt to assess fully the many different factors that may have caused the rise and fall of immigration flows during this period, but rather illustrates changes in a few key macro-level indicators that mirror the pattern of immigration flows.

The simplest and most commonly available measure of migration to the United States is the size of the foreign-born population; it consistently reaches new highs each year. However, in demographic terms, the total number of foreign-born persons living in the United States at any given point in time does not measure, and can even be misleading concerning, the *flow* of migrants to the U.S.; i.e., the number of people coming to the country from abroad over a specific period of time. It does provide a measure of the foreign-born *stock* in the country. Likewise, the foreign-born stock provides a useful measure of the *cumulative* results of immigration (i.e., additions to the foreign-born population) and of two processes that subtract from the foreign-born stock (deaths among the foreign-born and emigration by the foreign-born).

In this report, a variety of data measuring flows are used to assess changes in migration levels from one year to another over the period from 1992 through 2004. During this period, the steady increases in the overall stock of the foreign-born population could create the erroneous impression that immigration flows themselves have been increasing inexorably at an accelerating pace. In fact, this report demonstrates that entries of migrants suddenly and rapidly accelerated in the second half of the 1990s and then decelerated with almost equal speed after 2001. According to our analyses of the available data, no other spike of these dimensions has occurred since the current era of increased immigration flows began in 1970s. Although the historical data are not strictly comparable, several roughly similar spikes occurred during the trans-Atlantic era of migration; the peaks in immigration then were associated with events such as the Irish potato famine, the end of the Civil War, the dramatic economic swings of the 1890s and 1900s, and World War I.

An accurate assessment of whether immigration flows are rising, falling or holding steady is essential to formulating and evaluating public policy on a variety of issues at the local, state and federal levels. Unfortunately, no single source of data adequately measures such flows. Much of the data supplied by immigration authorities is of little use because the data systems are used to measure administrative processes within the immigration bureaucracy and do not reflect the movement of people into the United States. Further, much of the inflow—a majority in recent years—arrives outside the legal channels. In order to assess recent immigration flows, the Pew Hispanic Center examined data from Census 2000 as well as from two yearly surveys conducted by the Census Bureau—the Current Population Survey and the American Community Survey. All three identify the foreign-born and ask when they came to live in the United States. Additionally, the two surveys ask respondents where they lived a year earlier. Altogether, these

data produced at least five and as many as seven different measures of immigrant flows for each of the years examined. Each data source and survey question was analyzed separately to generate comparable measures of the number of arrivals for each calendar year. The individual sources produced different estimates of the *level* of the inflow in a given year, but all of the sources yielded the same basic pattern of a rise, a peak and then a decline at roughly the same points in time and the same rate of change. These results were then combined into an “average of averages” to produce a single, interpretable measure of immigration. While there is a range of estimates for the inflow in each year, the overall pattern of change over the period is supported by the full weight of the data.

Some of the major findings presented in this report:

### **Levels of Immigration Flows:**

- Immigration flows increased through most of the early and mid-1990s but to a limited extent and very gradually—growing from slightly more than 1 million in 1992 to about 1.2 million in 1997.
- At the turn of the 21<sup>st</sup> century, immigration levels increased dramatically. This spike took the total inflow to more than 1.5 million in 1999 and 2000—a level about 35% higher than in the middle of the decade. This peak proved to be short-lived, though.
- Since 2000, inflows of immigrants have decreased by about 25% to roughly the levels of the mid-1990s, returning to 1.1 million in 2003.
- The most recent data show a slight uptick in the flow to more than 1.2 million in 2004. With this level of immigration, the foreign-born population will continue to grow, albeit at a slower pace than the rates reached around 2000.

### **Origins and Types of Immigrants:**

- With some variations, the same basic pattern of gradual increase, spike and then decrease holds true for migration from every region of the world.
- Migration from Mexico followed the same overall trends. It peaked in 1999–2000 at a level more than one third above the inflows of the mid-1990s, then declined by about one quarter to 2002–2003 levels that were only slightly higher than those of the mid-1990s. Throughout this period, the Mexican share of total migration held relatively steady at about a third of the overall flow. However, there are indications in new data for 2004–2005 that Mexican migration is again increasing.
- From 1992 to 2004, the unauthorized share of immigration inflows increased and the share that was legal decreased. By the end of the period, more unauthorized migrants than authorized immigrants were entering the United States.

- Declines in legal immigration accounted for the largest part of the drop from the peak flows at the turn of the 21<sup>st</sup> century. From the peak in 1999–2000 to the trough in 2003, over 60% of the decrease in flow is attributable to lower levels of inflows of legal permanent residents and legal temporary immigrants counted as part of the population.

**Destination of New Immigrants:**

- The shift of immigrant flows away from states with large foreign-born populations such as California and New York towards new settlement states such as North Carolina and Iowa accelerated during both the peak and the decline that followed.

The Pew Hispanic Center is a nonpartisan research organization supported by The Pew Charitable Trusts. Its mission is to improve understanding of the U.S. Hispanic population and to chronicle Latinos' growing impact on the entire nation. The Center does not advocate for or take positions on policy issues. It is a project of the Pew Research Center, a nonpartisan “fact tank” in Washington, D.C., that provides information on the issues, attitudes and trends shaping America and the world.

# **RISE, PEAK AND DECLINE: TRENDS IN U.S. IMMIGRATION 1992-2004**

By  
Jeffrey S. Passel  
Roberto Suro

## **INTRODUCTION**

The number of immigrants living in the United States has been increasing steadily since 1970 as measured by the size of the foreign-born population in decennial censuses. Fueled primarily by immigration from Latin America—especially Mexico—and Asia, the foreign-born population grew from 9.6 million in 1970 to 19.8 million in 1990. In the last decade of the 20<sup>th</sup> century the numbers jumped dramatically by 57% to 31.1 million in Census 2000. Data from the Census Bureau’s Current Population Surveys (CPS) and other sources indicated that much of the growth in the 1990s took place in the second half of the decade. But significant questions remained: How much did the immigration flow increase in the late 1990s? After 2000, did the number of migrants added to the population every year continue to increase, level off or decline? And, more important, is there a basic long-term trend that produces steady year-to-year increases in the flow of migrants? Or, alternatively, are immigration flows variable from year to year and subject to factors, such as the condition of the U.S. economy, that cause them to increase or decline? How the volume of immigration has changed in the face of the dramatic economic swings of the past decade, the reactions to September 11 in terms of popular attitudes and official enforcement efforts, and attempts to tighten U.S. borders and admission procedures is not easy to address with standard measures of immigration.

To address these issues, the Pew Hispanic Center analyzed data from several sources collected by the Census Bureau and developed estimates of the number of foreign-born persons flowing into the country on a yearly basis for 1992 to 2004. (See “Measurement Methods” below.) These figures must be considered approximations of the true level of immigration since they represent averages across several data years, several different measures, and multiple, repeated measures for some of the methodologies used. Although data sources produced different numbers for the flow in a given year, all the sources yielded the same general pattern of change over the period: Immigration flows increased gradually through most of the 1990s, spiked dramatically at the end of the decade and then fell back after 2001 to the levels registered in the mid-1990s.

The spike was significant both in absolute numbers and in percentage change. The peak immigration flows in 1999 and 2000 reached at least 1.5 million people a year (1.8 million by some measures), roughly 400,000 more than the troughs before and after. (See Figure 1 and Summary Table A.) In retrospect, it is now clear that the surge in immigration flows that occurred at the end of the 1990s was a discrete event with a beginning, middle and end. The extremely high flows at the end of the past decade were not the norm, nor part of a long-term trend, but rather the peak of a momentary increase that lasted for only a few years. Thus, even as the United States consistently experiences historically high rates of migration, flows are subject to considerable variation. If levels surge again, the change will mark a new episode in the long saga of immigration into the United States, and so too if they decline sharply.

As will be detailed below, both the increases and decreases in migration flows over the past 15 years coincided with sharp changes in the U.S. economy. Immigration increased rapidly as the United States experienced a record expansion at the end of the 1990s, and the flows dropped after 2001 as the U.S. economy went into a prolonged downturn. As economic growth resumed in 2003 and 2004, migration levels showed signs of increasing again. This same basic pattern held true for migration flows from every region of the world as immigrants came at

**Summary Table A. Average Annual Immigration for 1992–2004 by Place of Birth, by Legal Status, by State, and by Race/Hispanic Origin based on CPS, ACS and Census 2000 Data**

(In thousands)

Variable and Group	Average Immigration			Amount of Change		Percent Change	
	Start '92-'97	Peak '99-'00	End '02-'04	Start to Peak	Peak to End	Start to Peak	Peak to End
<b>Place of Birth</b>							
U.S., Total	1,139	1,541	1,164	401	-376	35%	-24%
Mexico	376	513	402	137	-111	37%	-22%
Other Latin Amer.	241	319	238	78	-81	32%	-25%
Asia	307	377	314	69	-63	23%	-17%
All Other	215	332	211	117	-122	54%	-37%
<b>Legal Status#</b>							
Total Immigration	1,274	1,577	1,124	303	-452	24%	-29%
Legal Permanent	628	647	452	19	-195	3%	-30%
Unauthorized	486	662	488	176	-174	36%	-26%
Legal Temporary	160	268	185	108	-83	68%	-31%
<b>State of Residence</b>							
U.S., Total	1,142	1,541	1,164	399	-377	35%	-24%
California	279	331	239	52	-92	19%	-28%
Other Major States	471	574	425	103	-149	22%	-26%
New Growth States	216	355	286	139	-70	64%	-20%
All Other	177	280	215	104	-66	59%	-23%
<b>Race/Hispanic Origin</b>							
Total Immigration**	1,142	1,540	1,165	398	-375	35%	-24%
Hispanic	554	751	576	196	-174	35%	-23%
Asian*	285	339	283	54	-56	19%	-17%
White*	217	350	226	133	-124	62%	-35%
Black*	84	98	78	14	-20	17%	-20%

# Status at time of survey.

\* Non-Hispanic only. See source for definitions.

\*\* Total includes American Indian/Alaska Native not shown separately.

Source: Pew Hispanic Center 2005, Detailed Tables 1a-1c.

roughly the same pace from countries and regions that were experiencing economic booms and those undergoing hard times. The correlation of U.S. economic trends to migration levels rather than the trends in immigrant-sending countries clearly suggests that the demand for immigrant


labor in the United States is a powerful factor in determining migration flows. Just as the U.S. economy experiences distinct episodes of expansion and contraction, migration levels can also be expected to rise and fall with them.

## THE MIGRATION FLOW PEAKED IN 1999–2000

At the start of the 1990s, immigration flows had reached historically high levels of more than a million people a year. (See Detailed Table 4 and Figures 8–9.) In the early and middle parts of the 1990s, the annual numbers held relatively steady at around 1.1 million people a year. Depending on the measure used, the flows started increasing between 1995 and 1997 towards about 1.2 million per year (Detailed Table 2a).

By 1999, immigration levels had increased substantially to the point where the average inflow during the peak period of immigration—a period encompassing 1999–2000 in most estimates and extending a year in either direction in some—reached at least 1.5 million per year. Again, this figure is “an average of averages” that may actually understate the inflows of immigrants, since about 1.8 million arrived in 1999 according to data from Census 2000 (Detailed Table 2a). The average annual level of immigration during this peak period is about 400,000 greater than during the mid-1990s, or about one third higher (Detailed Table 1a).

### Annual Migration to the U.S. Peaked in 1999–2000



**Figure 1. Annual Immigration to the United States based on Census 2000, ACS and CPS Data: 1991–2004**

Source: Detailed Table 1a.

After 2001, the annual inflow of immigrants slowed a bit and decreased to a level of 1.1 million to 1.2 million per year. Thus, average annual immigration declined by about 300,000 to 400,000 per year or at least 20% below the peak. With the decrease, immigration appears to have returned to roughly the levels of the mid-1990s. However, some data from the most recent

March CPS and the American Community Survey (ACS) give contradictory pictures of current flows; some measures suggest continued lower levels of inflows, but others point to very recent (i.e., late 2004 and 2005) increases in migration from Mexico and Latin America. According to these measures, migration flows could again be approaching 1.3 million a year and moving upward.

All the measures and data sources, however, are consistent in telling the same basic story: Migration flows gradually increased in the mid-1990s, grew very rapidly at the end of the decade, peaked for two or three years and then fell off after 2002, returning to roughly the same levels as before the run-up. (See “Measurement Methods” and Figure 10.)

## **CHANGES IN THE COMPOSITION OF IMMIGRANT FLOWS**

Different types of immigrants (grouped for example by legal status, country of origin or racial/ethnic composition) tended to have similar patterns of change through the upward trend and the subsequent downturn. However, some experienced different trends and certainly not all groups changed at the same rate. Consequently, the changing levels of immigration over the past decade have also resulted in some shifts in the composition of the immigrant inflow. At the end of the 1992–2004 period, the country-of-origin and racial/ethnic mix of the immigrant inflow was basically unchanged from the initial period, notwithstanding a changed mix at the peak. The most notable change over the period was the marked decrease in the share of immigration accounted for by legal permanent residents (i.e., legal immigrants).

### ***Legal Status***

The mix of legal and unauthorized migrants in the flow changed considerably from 1992 to 2004. The inflow of legal permanent immigrants (LPRs, or “green card” holders) increased only very slightly (3%) from the mid-1990s to the peak around 2000. On the other hand, annual arrivals of both unauthorized migrants and legal temporary migrants (or “legal nonimmigrants”) increased by substantially higher rates. The increase to the peak for unauthorized migrants was 36% and for legal nonimmigrants, 68% (Summary Table A and Detailed Table 1a).


During this period, immigration laws governing admissions did not change in any significant way to affect the number of new arrivals,<sup>1</sup> so it is not surprising that the number of legal immigrants did not increase when the other two groups did. Moreover, the very large number of immediate relatives of immigrants who acquired legal status under the Immigration Reform and Control Act of 1986 (IRCA) accounted for a large number of both new arrivals and status adjustments beginning in the early 1990s. By the end of our observation period, the pool of potential immigrants in this group had become smaller. By 2001, increased security requirements leading to processing delays and shrinking ceilings for refugee admissions resulted in fewer admissions of LPRs. In the case of nonimmigrants, the increase during the peak period was fueled, in large part, by an increased demand for temporary workers, especially high-tech workers, and was facilitated by a large increase in the number of visas available. For unauthorized migrants, heightened demand was almost certainly a large factor in the increase as

---

<sup>1</sup> Most of the changes that did occur were designed to permit groups already in the country with either Temporary Protected Status or undocumented status, or on waiting lists, to adjust their status to LPR.

this period coincided with heightened efforts by the federal government to control illegal crossings of the Southern border.

## Trend Down for LPRs; Unauthorized Exceed LPRs



**Figure 2. Annual Immigration to the United States by Legal Status based on Census 2000, ACS and CPS Data: 1991–2004**

Source: Detailed Table 1a.

After 2000, annual levels in all three major categories of legal status groups (legal immigrants, unauthorized migrants and legal nonimmigrants) decreased at roughly equal rates—by about 30%. But, because legal immigration had increased less in the run-up to the peak, it ended up at considerably lower annual levels than it had been in the mid-1990s, both in absolute and relative terms. By 2004, the number of legal immigrants arriving in the U.S. was about 30% below the levels of the mid-1990s. While legal immigrants accounted for about five in ten of all new arrivals before the peak, they represented only about four in ten afterwards. For unauthorized migrants, the reverse is true; they represented fewer than four in ten new immigrants before the peak and almost five in ten afterwards. Moreover, in absolute numbers, the flow of legal immigrants had been significantly larger than the flow of unauthorized immigrants in the mid-1990s. Both groups arrived in roughly equal numbers during the peak and immediately afterwards, but, by 2003 and 2004, more unauthorized migrants than legal immigrants arrived each year. The annual numbers of legal immigrants arriving since the peak is actually lower than it was in the mid-1990s while the number of unauthorized migrants in the annual inflow has returned to roughly the same levels.

### *National Origins, Race and Ethnicity*

The racial/ethnic composition of the immigrant inflow was almost identical at the end of the 1992–2004 period as at the beginning (Detailed Table 1a). But, during the peak period of

1999–2000, the representation of white<sup>2</sup> immigrants was higher and of Asians lower than either before or afterward. With the exception of a few isolated years, Hispanics made up roughly the same share of annual immigration throughout the entire period—just about half of annual inflows. Thus, the percentage increase to peak and decrease from the peak for Hispanics was about the same as the overall rates of increase and decrease (Summary Table A and Detailed Table 1a). White and Asian immigration moved in opposite directions relative to one another during these periods. White immigration increased by the highest percentage to the peak—about 60%; Asian increase was the smallest—19%. The reverse was true for the decrease from the peak as white immigration decreased most rapidly and Asian the least. As a result, the white share of incoming immigrants was higher at the peak than it had been previously, but by 2002–2004 the overall racial distribution was essentially identical to 1992–1997.

The differences in patterns of change for racial/ethnic groups reflect underlying legal status differences among the race groups and how the changes in admission and arrival patterns by status (described above) played out over the 1992–2004 period. Asian and European countries account for very large shares of legal temporary migrants, especially students, intracompany transfers and high-tech guest workers. Because of historic declines in legal admissions from Europe and, to some degree, Canada, LPR numbers from these areas are relatively low so that the legal temporary migrants account for a large share of *all* immigrants from these areas. Thus, the patterns of change in white immigration are largely driven by changes in legal temporary migration. Hence, the relatively large increase to the peak and the subsequent decline.


In the case of Asians, most of the migration is by LPRs and refugees, with relatively small shares of both unauthorized and legal temporary migrants. Even though migrants from Asia account for a large share of the legal temporary flow, these migrants are only a small proportion of the total flow from Asia. Thus, the patterns of change for Asian migration during the 1992–2004 period are driven largely by the changing flows of LPRs from Asia. This group did not increase a great deal to the peak, nor did it decrease much. This pattern is reflected in the changing flows from Asia.

The distribution of immigrants by country of birth changed hardly at all over the 12-year period we examine (Detailed Table 1b). Mexicans accounted for roughly a third of the total throughout with the rest of Latin America contributing another fifth. Migrants from Canada and Europe accounted for nearly one seventh of the flow and the rest of the world the remainder. This rough distribution remained remarkably stable as the total annual flow underwent dramatic changes. The basic pattern of increase, peak and decline was apparent in migratory flows from all over the world although some source countries and regions experienced sharper increases and drops than others.

---

<sup>2</sup> The race data in Census 2000 allow for individuals to be assigned to more than one race group. For consistency with historical data and for simplicity of presentation, we assign multiple-race individuals to single races using a hierarchical assignment process. The hierarchy for assignment is: Black, Asian or Pacific Islander, white or “some other race” (assigned as white), and American Indian or Alaska Native. (See Suro et al., 2005.) All references to race groups in this report should be interpreted to refer to non-Hispanics in these groups.

## Hispanic & White Immigrants Hit Peaks in 1999-2000




**Figure 3. Annual Immigration to the United States for Hispanics and Non-Hispanic Whites based on Census 2000, ACS and CPS Data: 1991–2004**

Source: Detailed Table 1a.

Mexico represents by far the largest source of immigrants and is sending about 400,000 migrants each year. But Mexican immigration reached a level of at least about 500,000 per year at the peak period of 1999–2000. (See also Figure 4.) These measures, being averages of averages, tend to smooth out peaks and valleys; thus, by some measures, Mexican inflows to the U.S. appear to have exceeded 650,000 per year at the highest levels (Detailed Table 2b). While the data show a clear downturn in Mexican immigration during 2002–2003, some of the most recent data point to the possibility of a sizable increase in Mexican immigration levels by 2004, albeit to levels still lower than the 1999–2000 peaks.

The data for Mexican arrivals also show a localized peak in 1995 (Figure 4 and Detailed Table 1b). It is not clear from the data we examined whether this short-lived uptick represents a problem with reporting by respondents or a real increase. Mexico did experience economic problems in 1994–1995 that could well be associated with short-term increases in migration. Moreover, this one-year increase occurs in four of the five estimation methods (Table 2b), which suggests that the increase was real and not a reporting anomaly. The fact that the one-year peak in 1995 also occurs for immigrants from other Latin American countries further supports the notion of a real increase for the year.

## Country Groups Show Similar Trends: Rise, Peak, and Decline



**Figure 4. Annual Immigration to the United States for Selected Countries or Regions of Birth based on Census 2000, ACS and CPS Data: 1991–2004**

Source: Detailed Table 1b.

Trends from other broad regional aggregations followed much the same trends as Mexican migration (Figure 4 and Detailed Table 1b). The rate of increase to the peak was higher for European/Canadian migrants and lower for Asians. These differences were offset by larger rates of decline from the peak for Europeans and smaller rates for Asians. These patterns lead to a virtually identical distribution of immigrants at the beginning and end of the period. The region of birth differences also largely reflect the legal status differences in composition, as discussed above for race/origin groupings. Individual countries do not necessarily adhere to the same regional patterns. For example, immigration from India registered the sharpest increase prior to the peak of any major source country—a spurt that produced a 77% increase in the annual flow, much higher than even the Mexican migration (Detailed Table 1b). This increase reflects the composition of the migration stream in that India was one of the major beneficiaries of the increased number of visas made available to high-tech workers in the peak period.


### CHANGES IN THE DESTINATIONS OF IMMIGRANTS

Another significant shift occurred in the destinations of immigrants within the United States. The well-documented shift of new immigrants away from traditional settlement areas, such as California and New York, and to the so-called “new growth” states<sup>3</sup> (Passel et al. 2002,

<sup>3</sup> “New growth” designates states other than the six largest immigration states (CA, NY, TX, FL, IL, NJ) where the foreign-born population grew faster during 1990–2000 than in the fastest-growing large state (TX). The 22 new

Kochhar et al. 2005) is quite apparent in these data, as the share going to these two large states dropped from 37% in the mid-1990s to about 30% at the circa-2000 peak (Detailed Table 1c and Figure 5). The changes over time were certainly not uniform among the major receiving states. California and New York lost significant shares of the immigrant inflow between 1992 and 2004. New York was unique among these states in that it did not experience the 1999–2000 peak and actually had *less* immigration than in 1992–1997; immigration to New York continued to fall after 2000. Florida and Texas received slightly larger shares of the immigrant flow in 2002–2004 than in 1992–1997, unlike the other four large receiving states.

## Growth Shifts to Many New Areas; Flows to New York Decrease



**Figure 5. Annual Immigration to California, New York and Other Areas based on Census 2000, ACS and CPS Data: 1991–2004**

Source: Detailed Table 1c.

The share of immigration flows settling in the new growth states increased throughout this period. These states received 23% of new immigration during the 1999–2000 peak as compared with 19% in the initial period. Further shifts occurred as immigration levels declined from their peak as the new growth states continued to increase their *share* of new immigration to 25% of the total. (In the decline, the share going to California and New York dropped a little further to 28% of new arrivals.)

These data point to even further geographic diversification than do many other studies, as states other than the new growth states (the “other states” in Detailed Table 1c) also showed increases in both the share and the number of new immigrants settling there. The “other states”

---


growth states are: Southeast—DE, NC, SC, GA, KY, TN, AL, MS, AR, OK; Midwest—IN, MN, IA, NE, KS; and Mountain/West—ID, CO, AZ, UT, NV, WA, OR.

share increased to 18% from 16% in the mid-1990s, representing a growth of 59% in the number of new immigrants going to these states. After the peak period, these other states maintained their increased share of new immigrants. Thus, the shifting of immigrant settlement to new destinations is not just a short-lived phenomenon associated with the peak levels of immigration; it continued even as immigration decreased from the 1999–2000 peak.<sup>4</sup>

## MEXICO-U.S. MIGRATION AND RELATED FACTORS

The pattern of rise, peak and decline evident in total immigration flows coincides closely with a similar pattern in the performance of the U.S. economy, and the correlation is particularly strong with the flow from Mexico. During the period of increased migration prior to the peak, U.S. employment increased by 1.59 million in 1993, the first full year of recovery after the 1991 recession; even greater increases in U.S. employment followed and 1.85 million jobs were added in 1998. The annual number of migrants coming from Mexico increased from about 332,000 to 507,000 over the same period. (See Detailed Table 5a.) In 2000, both the U.S. expansion and the growth of Mexican migration reached a peak. That year the U.S. economy added nearly 3.4 million jobs and migration from Mexico crested at an estimated 530,000 new arrivals. In the decline phase, the U.S. economy lost 415,000 jobs in 2002 and, while migration from Mexico continued, it dropped to 378,000.

### Mexican Migration Follows Trends in U.S. Employment Rate



**Figure 6. Mexican Migration to the United States and U.S. Unemployment Rate: 1991–2004**

Source: Detailed Table 5a.

<sup>4</sup> This shift does not mean that immigrants are not continuing to settle in the traditional areas. In fact, for 2002–2004, the six large traditional settlement areas still received 57% of new immigration.


As the U.S. economy regained momentum in 2003 and 2004, the pace of Mexican migration picked up also. Detailed studies of the U.S. labor market during this recovery phase show that there has been heightened demand for low-skilled, low-wage workers largely because the construction industry has been responsible for much of the new job creation while other sectors such as manufacturing have continued to contract (Kochhar 2004 and 2005). Recently arrived Hispanic immigrants have constituted a disproportionate share of the new workers hired into the construction industry, according to these studies.

The annual flow of migrants from Mexico over the 1992–2004 period appears to be more closely correlated to macro trends in the U.S. economy than in the Mexican economy. Of the variables we examine, changes in the rate of U.S. employment correlate most strongly, at 0.90. (See Detailed Table 5a and Figure 6.) Other U.S. economic variables have correlations of 0.40–0.50 whereas the correlations for Mexican macroeconomic indicators vary from about -0.23 to -0.30. (See Detailed Tables 5a-5b.) These patterns suggest that during this period the “pull” factors have been somewhat more powerful than the “push” factors in determining short-term migration levels.

The Mexican economy underwent a severe crisis in 1995 that produced a dramatic 6.2% drop in the country’s gross domestic product (GDP) that year (Detailed Table 5b). By the time migration levels peaked in 1999 and 2000, the Mexican economy was in a full-blown expansion phase, registering 6.6% GDP growth in 2000. Although the economy recovered quickly, the migration impact of a sharp downturn can stretch out as discouragement gradually produces decisions to seek work in another country. Moreover, the expansion’s impact on migration was somewhat muted because productivity gains in Mexico outpaced job creation. As a result, even when it was growing robustly at the end of the decade, the Mexican economy was not generating enough jobs to absorb all new entrants to the labor market. Following 2001, the Mexican economy experienced a downturn in sync with the U.S. economy. Indeed, with much of its economy linked to the U.S. market under the North American Free Trade Agreement, Mexico’s business cycle now very clearly mirrors trends in the U.S. economy.

Macro-economic trends alone do not determine migration flows. A variety of other factors also influence the number of people moving from one place to another, and these can include everything from border controls in a receiving country to agricultural support policies in a sending country. An overarching factor is the operation of family networks that link migrants to relatives left behind. These networks can greatly facilitate new migration by providing access to housing, information about work opportunities and the comfort of familiar faces in a new land. The annual migration flows to the United States, particularly those from Mexico, suggest that all of these factors, especially family networks, combine to create the conditions for the high and increasing levels of immigration recorded for more than two decades. Specific economic circumstances such as the U.S. boom of the late 1990s and the subsequent downturn can then provide the stimuli for specific and contained fluctuations in migration levels of the sort described here.

# Mexican Migration Less Affected by Mexican Labor Force Growth



**Figure 7. Mexican Migration to the United States and Mexican Labor Force Growth: 1991–2004**

Source: Detailed Table 5a.

## MEASUREMENT METHODS


### *Problems with Existing Measures*

Although there have been occasions in the past when immigration has been higher in relation to the size of the country’s population, the number of immigrants coming to the United States has reached unprecedented levels in each of the last three decades (Figure 8). Accurate measurement of immigration is important for developing measures of the total U.S. population and for formulating and evaluating public policy on a variety of issues at the local, state and federal levels. Unfortunately, the United States does not have very good data on the numbers of new immigrants arriving in the country each year and no single source of data adequately measures such flows. Available data from immigration agencies are generally designed for administrative purposes rather than as measures of the number of people moving into the United States; immigrants arriving outside legal channels have increased numerically and as a share of the total inflow. Some of the serious measurement and tracking issues include:

- Legal immigration is conventionally measured as the number of persons getting legal permanent resident status (“green cards”) in a given year. This number bears little relationship to the demographic concept of immigration, which is the number of people moving into the country during the year. In particular, well over half of those getting green cards are “adjusting status” because they are already in the United States (Detailed Table 3). Further, the total number of green cards each year fluctuates wildly because of processing backlogs and resource allocation decisions

made formerly at the Immigration and Naturalization Service (INS) and now at the Department of Homeland Security (DHS). Thus, the annual number of new-arrival green cards stayed within a fairly narrow range for 1995–2002, averaging about 390,000 per year, with the highest level exceeding the lowest by only about 18%. In 2003–2005, new arrivals dropped slightly to about 360,000 per year. In contrast with the relatively smooth pattern of change in new arrivals, the number of status adjustments varied from a low of 245,000 in 1999 to a peak almost three times as large at 680,000 in 2002.<sup>5</sup>

## In-Flows Increase Since 1960s; Relatively Larger in 19th Century



**Figure 8. Immigration by Decade—Number Levels and Percent of U.S. Population: 1821–1830 to 2001–2010**


Source: Detailed Table 4.

Large fluctuations in the number of immigrants arriving in the United States have occurred at various times in the nation’s history, notably during and after the Civil War, coincident with economic swings in the late 19<sup>th</sup> century, and before and after World War I (Figure 9). From the 1930s through the 1980s, variability in annual admissions decreased substantially. Since then, large swings in admissions have again become the norm. Unlike the situation a century ago, however, the current fluctuations do not seem to reflect real changes in the numbers of people entering the country or the numbers wanting to come. While the pattern of annual flows portrayed in the foregoing analysis is very roughly mirrored in the federal government’s administrative data on the processing of key categories of legal immigrants and

<sup>5</sup> Note that the figures in the text refer to fiscal year data published in the *Yearbook of Immigration Statistics*, whereas the data in Detailed Table 3 are weighted averages of the published data, representing March–February years to be comparable with the CPS data.

visitors, the increases in “green cards” and arrivals of students and other temporary migrants that occurred through the 1990s to 2001 and then the subsequent declines appear to reflect processing backlogs, security delays and other developments that followed the September 11 attacks.

## Large Fluctuations in Admissions in 19th Century



**Figure 9. Legal Admissions to the United States by Single Years: Fiscal Years 1820–2004**

Source: *Yearbook of Immigration Statistics: 2004*, Tables 1 and 4.

- Significant numbers of temporary migrants arrive in the United States each year with legal nonimmigrant visas. The vast majority of legal nonimmigrants are not immigrants *per se* but visitors who are coming as tourists or for business.<sup>6</sup> The largest numbers of temporary migrants who could be considered U.S. residents enter as students (F visas and M visas), highly skilled guest workers (H-1B visas), and intracompany transfers (L visas). The data systems for tracking arrivals and residents have improved to some degree but still do not provide the data needed to measure immigration inflows accurately—specifically, how many people have newly entered the country, how many have left and how many have acquired other statuses.<sup>7</sup>
- Large numbers of immigrants arrive without authorization. In recent years, estimates suggest that this group is the largest of the three. While techniques have improved substantially to the point where there seems to be broad agreement that the unauthorized population has reached or exceeds 10 million (Passel 2005), the

<sup>6</sup> Certainly a small share of the 20+ million annual “visitors” become “immigrants” by overstaying their visas and entering the unauthorized migrant population.

<sup>7</sup> See Passel and Fix (2003) and Passel (1997) for a discussion of the needed data and system requirements

available data do not accurately measure year-to-year changes as would be needed to measure inflows.

Measures of the size and composition of the foreign-born population have traditionally drawn on data from the decennial census and two annual surveys conducted by the Census Bureau—March Supplements to the Current Population Survey (CPS) and the American Community Survey (ACS). These data provide an excellent basis for assessing impacts of immigrants. However, comparison of the size of the foreign-born population from one year to the next is not an adequate method for measuring annual changes in size or for measuring inflows. With the number of foreign-born residents reaching 35 million, the standard error (or sampling variability) of the annual change is so large that the year-to-year difference can vary substantially due to random measurement factors. Thus, while the overall trend in foreign-born growth is clear from the annual population totals (Detailed Table 3), it seems unlikely that the annual changes fluctuated between about 84,000 as measured by the 1995–1996 CPS difference to the more than 1.9 million difference between the 1999 and 2000 CPSs. The larger samples of the ACS seem to produce less fluctuation in measured change in the foreign-born population, but other problems remain before year-to-year changes can be converted into inflow estimates.

Annual inflows of new immigrants account for only part of the annual change in the foreign-born population. In demographic terms, there are three components that account for changes in the size of the foreign-born population. The largest is the arrival of new immigrants, now numbering well over 1 million per year. The other two are deaths of immigrants living in the country and outmigration (emigration) of former immigrants. Neither of these flows is small. During the 1990s, deaths of the foreign-born averaged 200,000 to 250,000 per year. This component can be measured directly by vital statistics and its adequacy can be assessed with conventional analysis of mortality data. However, measurement of emigration has been especially problematic. Original estimates for the 1990s were about 275,000 per year (Robinson 2001; Passel 2001). However, new estimates (Van Hook, et al. 2004) suggest that true levels of emigration were probably somewhat higher. Unfortunately, even with current methodological improvements, the available methods and data do not permit development of precise *annual* estimates of emigration required to convert changes in the foreign-born population into measures of newly arriving immigrants.

### ***Immigration Measures from the Census, ACS and CPS***

Our goal of measuring trends and patterns in annual immigration—specifically in the number of foreign-born persons coming to the United States in a given year with the intention of living in the country—and its characteristics thus requires expansion of the data and methods brought to bear on the problem. In assessing immigration levels and trends, we use three sources of data:

- (1) The March Supplements to the Current Population Survey, the annual socioeconomic supplement to the U.S. government’s monthly labor force survey, for 1994–2005, with two different weighting schemes, one covering 1994–2001 and the other overlapping to cover 2000–2005;
- (2) Sample data from Census 2000; and

(3) The American Community Survey (ACS) national sample for 2000–2004.<sup>8</sup>

Two different types of data from these sources enter into our measures. The March CPSs and the ACSs include a question asked of all respondents at least 1 year old about residence one year earlier. Thus, the number of foreign-born who lived abroad one year before the survey data provides an assessment of the inflow of immigrants in the year before the survey. The estimates coming from the analyses of this question, particularly from the CPS,<sup>9</sup> give figures slightly lower than other measures, but, as we will see, the pattern of change across the 1990s and 2000s is consistent with other measures.

The CPS, Census 2000 and the ACS all ask immigrants when they “came to live in the United States.” While there is some controversy about the interpretation of these data in relation to new arrivals of immigrants,<sup>10</sup> their use to assess migration flows is well established and the results track well with other measures. Our approach involves averaging arrival cohorts across several survey years for both the ACS and CPS. It is also necessary to annualize the CPS estimates because the data are only available for arrival in groups of years, not for single years.

Further complications are introduced by the use of CPS data spanning the 1994–2005 period. CPS population figures arise out of a complicated weighting process that uses postcensal population estimates, generated by the Census Bureau and benchmarked to the previous census. In most decades, this switch in weighting from the previous census to a new one introduces only minor discontinuities. However, the Census Bureau underestimated the population count from Census 2000 by almost 5 million persons (Passel 2001) so that CPS data developed with weights based on the 1990 Census differ considerably from similar data developed using weights based on Census 2000. The two groups most affected by the reweighting that occurred officially for March 2002—Asians and Hispanics—are immigrant-dominated populations. Thus, the reweighting process had a marked effect on the size of the foreign-born population as measured by the CPS. Because of the magnitude of the changes introduced by the weighting change, the Census Bureau has released two transitional, overlapping CPS datasets. For March 2001, there is an entire alternative dataset available for producing measures consistent with data from 2002 and later.<sup>11</sup> For March 2000, the Census Bureau supplied an alternative set of weights consistent with the regular March supplement *and* Census 2000 (Passel 2001). Thus, we have two CPS measures for 2000 and 2001 to help assess the impact of the new census results on measures of immigrant inflows.

---

<sup>8</sup> For 2000 and 2001, the ACS was designated as the Census Supplementary Survey. For clarity and conciseness, we refer to both as ACS samples, for 2000 and 2001 respectively.

<sup>9</sup> The overlapping sample design of the CPS may affect measures of residence one year earlier because half of the sample housing units stay in the CPS from the previous year. Also, edit and imputation schemes may affect the final data.

<sup>10</sup> Redstone and Massey 2003; Myers 2004.

<sup>11</sup> This CPS, designated by the Census Bureau as the SCHIP (State Children’s Health Insurance Program) sample, is completely separate from the regular March 2001 Supplement. The SCHIP sample incorporates the sample expansion introduced in March 2002 and uses the new weighting methods introduced in 2002 as well as population controls based on Census 2000. See below.

### *Year/Period of Arrival*

The CPS, the ACS and Census 2000 all include a series of questions asking place of birth, citizenship and the year that respondents born outside the United States “came to live” in the United States. These questions define the immigrant or foreign-born population as persons born outside the United States who were not US citizens at birth. The estimates in Detailed Tables 2a–2d3 labeled “arrival” are derived from the Census, ACS and CPS questions on the year that respondents came to live in the United States.

**Census 2000.** The estimates from Census 2000 use the 5-percent Public-Use Microdata Sample (PUMS) as augmented with assignments of legal status (Passel, Van Hook and Bean 2005). The estimates are straightforward tabulations of the foreign-born population for single years of arrival by race/Hispanic origin,<sup>12</sup> legal status, country of birth or state of residence. The only estimation required is for the year 2000. Census data for arrivals in 2000 are incomplete because the census enumerates persons at their residence as of April 1, 2000. Persons entering the U.S. after April 1 should not be included in the census count; however, the census enumeration process actually spreads over a period of several months after April 1 as enumerators collect information from persons who failed to respond initially to the Census. Accordingly, we treat the data for persons arriving in 2000 as representing one third of the entrants during the calendar year rather than the one fourth share implied by the Census date. Thus, the estimate from the 2000 PUMS of 589,000 immigrants arriving in 2000 is inflated to the figure of 1,765,000 for the full year shown in Detailed Table 1a.

**American Community Surveys, 2000–2004.** The detailed data collected in the American Community Survey are basically the same as collected in the sample phase of the Census. The ACS design, however, differs in that the survey consists of non-overlapping samples collected on a monthly basis over the course of the calendar year rather than the traditional census or survey method of collecting all data for a specific reference date. For our ACS-based estimates, we again use tabulations from the PUMS. For 2000–2004, the ACS was not in full production; the sample size will be 250,000 households per month, or 3 million per year, but during testing the ACS had a nominal sample size of 700,000 households over the course of the calendar year. Because only about one third of nonresponses are followed up in the ACS, the actual sample size for each year was about 480,000.<sup>13</sup> The ACS, as implemented for these years, covers only the household population, not the whole population, of the United States; accordingly, the ACS figures for immigrants are slightly less than the Census values in 2000 and are a bit lower in other years than the entire U.S. total would be, were it available.

As with the Census-based estimates, we use straightforward tabulations of the foreign-born population by single years of arrival from the ACS as our initial estimates for

---

<sup>12</sup> The race data in Census 2000 allow for individuals to be assigned to more than one race group. For consistency with historical data and for simplicity of presentation, we assign multiple-race individuals to single races using a hierarchical assignment process. The hierarchy for assignment is: Black, Asian or Pacific Islander, white or “some other race” (assigned as white), and American Indian or Alaska Native. (See Suro et al., 2005.)

<sup>13</sup> For 2001–2004, data from all ACS households were released in the PUMS. For the Census 2000 Supplementary Survey (C2SS) which represented the ACS for 2000, only about one quarter of the households in the full ACS sample were released in the PUMS.

race/Hispanic groups,<sup>14</sup> countries of birth and states of residence. There are several data-driven limitations to the ACS estimates, though. Because of the smaller sample size of the ACS, not all of the countries of birth coded in Census 2000 were available in the ACS; the impact of this limitation is small, however, since all large sending countries are separately identified in the data. We did not generate estimates of inflows by legal status because the status assignments have not been done with ACS data.

The ACS estimates for each year of arrival presented in Detailed Tables 2a–2d3 are an average of the five individual ACS estimates (i.e., from the 2000–2004 ACSs). The principal technical issue in developing these averages is the handling of estimates of the number of immigrants arriving in the year of the survey, because the data are collected throughout the year rather than at the end of the year. Thus, the tabulated ACS data from 2003, for example, do not generate an estimate of the full number of immigrants arriving in 2003. This deficiency affects the estimates for 2000–2004 only, not those for years before 2000. Immigrant arrivals in each year through 1999 are averages of five individual estimates. For the 2000–2003 estimates, the survey conducted in the year of the estimate is dropped from the average; that is, the average estimate for 2000, as shown in Detailed Tables 2a–2d3, is based on four separate estimates from the 2001–2004 ACSs; for 2001, from the three ACSs of 2002–2004; for 2002, from the two ACSs of 2003–2004, and for 2003, from the 2004 ACS alone. The estimate shown for 2004 is obtained by inflating the partial-year data from 2004 to a full-year estimate. The inflation factor for 2004 is the average of factors for 2000–2003 obtained by computing the ratio of the partial-year estimate from the year’s survey to the full-year estimate from the next year’s ACS. For example, the inflation factor for the 2000 ACS is the ratio of immigrant entries in 2000 from the 2000 ACS (a partial year) to immigrant entries in 2000 from the 2001 ACS (a full year).

**Current Population Surveys, 1994–2005.** The Current Population Survey is the U.S. government’s labor force survey that provides the monthly data used for the official measure of the unemployment rate. Beginning in 1994, the information needed to identify immigrants and to measure immigration (country of birth, citizenship and year of entry) was added to the data collected in the basic CPS and its supplements as part of the redesign process done every decade. The regular monthly CPS is a complex state-based sample of about 50,000 households; each month’s sample overlaps with the previous year and adjacent months to minimize the variance of estimates of month-to-month change in employment. In March of every year, the sample size is increased by augmenting it with CPS households from other months; the data collected are greatly expanded also. The additional data include information on income (by source of income), health insurance, participation in social programs, detailed labor force history and a variety of other items. The CPS universe is the civilian, noninstitutional population; this universe is larger than the ACSs—the household population—but smaller than the Census’s universe—the total population.

Through 2001, the March CPS expansion increased the sample size by about 10% over the regular monthly sample to 55,000 households by doubling the sample of Hispanic households. The weights for the CPS are based on the Census Bureau’s population estimates obtained by updating the previous census. So the population estimates for the March 1994–2001

---

<sup>14</sup> All years of the ACS allow multiple-race responses. Accordingly individuals in the PUMS were classified by race using the same hierarchical methodology as applied to Census 2000.

CPSs are based on the 1990 Census, *as corrected for undercount*, using detailed national estimates by age, sex and race; national estimates by age, sex and Hispanic origin; and state estimates of the population aged 16 and over. In general, figures for the foreign-born population from these 1990-based CPSs are less than those from 2000-based CPSs.

In the post-2000 redesign of the CPS, the March supplement sample size was increased substantially to about 80,000 households by oversampling households with children and minority households other than Hispanics (which were already oversampled).<sup>15</sup> The weighting scheme was also changed. The weights for the post-2000 redesign are based on Census 2000, *without a correction for undercount*, using the same detailed national categories for age, sex and race; national estimates for age, sex and Hispanic origin; and state estimates but for all ages and with detail by broad age groups, sex and simplified race groups. The redesigned questionnaire, expanded sample and new weighting scheme were introduced for the March 2002 supplement. Beginning in 2003, the race question was changed to allow for multiple responses as in Census 2000 and the ACS; to incorporate these new race data, the weighting categories were adjusted slightly by placing all persons with multiple race responses into a separate weighting group. For March 2001, the Census Bureau tested the entire redesign including the greatly expanded sample (but not the new race question) and released a separate set of CPS data for that year that are consistent with the data for March 2002 and later. In addition, for the March 2000 supplement, the Census Bureau produced a special set of CPS weights consistent with the population as enumerated in Census 2000 rather than the official CPS data for March 2000 which are weighted to a population estimate based on the 1990 Census carried forward to 2000. As a result of the redesign and testing, we have a series of March CPS supplements for 2000–2005 that are consistent with Census 2000 and that overlap for two years with the 1990-based series of 1994–2001.<sup>16</sup> We use the CPS supplements to produce two separate series of immigration estimates by race, by country of birth,<sup>17</sup> by legal status<sup>18</sup> and by state of residence—a 1990-based series and a 2000-based series.

Producing annual estimates of immigrants arriving from the CPS question on year of arrival in the United States is more complicated than the analogous process for Census 2000 and for the ACSs of 2000–2004. Although the CPS collects information on year of arrival for every

---

<sup>15</sup> For details of CPS design, weighting and methods, see U.S. Census Bureau 2000 and 2002.

<sup>16</sup> For 1994 and 1995, the official CPS data from the Census Bureau and the Bureau of Labor Statistics (BLS) have weights and race data that are incorrect and inconsistent with subsequent data because of errors in the collection and editing of the race item. We use a set of weights produce by the author for the Urban Institute that correct the race data and CPS weights (Passel 1996). The error mainly affects data for Asians and American Indians; the correction adds substantially more than 2 million persons to the foreign-born population.

<sup>17</sup> We augment the official data on country of birth by editing the data to assign country of birth to about three quarters of the more than 1 million persons reported in the CPSs of 1999 and later as “country of birth unknown” or “some other country.” The Census and ACS data do not include equivalent categories because they incorporate more extensive edits to eliminate such responses (or, more properly, such nonresponses). The data on country of birth collected and released for March 1994 cover only about 30 specific countries, rather than the full complement of countries and regions of birth covered in other CPSs, Census 2000, and the ACS. Accordingly, we do not use data by country of birth from the 1994 CPS.

<sup>18</sup> The legal status data use the methodology first created by Passel and Clark (1998) for the Urban Institute and later adapted to Census 2000 (Passel et al. 2004, 2005). The legal status assignments have not been implemented with CPS data for 1994 and 1997 and the assignments for March 2005 have not been completed, so the estimates by legal status developed here exclude those CPSs.

year, the data released to the public group the responses into intervals. Thus, for the period of interest (i.e., 1992 and later), the CPS provides information only for two-year periods of arrival, beginning with even-numbered years; that is, the data responses are coded as arrived in 1992–93, 1994–95, 1996–97, etc. To produce annual estimates of arrivals, we assign each year of the two-year period the same value equal to one half of the estimate for the two-year period. A further complication is introduced because the most recent period of arrival in every CPS is expanded to include the current year of the survey. Also, since all of the coded intervals must begin with an even numbered year and must include at least two full years (according to the Census Bureau’s data disclosure standards), the most recent period of arrival is coded to cover three full years plus the partial year of the survey in odd-numbered years. Since the March CPS interviews are done during the week including March 19, the most recent arrival period shown in even-numbered years covers two full years and 2.5 months (i.e., 1992–94 for the March 1994 CPS; 1994–96 for March 1996, 1996–98 in March 1998, etc.). In odd-numbered years, the most recent period of arrival encompasses three years and 2.5 months (i.e., 1992–95 for the March 1995 CPS; 1994–97 for March 1997, 1996–99 for March 1999, etc.). To estimate annual arrivals by calendar year for these most recent periods, we divide the number of immigrants arriving in the interval by the number of years covered (either 2.208 or 3.208) and assign the average value to each year covered by the interval, including the year of collection. This averaging across periods tends to smooth out the time series of estimates and produce estimates that change in “steps” when compared with the series from the ACS and Census. (Note, for example, in Detailed Tables 2a–2d3, that the 2000-based CPS values for immigrants arriving during 1990–1999 are identical in adjacent years whereas the ACS and Census estimates vary from year to year.)

The CPS-based estimates from the period of arrival data are also averaged across multiple CPSs. Because of sampling variability and attrition of some arrival cohorts due to the combined effects of small sample sizes, emigration and mortality, not all of the CPSs could be used for every estimate year. However, all periods of arrival, with a very few exceptions, draw on data from at least three CPS supplements; the following table details the supplements used to estimate arrivals for each calendar year:

<u>Calendar years for arrivals</u>	<u>Supplements for 1990-based series</u>	<u>Supplements for 2000-based series</u>
1990–1991	March 1994–96	March 2001–02
1992–1993	March 1994–01	March 2000–01
1994–1995 <sup>a</sup>	March 1996–01	March 2000–02
1996–1997 <sup>a</sup>	March 1998–01	March 2000–04
1998–1999 <sup>a</sup>	March 2000–01	March 2000–03
2000–2001 <sup>a</sup>	March 2000–01	March 2002–05
2002–2003 <sup>a</sup>	—	March 2004–05
2004 <sup>a</sup>	—	March 2004–05

<sup>a</sup> Note that for each of these periods, the two March supplements for the specific years are used with the noted adjustments for partial years. That is, to develop estimates for calendar 1996, for example, the data for average annual arrivals during 1994–96 from the March 1996 CPS are incorporated, but with a weight of 0.208, and the data for average annual arrivals during 1994–97 from the March 1997 CPS are incorporated with a weight of 1.0.

In averaging the annual estimates across multiple CPS observations, each CPS is given an equal weight except that the annualized estimates for the year of the CPS supplement (e.g., the estimate for 2002 based on the March 2002 CPS) are only weighted at 0.208 or a weight equivalent to an observation covering 2.5 out of 12 months.

Because of the multiple averaging involved in developing estimates for calendar year arrivals from CPS data, the CPS-based time series of arrivals tend to be smoother than the other estimates (Detailed Tables 2a–2d3). Because they are averaged across time and CPSs, the increases to peak values tend to start a year earlier than other estimates, the peak values sometimes last a year longer than other estimates, and the declines from the peaks tend to start a year later than in some series. There are substantial differences in the estimates developed from 1990-based CPS weights (the series for 1994–2001 CPS data) and those developed from the 2000-based CPS weights (the series for 2000–2005 CPS data). The 1990-based population estimates were substantially different from the population figures that emerged from Census 2000. Specifically, the 1990-based population estimates understated the Hispanic and Asian populations by a bit more than 10%, with some of the age-sex groups (e.g., Hispanic males ages 20–29) falling as much as 20 to 30% below the Census 2000 counts. Further, the state-level estimates for states that were new destinations for immigrants, especially for Hispanic immigrants, were lower than Census 2000 counts, especially for the minority populations in these states. The introduction of Census 2000-based population data into the weighting process thus led to significantly higher figures for immigrants. The overall foreign-born totals, in Detailed Table 3, show that the 1990-based totals for 2000 and 2001 are about 6% less than the 2000-based figures. The impact of new weights is, of course, much larger for Hispanic and Asian populations and for more recent arrival cohorts. Thus, comparison of the averaged estimates for arrival cohorts in Detailed Table 2a shows that the Hispanic figures for 1990–2001 arrivals run about 20% lower for the 1990-based estimates; for Asians and blacks, the 1990-based estimates also are lower but with more variability than for Hispanics; for white immigrants, the 1990-based estimates are actually slightly larger than the 2000-based series. Whereas some of these differences are substantial, they should not be taken as indicative of flaws in the overall estimates; rather, they demonstrate the degree of error that had built up in the population estimates and data series for the 1990s due to inadequate information about immigrant flows to the United States (Passel 2001).

### ***Residence 1 Year Ago***

The ACS asks respondents “Where did this person live 1 year ago?” while the CPS asks “Where did [respondent] live on March 1, [insert previous year]?” This question is asked of respondents more than 1 year old who report living in a different house or apartment on the reference date. We use these data to identify immigrants during a year—defined as foreign-born individuals who report living outside the United States in response to these questions. Census 2000 has a similar question but the reference date is five years before the census (i.e., April 1, 1995) so we do not use these data in this study.

**American Community Survey, 2000–2004.** The development of estimates from the ACS information on residence one year earlier is very straightforward compared with the year of immigration variables. We first tabulate foreign-born individuals who report living outside the United States a year ago by race, by country of birth and by state of residence using the procedures described above for these variables. The only issue in combining the estimates is the

date of reference for the migration period. Since the ACS data are collected through the calendar year, we assume that, on average, the data were collected at the midpoint of the survey year; for example, we assume that the 2003 ACS data were collected as of July 1, 2003. Thus, the reference period during which migration is assumed to have occurred is July 1 of the year before the survey through June 30 of the year of the survey. To convert these estimates to calendar years, we average estimates from adjacent ACS years with weights of 0.5; for 1999 estimates, we use one half of the value from the 2000 ACS and assume that it applies to the entire calendar year. Likewise for 2004, we assume that the ACS value for migration applies to the whole year. The results of this averaging process are shown as estimates of immigration (labeled as “yr ago”) for 1999–2004 in Detailed Tables 2a–2d3.

**Current Population Surveys, 1994–2005.** Again, the CPS estimates are somewhat more complex than the ACS estimates, but the overall process is very similar. Again, we first tabulate the number of foreign-born individuals who lived outside the United States one year before the survey from each March CPS Supplement by race, by legal status, by country of birth, and by state. We again have two separate series of estimates—based on the 1994–2001 CPSs for 1990-based weights and on the 2000–2005 CPS for the 2000-based weights. As before, each series is treated separately. Because of the data deficiencies noted above, we do not use country of birth data from the 1994 CPS, and the values for other years have been edited to reduce the number of unknowns; the race data for 1994–95 have been edited to correct Census Bureau processing errors and the data for 2003–05 edited to assign multiracial individuals to single races. We do not have legal status information for the 1994, 1997 and 2005 CPSs, so the annualized estimates for years affected by these surveys draw on less information.

Finally, the CPS data required one further modification. In processing the data, it became apparent that there were serious problems with the residence one year earlier data from the March 1995 CPS. Specifically, the estimated annual immigration based on this survey was only about 55% of the estimated values from the 1994 and 1996 CPSs. However, there was no indication from any other data source (including the year of arrival data) to suggest that the numbers were so low during the period. It appears that an additional question in the March 1995 CPS asking about residence *five* years earlier may have affected responses to the residence *one* year ago question. Because of these data problems, we dropped the 1995 data from this analysis.<sup>19</sup>

The conversion of basic CPS tabulation of immigrants in the year before the survey followed the annualization process described above for averaging ACS data. The reference period of the migration is specified more clearly in the CPS than in the ACS, so the process for developing calendar year estimates is also better specified. Specifically, the annual estimate of immigration for the year before the CPS using the residence one year ago data weights the current CPS for 10 months and the previous CPS for 2 months. For example, the number of immigrants arriving in calendar year 1998 is computed as 10 times the foreign-born population living outside the U.S. one year ago identified in the March 1999 CPS plus twice the number from the March 1998 CPS with the total divided by 12 (i.e., 10+2). If either year is missing (as with 1995 data as just noted or, for example, 1997 data on legal status), an adjustment is made in

---

<sup>19</sup> The March 2005 CPS Supplement also included this question about residence 5 years ago in addition to the question on residence 1 year ago. There are some indications that the residence 1 year ago data from 2005 may be somewhat “out of line” with other data, but the 2005 figures are *higher* than expected, not substantially lower.

the denominator so that, in essence, the migration rate observed in the available CPS is assumed to apply to the entire calendar year.

Detailed Table 2a–2d3 shows the two separate series of annualized estimates based on CPS data for residence one year ago. Again, the weighting has an impact on the estimates as the 2000-based weights give measures of immigration about 10% higher than the 1990-based weights. There is, however, little overlap in the series as only the 2000 and 2001 CPSs carry two sets of weights. In contrast to the period of arrival estimates, the ACS tends to yield somewhat higher estimates of immigration from the residence one year ago question than the CPS estimates. Because the time reference in the CPS is more specific than in the ACS (i.e., “March 1” versus “1 year ago”), the ACS may pick up more migrants and movers whose actual date of moving occurred slightly more than one year before the interview.<sup>20</sup> Alternatively, the ACS-CPS difference may be due to sampling variability or differences in the population estimates used in weighting the surveys.


### ***Combined Estimates***

To arrive at a single set of immigration values for calendar years 1992–2004, we take a simple average of the estimates available for each year, but restrict the averaging to estimates based on weights consistent with Census 2000. Specifically, the estimates incorporated into our overall average are: (a) Census 2000 estimates based on year of arrival for 1992–2000; (b) average ACS estimates based on year of arrival for 1992–2004; (c) average CPS 2000-based estimates based on year of arrival for 1992–2004; (d) average ACS estimates based on residence abroad 1 year ago for 1999–2004; (e) average CPS 2000-based estimates based on residence abroad 1 year ago for 1999–2004. In averaging these estimates (most of which are averages themselves), we are trying to address questions surrounding the *trend* in immigration over this period, not the *level* of immigration. The different measurement techniques provide somewhat different information about levels of immigration but all show the same trends over time. Thus, the average across methods should not be treated as the single best measure of the number of immigrants entering the country, but rather as an indicator of the relative contributions of different groups (e.g., race, legal status, geography) to immigration and of how these contributions have changed over time.

---

<sup>20</sup> The CPS changed the wording of its question in March 2005 to correspond to the ACS wording. The March 2005 CPS shows much higher levels of immigration in response to this question than does the March 2004 CPS. This difference may represent a real increase, but part of it may be attributable to the response pattern noted in the text.

## All Measures of Annual Flows Show Similar Trends for 1992–2004




**Figure 10. Annual Immigration to the United States by Data Source and Estimation Method: 1991–2004**

Source: Detailed Table 2a.

Figure 10 shows the estimated annual level of immigration for all of the series of annual estimates based on different methods; Figure 11 shows the same level of detail, but for immigration from Mexico. The variability across different estimate methods is clear in both figures as the lines show a range of several hundred thousand from highest to lowest for a number of years. The largest high-low differences tend to be in peak immigration years, however. What is also apparent from the figures is that all of the separate estimates series show similar patterns of a relatively low plateau at the beginning, an increase to peak values, followed by a decline from the peak.

# Mexican Migration Measures Follow Similar Trends



**Figure 11. Annual Mexican Immigration to the United States by Data Source and Estimation Method: 1991–2004**

Source: Detailed Table 2b.

## REFERENCES

- Camarota, Steven A. 2004. *Economy Slowed, But Immigration Didn't: The Foreign-Born Population, 2000-2004*. Backgrounder. Washington, DC: Center for Immigration Studies. November.
- Ellis, Mark and Richard Wright. 1998. "When immigrants are not migrants: Counting arrivals of the foreign born using the US census." *International Migration Review* 32:127-144.
- Kochhar, Rakesh. 2005. *Latino Labor Report, 2004: More Jobs for New Immigrants but at Lower Wages*. Washington, DC: Pew Hispanic Center. May 26. (Also, <http://pewhispanic.org/files/reports/45.pdf>.)
- Kochhar, Rakesh. 2004. *Latino Labor Report, 2003: Strong but Uneven Gains in Employment*. Washington, DC: Pew Hispanic Center. February 23. (Also, <http://pewhispanic.org/files/reports/26.pdf>.)
- Kochhar, Rakesh, Roberto Suro, and Sony Tafoya. 2005. *The New Latino South: The Context and Consequences of Rapid Population Growth*. Washington, DC: Pew Hispanic Center. August 26. (Also, <http://pewhispanic.org/files/reports/50.pdf>.)
- Myers, Dowell. 2004. "Accuracy of Data Collected by the Census Question on Immigrants' Year of Arrival." Population Dynamics Research Group, School of Policy, Planning, and Development, University of Southern California, Working Paper No PDRG04-01. January. (Also, [http://www-ref.usc.edu/~dowell/pdf/Year\\_of\\_Arrival\\_Brief10b.pdf](http://www-ref.usc.edu/~dowell/pdf/Year_of_Arrival_Brief10b.pdf).)
- Passel, Jeffrey S. 2005. *Unauthorized Migrants: Numbers and Characteristics*. Washington, DC: Pew Hispanic Center. June 14. (Also, <http://pewhispanic.org/files/reports/46.pdf>.)
- Passel, Jeffrey S. 2001. "An Evaluation of Demographic Analysis." In *Final Report of the Census Monitoring Board, Presidential Members*. Washington, DC. September. (Also, [www.cmbp.gov](http://www.cmbp.gov))
- Passel, Jeffrey S. 1997. *Immigration Statistics: No Longer Neglected, But Still Inadequate*. Statistical Policy Working Paper 26, Seminar on Statistical Methodology in the Public Service, Office of Information and Regulatory Affairs. Washington, DC: Office of Management and Budget. August.
- Passel, Jeffrey S. 1996. "Problem with March 1994 and 1995 CPS Weighting (and Revised Weights)." Research Memorandum for CPS Users. Washington, DC: Urban Institute. November (Revised November 1998).
- Passel, Jeffrey S., Randolph Capps, and Michael E. Fix. 2002. *The Dispersal of Immigrants in the 1990s*. Information Brief No. 2 in *Series on Immigrant Families and Workers: Facts and Perspectives*. Washington, DC: Urban Institute. November 26. (Also, <http://www.urban.org/url.cfm?ID=410589>.)
- Passel, Jeffrey S. and Rebecca L. Clark. 1998. *Immigrants in New York: Their Legal Status, Incomes and Tax Payments*. Washington, DC: Urban Institute. April.
- Passel, Jeffrey S. and Michael Fix. 2003. "What Do We Need to Know? Implications of Homeland Security for Immigration Data." Speech delivered at *INS and the Department*

- of Homeland Security: A Farewell Tribute— A Look Ahead*, sponsored by the Migration Policy Institute. Washington, DC. February 28.
- Passel, Jeffrey S., Jennifer Van Hook, and Frank D. Bean. 2005. *Demographic Profile of Unauthorized Migrants and Other Immigrants, Based on Census 2000: Characteristics and Methods*. Report to the Census Bureau. Washington, DC: Sabre Systems. August. (Also, [http://www.sabresys.com/i\\_whitepapers.asp](http://www.sabresys.com/i_whitepapers.asp).)
- Passel, Jeffrey S., Jennifer Van Hook, and Frank D. Bean. 2004. *Estimates of Legal and Unauthorized Foreign Born Population for the United States and Selected States, Based on Census 2000*. Report to the Census Bureau. Washington, DC: Urban Institute. June 1. (Also, [http://www.sabresys.com/i\\_whitepapers.asp](http://www.sabresys.com/i_whitepapers.asp).)
- Redstone, Ilana and Douglas S. Massey. 2003. “Coming to Stay: An Analysis of the U.S. Census Question on Year of Arrival.” Paper presented at the Annual Meetings of the Population Association of America. Minneapolis, MN.
- Robinson, J. Gregory. 2001. *Accuracy and Coverage Evaluation: Demographic Analysis Results*. DSSD Census 2000 Procedures and Operations Memorandum Series B-4. Washington, DC: U.S. Census Bureau. March 2. (Also, <http://www.census.gov/dmd/www/pdf/Fr4.pdf>)
- Suro, Roberto, Richard Fry, and Jeffrey S. Passel. 2005. *Hispanics and the 2004 Election: Population, Electorate and Voters*. Washington, DC: Pew Hispanic Center. June 27. (Also, <http://pewhispanic.org/files/reports/48.pdf>.)
- U.S. Census Bureau. 2002. *Current Population Survey: Design and Methodology*. Technical Paper 63RV (TP63RV). Washington, DC: U.S. Census Bureau. March. (Also, <http://www.census.gov/prod/2002pubs/tp63rv.pdf>.)
- U.S. Census Bureau. 2000. *Current Population Survey: Design and Methodology*. Technical Paper 63 (TP63). Washington, DC: U.S. Census Bureau. March. (Also, <http://www.census.gov/prod/2000pubs/tp63.pdf>.)
- Van Hook, Jennifer, Jeffrey S. Passel, Weiwei Zhang, and Frank D. Bean. 2004. *Foreign-Born Emigration: New Approaches and Estimates Based on Matched Current Population Survey (CPS) Files*. Report to the Census Bureau. Urban Institute: Washington, DC. September. (Also, [http://www.sabresys.com/i\\_whitepapers.asp](http://www.sabresys.com/i_whitepapers.asp).) Forthcoming in *Demography*.

**APPENDIX A. DETAILED TABLES**

for

**RISE, PEAK, AND DECLINE:  
TRENDS IN U.S. IMMIGRATION 1992–2004**

By  
Jeffrey S. Passel  
Roberto Suro

**Detailed  
Table 1a.**

**Average Annual Immigration for Calendar Years, 1990-2004,  
by Race/Hispanic Origin and by Legal Status  
based on CPS, ACS, and Census 2000 Data**

(In thousands)

Calendar Year	Hispanic/Race Groups					Legal Status				
	Total**	Hisp.	API*	White*	Black*	Total#	LPR	Undoc.	Legal Temp.	
<b>Average Annualized Immigration</b>										
1990	1,287	687	318	194	87	(na)	800	473	(x)	
1991	1,060	504	296	188	70	(na)	711	395	(x)	
<b>1992</b>	<b>1,066</b>	<b>502</b>	<b>298</b>	<b>196</b>	<b>69</b>	<b>(na)</b>	<b>675</b>	<b>394</b>	<b>161</b>	
<b>1993</b>	<b>1,031</b>	<b>506</b>	<b>268</b>	<b>190</b>	<b>66</b>	<b>(na)</b>	<b>646</b>	<b>401</b>	<b>161</b>	
<b>1994</b>	<b>1,129</b>	<b>561</b>	<b>266</b>	<b>214</b>	<b>86</b>	<b>(na)</b>	<b>630</b>	<b>519</b>	<b>158</b>	
<b>1995</b>	<b>1,256</b>	<b>651</b>	<b>286</b>	<b>221</b>	<b>96</b>	<b>(na)</b>	<b>671</b>	<b>581</b>	<b>154</b>	
<b>1996</b>	<b>1,171</b>	<b>556</b>	<b>287</b>	<b>232</b>	<b>95</b>	<b>1,234</b>	<b>573</b>	<b>503</b>	<b>157</b>	
<b>1997</b>	<b>1,198</b>	<b>551</b>	<b>307</b>	<b>246</b>	<b>93</b>	<b>1,257</b>	<b>573</b>	<b>517</b>	<b>167</b>	
1998	1,462	729	334	301	96	1,541	615	668	258	
<b>1999</b>	<b>1,529</b>	<b>729</b>	<b>344</b>	<b>357</b>	<b>98</b>	<b>1,594</b>	<b>659</b>	<b>656</b>	<b>279</b>	
<b>2000</b>	<b>1,552</b>	<b>773</b>	<b>334</b>	<b>343</b>	<b>98</b>	<b>1,559</b>	<b>635</b>	<b>667</b>	<b>257</b>	
2001	1,388	644	318	318	105	1,386	578	549	260	
<b>2002</b>	<b>1,168</b>	<b>553</b>	<b>292</b>	<b>231</b>	<b>91</b>	<b>1,140</b>	<b>484</b>	<b>450</b>	<b>206</b>	
<b>2003</b>	<b>1,102</b>	<b>541</b>	<b>276</b>	<b>215</b>	<b>68</b>	<b>1,041</b>	<b>417</b>	<b>451</b>	<b>173</b>	
<b>2004</b>	<b>1,226</b>	<b>636</b>	<b>282</b>	<b>231</b>	<b>76</b>	<b>1,191</b>	<b>455</b>	<b>562</b>	<b>174</b>	
<b>Start</b>	<b>'92-'97</b>	<b>1,142</b>	<b>554</b>	<b>285</b>	<b>217</b>	<b>84</b>	<b>1,245</b>	<b>628</b>	<b>486</b>	<b>160</b>
<b>Peak</b>	<b>'99-'00</b>	<b>1,540</b>	<b>751</b>	<b>339</b>	<b>350</b>	<b>98</b>	<b>1,577</b>	<b>647</b>	<b>662</b>	<b>268</b>
<b>End</b>	<b>'02-'04</b>	<b>1,165</b>	<b>576</b>	<b>283</b>	<b>226</b>	<b>78</b>	<b>1,124</b>	<b>452</b>	<b>488</b>	<b>185</b>
<b>Change (Amount)</b>										
	to Peak	398	196	54	133	14	331	19	176	108
	to End	-375	-174	-56	-124	-20	-452	-195	-174	-83
<b>Change (%)</b>										
	to Peak	35%	35%	19%	62%	17%	27%	3%	36%	68%
	to End	-24%	-23%	-17%	-35%	-20%	-29%	-30%	-26%	-31%

**Detailed  
Table 1a.**

**Average Annual Immigration for Calendar Years, 1990-2004,  
by Race/Hispanic Origin and by Legal Status  
based on CPS, ACS, and Census 2000 Data**

(In thousands)

Calendar Year	Hispanic/Race Groups					Legal Status			
	Total**	Hisp.	API*	White*	Black*	Total#	LPR	Undoc.	Legal Temp.
<b>Percent of Total Immigration</b>									
1990	100%	53%	25%	15%	7%	(na)	62%	37%	(x)
1991	100%	48%	28%	18%	7%	(na)	55%	31%	(x)
<b>1992</b>	<b>100%</b>	<b>47%</b>	<b>28%</b>	<b>18%</b>	<b>6%</b>	<b>(na)</b>	<b>52%</b>	<b>31%</b>	<b>12%</b>
<b>1993</b>	<b>100%</b>	<b>49%</b>	<b>26%</b>	<b>18%</b>	<b>6%</b>	<b>(na)</b>	<b>50%</b>	<b>31%</b>	<b>12%</b>
<b>1994</b>	<b>100%</b>	<b>50%</b>	<b>24%</b>	<b>19%</b>	<b>8%</b>	<b>(na)</b>	<b>49%</b>	<b>40%</b>	<b>12%</b>
<b>1995</b>	<b>100%</b>	<b>52%</b>	<b>23%</b>	<b>18%</b>	<b>8%</b>	<b>(na)</b>	<b>52%</b>	<b>45%</b>	<b>12%</b>
<b>1996</b>	<b>100%</b>	<b>47%</b>	<b>25%</b>	<b>20%</b>	<b>8%</b>	<b>100%</b>	<b>46%</b>	<b>41%</b>	<b>13%</b>
<b>1997</b>	<b>100%</b>	<b>46%</b>	<b>26%</b>	<b>21%</b>	<b>8%</b>	<b>100%</b>	<b>46%</b>	<b>41%</b>	<b>13%</b>
1998	100%	50%	23%	21%	7%	100%	40%	43%	17%
<b>1999</b>	<b>100%</b>	<b>48%</b>	<b>22%</b>	<b>23%</b>	<b>6%</b>	<b>100%</b>	<b>41%</b>	<b>41%</b>	<b>18%</b>
<b>2000</b>	<b>100%</b>	<b>50%</b>	<b>22%</b>	<b>22%</b>	<b>6%</b>	<b>100%</b>	<b>41%</b>	<b>43%</b>	<b>16%</b>
2001	100%	46%	23%	23%	8%	100%	42%	40%	19%
<b>2002</b>	<b>100%</b>	<b>47%</b>	<b>25%</b>	<b>20%</b>	<b>8%</b>	<b>100%</b>	<b>42%</b>	<b>39%</b>	<b>18%</b>
<b>2003</b>	<b>100%</b>	<b>49%</b>	<b>25%</b>	<b>20%</b>	<b>6%</b>	<b>100%</b>	<b>40%</b>	<b>43%</b>	<b>17%</b>
<b>2004</b>	<b>100%</b>	<b>52%</b>	<b>23%</b>	<b>19%</b>	<b>6%</b>	<b>100%</b>	<b>38%</b>	<b>47%</b>	<b>15%</b>
<b>Start '92-'97</b>	<b>100%</b>	<b>49%</b>	<b>25%</b>	<b>19%</b>	<b>7%</b>	<b>(x)</b>	<b>55%</b>	<b>43%</b>	<b>14%</b>
<b>Peak '99-'00</b>	<b>100%</b>	<b>49%</b>	<b>22%</b>	<b>23%</b>	<b>6%</b>	<b>(x)</b>	<b>42%</b>	<b>43%</b>	<b>17%</b>
<b>End '02-'04</b>	<b>100%</b>	<b>49%</b>	<b>24%</b>	<b>19%</b>	<b>7%</b>	<b>(x)</b>	<b>39%</b>	<b>42%</b>	<b>16%</b>
<b>Change (Amount)</b>									
to Peak	100%	49%	13%	33%	4%	100%	6%	53%	33%
to End	100%	46%	15%	33%	5%	100%	43%	38%	18%
<b>Change (%)</b>									
to Peak	(na)	0%	-3%	4%	-1%	(na)	-13%	0%	3%
to End	(na)	1%	2%	-3%	0%	(na)	-3%	-1%	-2%

Source: Passel (2005), Pew Hispanic Center.

Note: Estimates are weighted averages of annual estimates using 2000-based weights and data on: (a) year of arrival from the Current Population Surveys of March 2000-2005, the American Community Surveys of 2000-2004, and Census 2000; and (b) data on residence 1 year ago from the March Current Population Surveys of 2000-2005 and the American Community Surveys of 2000-2004. Data from March Current Population Surveys for 1994-2001 using 1990-based weights show similar trends but lower levels of arrivals. See text for details.

\* Non-Hispanic only. Multiple-race responses from Census 2000, ACS, and 2003-2004 CPS based on hierarchical assignment as: Black, Asian-Pacific Islander (API), White, and American Indian

\*\* Total includes American Indian/Alaska Native not shown separately.

# Legal status at time of survey. Totals do not add because data on temporary migrants are available only from the Census and CPSs in the 1-3 years following arrival. LPRs, or Legal Permanent Residents, include those arriving as refugees and those who have naturalized.

(x) -- not available.

(na) -- not applicable.

Detailed  
Table 1b.

**Average Annual Immigration for Calendar Years, 1990-2004,  
by Country or Region of Birth  
based on CPS, ACS, and Census 2000 Data**

(In thousands)

Calendar Year	Country of Birth							
	Total	Mexico	Other Latin Amer.	Europe & Can.	India	Middle East*	Other Asia	All Other
<b>Average Annualized Immigration</b>								
1990	1,287	470	296	142	39	27	274	38
1991	1,060	337	227	143	38	23	257	35
<b>1992</b>	<b>1,058</b>	<b>329</b>	<b>222</b>	<b>153</b>	<b>39</b>	<b>24</b>	<b>251</b>	<b>39</b>
<b>1993</b>	<b>1,023</b>	<b>332</b>	<b>218</b>	<b>148</b>	<b>38</b>	<b>24</b>	<b>225</b>	<b>40</b>
<b>1994</b>	<b>1,129</b>	<b>372</b>	<b>262</b>	<b>162</b>	<b>45</b>	<b>26</b>	<b>217</b>	<b>46</b>
<b>1995</b>	<b>1,256</b>	<b>443</b>	<b>284</b>	<b>161</b>	<b>50</b>	<b>28</b>	<b>231</b>	<b>59</b>
<b>1996</b>	<b>1,171</b>	<b>388</b>	<b>235</b>	<b>167</b>	<b>60</b>	<b>32</b>	<b>221</b>	<b>68</b>
<b>1997</b>	<b>1,198</b>	<b>390</b>	<b>225</b>	<b>180</b>	<b>71</b>	<b>32</b>	<b>230</b>	<b>71</b>
1998	1,462	507	292	218	83	32	247	83
<b>1999</b>	<b>1,529</b>	<b>496</b>	<b>312</b>	<b>255</b>	<b>91</b>	<b>42</b>	<b>246</b>	<b>87</b>
<b>2000</b>	<b>1,552</b>	<b>530</b>	<b>326</b>	<b>241</b>	<b>89</b>	<b>41</b>	<b>245</b>	<b>82</b>
2001	1,388	437	282	217	84	44	237	86
<b>2002</b>	<b>1,168</b>	<b>378</b>	<b>244</b>	<b>150</b>	<b>62</b>	<b>36</b>	<b>231</b>	<b>67</b>
<b>2003</b>	<b>1,102</b>	<b>369</b>	<b>228</b>	<b>143</b>	<b>55</b>	<b>30</b>	<b>220</b>	<b>55</b>
<b>2004</b>	<b>1,223</b>	<b>459</b>	<b>241</b>	<b>147</b>	<b>73</b>	<b>30</b>	<b>205</b>	<b>69</b>
<b>Start '92-'97</b>	<b>1,139</b>	<b>376</b>	<b>241</b>	<b>162</b>	<b>51</b>	<b>28</b>	<b>229</b>	<b>54</b>
<b>Peak '99-'00</b>	<b>1,541</b>	<b>513</b>	<b>319</b>	<b>248</b>	<b>90</b>	<b>41</b>	<b>246</b>	<b>85</b>
<b>End '02-'04</b>	<b>1,164</b>	<b>402</b>	<b>238</b>	<b>147</b>	<b>63</b>	<b>32</b>	<b>219</b>	<b>64</b>
<b>Change (Amount)</b>								
to Peak	401	137	78	86	39	14	16	31
to End	-376	-111	-81	-101	-27	-10	-26	-21
<b>Change (%)</b>								
to Peak	35%	37%	32%	53%	77%	51%	7%	57%
to End	-24%	-22%	-25%	-41%	-30%	-23%	-11%	-24%

**Detailed  
Table 1b.**

**Average Annual Immigration for Calendar Years, 1990-2004,  
by Country or Region of Birth  
based on CPS, ACS, and Census 2000 Data**

(In thousands)

Calendar Year	Country of Birth							
	Total	Mexico	Other Latin Amer.	Europe & Can.	India	Middle East*	Other Asia	All Other
<b>Percent of Total Immigration</b>								
1990	100%	37%	23%	11%	3%	2%	21%	3%
1991	100%	32%	21%	13%	4%	2%	24%	3%
<b>1992</b>	<b>100%</b>	<b>31%</b>	<b>21%</b>	<b>14%</b>	<b>4%</b>	<b>2%</b>	<b>24%</b>	<b>4%</b>
<b>1993</b>	<b>100%</b>	<b>32%</b>	<b>21%</b>	<b>14%</b>	<b>4%</b>	<b>2%</b>	<b>22%</b>	<b>4%</b>
<b>1994</b>	<b>100%</b>	<b>33%</b>	<b>23%</b>	<b>14%</b>	<b>4%</b>	<b>2%</b>	<b>19%</b>	<b>4%</b>
<b>1995</b>	<b>100%</b>	<b>35%</b>	<b>23%</b>	<b>13%</b>	<b>4%</b>	<b>2%</b>	<b>18%</b>	<b>5%</b>
<b>1996</b>	<b>100%</b>	<b>33%</b>	<b>20%</b>	<b>14%</b>	<b>5%</b>	<b>3%</b>	<b>19%</b>	<b>6%</b>
<b>1997</b>	<b>100%</b>	<b>33%</b>	<b>19%</b>	<b>15%</b>	<b>6%</b>	<b>3%</b>	<b>19%</b>	<b>6%</b>
1998	100%	35%	20%	15%	6%	2%	17%	6%
<b>1999</b>	<b>100%</b>	<b>32%</b>	<b>20%</b>	<b>17%</b>	<b>6%</b>	<b>3%</b>	<b>16%</b>	<b>6%</b>
<b>2000</b>	<b>100%</b>	<b>34%</b>	<b>21%</b>	<b>15%</b>	<b>6%</b>	<b>3%</b>	<b>16%</b>	<b>5%</b>
<b>2001</b>	<b>100%</b>	<b>32%</b>	<b>20%</b>	<b>16%</b>	<b>6%</b>	<b>3%</b>	<b>17%</b>	<b>6%</b>
2002	100%	32%	21%	13%	5%	3%	20%	6%
<b>2003</b>	<b>100%</b>	<b>34%</b>	<b>21%</b>	<b>13%</b>	<b>5%</b>	<b>3%</b>	<b>20%</b>	<b>5%</b>
<b>2004</b>	<b>100%</b>	<b>38%</b>	<b>20%</b>	<b>12%</b>	<b>6%</b>	<b>2%</b>	<b>17%</b>	<b>6%</b>
<b>Start '92-'97</b>	<b>100%</b>	<b>33%</b>	<b>21%</b>	<b>14%</b>	<b>4%</b>	<b>2%</b>	<b>20%</b>	<b>5%</b>
<b>Peak '99-'00</b>	<b>100%</b>	<b>33%</b>	<b>21%</b>	<b>16%</b>	<b>6%</b>	<b>3%</b>	<b>16%</b>	<b>5%</b>
<b>End '02-'04</b>	<b>100%</b>	<b>35%</b>	<b>20%</b>	<b>13%</b>	<b>5%</b>	<b>3%</b>	<b>19%</b>	<b>5%</b>
<b>Change (Amt.)</b>								
to Peak	100%	34%	19%	21%	10%	3%	4%	8%
to End	100%	29%	22%	27%	7%	3%	7%	5%
<b>Change (%)</b>								
to Peak	(na)	0%	0%	2%	1%	0%	-4%	1%
to End	(na)	1%	0%	-3%	0%	0%	3%	0%

Source: Passel (2005), Pew Hispanic Center.

Note: Estimates are weighted averages of annual estimates using 2000-based weights and data on: (a) year of arrival from the Current Population Surveys of March 2000-2005, the American Community Surveys of 2000-2004, and Census 2000; and (b) data on residence 1 year ago from the March Current Population Surveys of 2000-2005 and the American Community Surveys of 2000-2004. Data from March Current Population Surveys for 1994-2001 using 1990-based weights show similar trends but lower levels of arrivals. See text for details.

\* "Middle East" for these tabulations is defined as countries in southwestern Asia from Turkey in the north and west to Iran/Afghanistan in the east and Saudi Arabia/Yemen in the south.

(na) -- not applicable.

Detailed  
Table 1c.

Average Annual Immigration for Calendar Years, 1990-2004,  
by State and Region of Residence based on CPS, ACS, and Census 2000 Data

(In thousands)

Calendar Year	States														
	Total	Big 6*	CA	NY	TX	FL	IL	NJ	New Growth**	South-east	Mid-west	Mtn./West	All Other	North-east/South	Mid-west/West
<b>Average Annualized Immigration</b>															
1990	1,287	936	425	168	129	91	61	60	193	59	29	105	158	90	68
1991	1,060	758	333	141	104	78	50	51	159	48	25	86	143	80	63
1992	1,066	727	290	144	104	87	50	53	182	63	28	92	156	88	68
1993	1,031	693	262	140	105	86	51	48	181	64	26	91	158	90	67
1994	1,129	761	271	158	111	105	62	54	201	72	32	97	167	90	77
1995	1,256	833	290	163	134	121	66	58	239	87	35	117	185	98	86
1996	1,171	741	276	136	128	88	59	54	240	92	38	109	191	102	88
1997	1,198	741	282	132	126	89	59	53	254	101	41	112	204	110	93
1998	1,462	875	321	136	154	123	78	64	334	135	52	147	253	140	113
1999	1,529	901	330	137	147	157	68	61	355	145	58	152	273	151	122
2000	1,552	909	332	128	163	152	72	63	356	136	56	164	287	159	129
2001	1,388	818	305	112	138	140	61	61	303	111	50	141	267	153	115
2002	1,168	667	230	87	133	110	55	51	269	113	39	117	232	132	100
2003	1,102	629	221	90	124	101	51	42	262	120	42	100	211	111	100
2004	1,222	695	265	94	126	110	53	46	325	159	47	119	202	99	102
Start	'92-'97	1,142	749	279	145	118	96	58	216	80	33	103	177	97	80
Peak	'99-'00	1,541	905	331	133	155	154	70	355	140	57	158	280	155	125
End	'02-'04	1,164	663	239	90	128	107	53	286	131	43	112	215	114	100
<b>Change (Amount)</b>															
	to Peak	399	156	52	-13	37	58	12	139	61	24	55	104	58	45
	to End	-377	-241	-92	-42	-27	-47	-17	-70	-9	-14	-46	-66	-41	-25
<b>Change (%)</b>															
	to Peak	35%	21%	19%	-9%	31%	61%	21%	64%	76%	71%	53%	59%	60%	57%
	to End	-24%	-27%	-28%	-32%	-17%	-30%	-24%	-20%	-7%	-25%	-29%	-23%	-26%	-20%

Detailed  
Table 1c.

Average Annual Immigration for Calendar Years, 1990-2004,  
by State and Region of Residence based on CPS, ACS, and Census 2000 Data

(In thousands)

Calendar Year	States														
	Total	Big 6*	CA	NY	TX	FL	IL	NJ	New Growth**	South-east	Mid-west	Mtn./West	All Other	North-east/South	Mid-west/West
<b>Percent of Total Immigration</b>															
1990	100%	73%	33%	13%	10%	7%	5%	5%	15%	5%	2%	8%	12%	7%	5%
1991	100%	71%	31%	13%	10%	7%	5%	5%	15%	5%	2%	8%	13%	8%	6%
1992	100%	68%	27%	13%	10%	8%	5%	5%	17%	6%	3%	9%	15%	8%	6%
1993	100%	67%	25%	14%	10%	8%	5%	5%	18%	6%	3%	9%	15%	9%	7%
1994	100%	67%	24%	14%	10%	9%	6%	5%	18%	6%	3%	9%	15%	8%	7%
1995	100%	66%	23%	13%	11%	10%	5%	5%	19%	7%	3%	9%	15%	8%	7%
1996	100%	63%	24%	12%	11%	8%	5%	5%	20%	8%	3%	9%	16%	9%	8%
1997	100%	62%	24%	11%	11%	7%	5%	4%	21%	8%	3%	9%	17%	9%	8%
1998	100%	60%	22%	9%	11%	8%	5%	4%	23%	9%	4%	10%	17%	10%	8%
1999	100%	59%	22%	9%	10%	10%	4%	4%	23%	9%	4%	10%	18%	10%	8%
2000	100%	59%	21%	8%	10%	10%	5%	4%	23%	9%	4%	11%	19%	10%	8%
2001	100%	59%	22%	8%	10%	10%	4%	4%	22%	8%	4%	10%	19%	11%	8%
2002	100%	57%	20%	7%	11%	9%	5%	4%	23%	10%	3%	10%	20%	11%	9%
2003	100%	57%	20%	8%	11%	9%	5%	4%	24%	11%	4%	9%	19%	10%	9%
2004	100%	57%	22%	8%	10%	9%	4%	4%	27%	13%	4%	10%	17%	8%	8%
<b>Start</b>	<b>'92-'97</b>	<b>100%</b>	<b>66%</b>	<b>24%</b>	<b>13%</b>	<b>10%</b>	<b>8%</b>	<b>5%</b>	<b>19%</b>	<b>7%</b>	<b>3%</b>	<b>9%</b>	<b>16%</b>	<b>8%</b>	<b>7%</b>
<b>Peak</b>	<b>'99-'00</b>	<b>100%</b>	<b>59%</b>	<b>21%</b>	<b>9%</b>	<b>10%</b>	<b>10%</b>	<b>5%</b>	<b>23%</b>	<b>9%</b>	<b>4%</b>	<b>10%</b>	<b>18%</b>	<b>10%</b>	<b>8%</b>
<b>End</b>	<b>'02-'04</b>	<b>100%</b>	<b>57%</b>	<b>21%</b>	<b>8%</b>	<b>11%</b>	<b>9%</b>	<b>5%</b>	<b>25%</b>	<b>11%</b>	<b>4%</b>	<b>10%</b>	<b>18%</b>	<b>10%</b>	<b>9%</b>
<b>Change (Amount)</b>															
	to Peak	<b>99%</b>	39%	13%	-3%	9%	14%	3%	35%	15%	6%	14%	26%	15%	11%
	to End	<b>100%</b>	64%	24%	11%	7%	12%	5%	19%	3%	4%	12%	17%	11%	7%
<b>Change (%)</b>															
	to Peak	(na)	-7%	-3%	-4%	0%	2%	-1%	4%	2%	1%	1%	3%	2%	1%
	to End	(na)	-2%	-1%	-1%	1%	-1%	0%	1%	2%	0%	-1%	0%	0%	0%

**Detailed  
Table 1c.**

**Average Annual Immigration for Calendar Years, 1990-2004,  
by State and Region of Residence based on CPS, ACS, and Census 2000 Data**

(In thousands)

Calendar Year	States													
	<b>Total</b>	<b>Big 6*</b>	CA	NY	TX	FL	IL	NJ	<b>New Growth**</b>	South- east	Mid- west	Mtn./ West	<b>All Other</b>	North- east/ South

Source: Passel (2005), Pew Hispanic Center.

Note: Estimates are weighted averages of annual estimates using 2000-based weights and data on: (a) year of arrival from the Current Population Surveys of March 2000-2005, the American Community Surveys of 2000-2004, and Census 2000; and (b) data on residence 1 year ago from the March Current Population Surveys of 2000-2005 and the American Community Surveys of 2000-2004. Data from March Current Population Surveys for 1994-2001 using 1990-based weights show similar trends but lower levels of arrivals. See text for details.

\* The 6 states with the largest immigrant populations: CA, NY, TX, FL, IL, and NJ.

\*\* "New Growth States" are states other than the 6 largest immigration states where the foreign-born population grew faster during 1990-2000 than in the fastest growing large state (TX). The 22 New Growth States are: Southeast -- DE, NC, SC, GA, KY, TN, AL, MS, AR, OK; Mid-West -- IN, MN, IA, NE, KS; and Mountain/West -- ID, CO, AZ, UT, NV, WA, OR.

(na) -- not applicable.

Detailed Table  
2a.

Average Annual Immigration for Calendar Years, 1990-2004, by Race/Hispanic Origin and by Estimation Method based on CPS, ACS, and Census 2000 Data

(In thousands)

Calendar Year	Average (2000-Based)	2000-Based					1990-Based		Average (2000-Based)	2000-Based					'90-Based		
		CPS (arrival)	ACS (arrival)	Cen. 2000 (arrival)	CPS (yr ago)	ACS (yr ago)	CPS (arrival)	CPS (yr ago)		CPS (arrival)	ACS (arrival)	Cen. 2000 (arrival)	CPS (yr ago)	ACS (yr ago)	CPS (arrival)	CPS (yr ago)	
<b>Total Population**</b>									<b>Hispanic Population</b>								
1990	1,287	1,212	1,307	1,342	(x)	(x)	1,171	(x)	687	641	701	720	(x)	(x)	520	(x)	
1991	1,060	1,212	959	1,008	(x)	(x)	1,171	(x)	504	641	426	446	(x)	(x)	520	(x)	
1992	1,066	1,077	1,045	1,076	(x)	(x)	1,030	(x)	502	544	469	493	(x)	(x)	456	(x)	
1993	1,031	1,077	981	1,036	(x)	(x)	1,030	867	506	544	478	497	(x)	(x)	456	363	
1994	1,129	1,207	1,041	1,140	(x)	(x)	1,058	867	561	604	505	576	(x)	(x)	480	363	
1995	1,256	1,207	1,205	1,357	(x)	(x)	1,051	934	651	604	630	718	(x)	(x)	482	427	
1996	1,171	1,192	1,161	1,161	(x)	(x)	1,067	922	556	555	568	546	(x)	(x)	462	388	
1997	1,198	1,192	1,172	1,229	(x)	(x)	1,071	817	551	555	546	551	(x)	(x)	469	295	
1998	1,462	1,539	1,388	1,458	(x)	(x)	1,242	921	729	799	685	702	(x)	(x)	567	361	
1999	1,529	1,539	1,536	1,817	1,341	1,412	1,329	1,200	729	799	785	909	585	567	627	494	
2000	1,552	1,595	1,665	1,765	1,310	1,426	1,388	1,209	773	817	844	1,040	576	586	666	499	
2001	1,388	1,614	1,432	(x)	1,154	1,350	1,405	1,200	644	833	673	(x)	506	564	676	495	
2002	1,168	1,324	1,244	(x)	958	1,147	(x)	(x)	553	677	625	(x)	425	483	(x)	(x)	
2003	1,102	1,274	1,196	(x)	852	1,084	(x)	(x)	541	661	615	(x)	394	495	(x)	(x)	
2004	1,226	1,259	1,297	(x)	1,216	1,134	(x)	(x)	636	655	676	(x)	667	546	(x)	(x)	
<b>Start</b>	<b>'92-'97</b>	<b>1,142</b>	<b>1,159</b>	<b>1,101</b>	<b>1,166</b>	<b>(x)</b>	<b>(x)</b>	<b>1,051</b>	<b>882</b>	<b>554</b>	<b>568</b>	<b>532</b>	<b>563</b>	<b>(x)</b>	<b>(x)</b>	<b>467</b>	<b>367</b>
<b>Peak</b>	<b>'99-'00</b>	<b>1,540</b>	<b>1,567</b>	<b>1,600</b>	<b>1,791</b>	<b>1,325</b>	<b>1,419</b>	<b>1,359</b>	<b>1,204</b>	<b>751</b>	<b>808</b>	<b>814</b>	<b>975</b>	<b>581</b>	<b>577</b>	<b>646</b>	<b>496</b>
<b>End</b>	<b>'02-'04</b>	<b>1,165</b>	<b>1,285</b>	<b>1,245</b>	<b>(x)</b>	<b>1,009</b>	<b>1,122</b>	<b>(x)</b>	<b>(x)</b>	<b>576</b>	<b>664</b>	<b>639</b>	<b>(x)</b>	<b>495</b>	<b>508</b>	<b>(x)</b>	<b>(x)</b>
<b>Change (Amount)</b>																	
to Peak		398	408	499	624	(x)	(x)	308	323	196	241	282	411	(x)	(x)	179	129
to End		-375	-281	-355	(x)	-317	-297	(x)	(x)	-174	-144	-176	(x)	-86	-68	(x)	(x)
<b>Change (%)</b>																	
to Peak		35%	35%	45%	54%	(x)	(x)	29%	37%	35%	42%	53%	73%	(x)	(x)	38%	35%
to End		-24%	-18%	-22%	(x)	-24%	-21%	(x)	(x)	-23%	-18%	-22%	(x)	-15%	-12%	(x)	(x)

Detailed Table  
2a.

Average Annual Immigration for Calendar Years, 1990-2004, by Race/Hispanic Origin and by Estimation Method based on CPS, ACS, and Census 2000 Data

(In thousands)

Calendar Year	Average (2000-Based)	2000-Based					1990-Based		Average (2000-Based)	2000-Based					'90-Based	
		CPS (arrival)	ACS (arrival)	Cen. 2000 (arrival)	CPS (yr ago)	ACS (yr ago)	CPS (arrival)	CPS (yr ago)		CPS (arrival)	ACS (arrival)	Cen. 2000 (arrival)	CPS (yr ago)	ACS (yr ago)	CPS (arrival)	CPS (yr ago)
<b>Asian/Pacific Islander Population*</b>																
1990	318	312	313	327	(x)	(x)	324	(x)	194	183	199	199	(x)	(x)	257	(x)
1991	296	312	276	300	(x)	(x)	324	(x)	188	183	190	191	(x)	(x)	257	(x)
1992	298	283	305	306	(x)	(x)	282	(x)	196	194	194	200	(x)	(x)	228	(x)
1993	268	283	248	274	(x)	(x)	282	247	190	194	185	191	(x)	(x)	228	212
1994	266	280	247	272	(x)	(x)	266	247	214	218	212	211	(x)	(x)	237	212
1995	286	280	272	307	(x)	(x)	260	259	221	218	215	230	(x)	(x)	233	209
1996	287	305	267	290	(x)	(x)	269	274	232	234	231	230	(x)	(x)	255	238
1997	307	305	297	317	(x)	(x)	267	225	246	234	240	264	(x)	(x)	251	251
1998	334	321	326	355	(x)	(x)	281	255	301	316	284	302	(x)	(x)	307	249
1999	344	321	335	405	325	331	290	287	357	316	305	381	363	417	325	350
2000	334	353	372	316	291	340	287	276	343	302	330	310	361	412	336	363
2001	318	359	346	(x)	236	331	284	273	318	293	303	(x)	301	375	338	361
2002	292	300	298	(x)	279	291	(x)	(x)	231	251	223	(x)	157	292	(x)	(x)
2003	276	285	284	(x)	261	272	(x)	(x)	215	242	220	(x)	157	241	(x)	(x)
2004	282	281	298	(x)	271	276	(x)	(x)	231	240	246	(x)	196	243	(x)	(x)
<b>Start '92-'97</b>	<b>285</b>	<b>289</b>	<b>273</b>	<b>294</b>	<b>(x)</b>	<b>(x)</b>	<b>271</b>	<b>251</b>	<b>217</b>	<b>215</b>	<b>213</b>	<b>221</b>	<b>(x)</b>	<b>(x)</b>	<b>239</b>	<b>224</b>
<b>Peak '99-'00</b>	<b>339</b>	<b>337</b>	<b>353</b>	<b>361</b>	<b>308</b>	<b>336</b>	<b>288</b>	<b>282</b>	<b>350</b>	<b>309</b>	<b>318</b>	<b>346</b>	<b>362</b>	<b>415</b>	<b>330</b>	<b>356</b>
<b>End '02-'04</b>	<b>283</b>	<b>289</b>	<b>293</b>	<b>(x)</b>	<b>271</b>	<b>280</b>	<b>(x)</b>	<b>(x)</b>	<b>226</b>	<b>245</b>	<b>230</b>	<b>(x)</b>	<b>170</b>	<b>259</b>	<b>(x)</b>	<b>(x)</b>
<b>Change (Amount)</b>																
to Peak	54	47	81	66	(x)	(x)	17	31	133	93	105	125	(x)	(x)	92	132
to End	-56	-48	-60	(x)	-38	-56	(x)	(x)	-124	-64	-88	(x)	-192	-156	(x)	(x)
<b>Change (%)</b>																
to Peak	19%	16%	30%	23%	(x)	(x)	6%	12%	62%	43%	49%	56%	(x)	(x)	38%	59%
to End	-17%	-14%	-17%	(x)	-12%	-17%	(x)	(x)	-35%	-21%	-28%	(x)	-53%	-38%	(x)	(x)

Detailed Table  
2a.

Average Annual Immigration for Calendar Years, 1990-2004, by Race/Hispanic Origin and by Estimation Method based on CPS, ACS, and Census 2000 Data

(In thousands)

Calendar Year	Average (2000-Based)	2000-Based					1990-Based		Average (2000-Based)	2000-Based					'90-Based	
		CPS (arrival)	ACS (arrival)	Cen. 2000 (arrival)	CPS (yr ago)	ACS (yr ago)	CPS (arrival)	CPS (yr ago)		CPS (arrival)	ACS (arrival)	Cen. 2000 (arrival)	CPS (yr ago)	ACS (yr ago)	CPS (arrival)	CPS (yr ago)
<b>Black, non-Hispanic Population*</b>																
1990	87	73	94	95	(x)	(x)	68	(x)								
1991	70	73	66	71	(x)	(x)	68	(x)								
<b>1992</b>	<b>69</b>	<b>55</b>	<b>77</b>	<b>76</b>	<b>(x)</b>	<b>(x)</b>	<b>62</b>	<b>(x)</b>								
<b>1993</b>	<b>66</b>	<b>55</b>	<b>69</b>	<b>73</b>	<b>(x)</b>	<b>(x)</b>	<b>62</b>	<b>43</b>								
<b>1994</b>	<b>86</b>	<b>101</b>	<b>76</b>	<b>80</b>	<b>(x)</b>	<b>(x)</b>	<b>74</b>	<b>43</b>								
<b>1995</b>	<b>96</b>	<b>101</b>	<b>86</b>	<b>101</b>	<b>(x)</b>	<b>(x)</b>	<b>76</b>	<b>37</b>								
<b>1996</b>	<b>95</b>	<b>96</b>	<b>95</b>	<b>94</b>	<b>(x)</b>	<b>(x)</b>	<b>79</b>	<b>21</b>								
<b>1997</b>	<b>93</b>	<b>96</b>	<b>88</b>	<b>96</b>	<b>(x)</b>	<b>(x)</b>	<b>83</b>	<b>46</b>								
1998	96	99	91	97	(x)	(x)	83	56								
<b>1999</b>	<b>98</b>	<b>99</b>	<b>110</b>	<b>119</b>	<b>68</b>	<b>95</b>	<b>82</b>	<b>68</b>								
<b>2000</b>	<b>98</b>	<b>120</b>	<b>117</b>	<b>99</b>	<b>70</b>	<b>86</b>	<b>94</b>	<b>57</b>								
2001	105	126	110	(x)	107	79	100	54								
<b>2002</b>	<b>91</b>	<b>93</b>	<b>97</b>	<b>(x)</b>	<b>94</b>	<b>81</b>	<b>(x)</b>	<b>(x)</b>								
<b>2003</b>	<b>68</b>	<b>83</b>	<b>76</b>	<b>(x)</b>	<b>39</b>	<b>75</b>	<b>(x)</b>	<b>(x)</b>								
<b>2004</b>	<b>76</b>	<b>80</b>	<b>77</b>	<b>(x)</b>	<b>77</b>	<b>68</b>	<b>(x)</b>	<b>(x)</b>								
<b>Start '92-'97</b>	<b>84</b>	<b>84</b>	<b>82</b>	<b>87</b>	<b>(x)</b>	<b>(x)</b>	<b>73</b>	<b>38</b>								
<b>Peak '99-'00</b>	<b>98</b>	<b>109</b>	<b>113</b>	<b>109</b>	<b>69</b>	<b>91</b>	<b>88</b>	<b>62</b>								
<b>End '02-'04</b>	<b>78</b>	<b>85</b>	<b>84</b>	<b>(x)</b>	<b>70</b>	<b>75</b>	<b>(x)</b>	<b>(x)</b>								
<b>Change (Amount)</b>																
to Peak	14	25	32	22	(x)	(x)	16	25								
to End	-20	-24	-30	(x)	1	-16	(x)	(x)								
<b>Change (%)</b>																
to Peak	17%	30%	39%	26%	(x)	(x)	21%	65%								
to End	-20%	-22%	-26%	(x)	1%	-17%	(x)	(x)								

Source: Passel (2005), Pew Hispanic Center.

Note: See text for details of estimation methods.

\* Multiple-race responses from Census 2000, ACS, and 2003-2004 CPS based on hierarchical assignment as: Black, Asian-Pacific Islander (API), White, and American Indian.

\*\* Total includes American Indian/Alaska Native not shown separately.

(x) -- not available.

Detailed Table  
2b.

Average Annual Immigration for Calendar Years, 1990-2004, by Country or Region of Birth and by Estimation Method based on CPS, ACS, and Census 2000 Data

(In thousands)

Calendar Year	Average (2000-Based)	2000-Based					1990-Based		Average (2000-Based)	2000-Based					'90-Based		
		CPS (arrival)	ACS (arrival)	Cen. 2000 (arrival)	CPS (yr ago)	ACS (yr ago)	CPS (arrival)	CPS (yr ago)		CPS (arrival)	ACS (arrival)	Cen. 2000 (arrival)	CPS (yr ago)	ACS (yr ago)	CPS (arrival)	CPS (yr ago)	
		<b>Born in Mexico</b>						<b>Born in Other Latin America</b>									
1990	470	429	483	499	(x)	(x)	347	(x)	296	280	305	303	(x)	(x)	232	(x)	
1991	337	429	284	299	(x)	(x)	347	(x)	227	280	195	207	(x)	(x)	232	(x)	
1992	329	353	307	328	(x)	(x)	305	(x)	222	211	228	228	(x)	(x)	206	(x)	
1993	332	353	314	328	(x)	(x)	305	(x)	218	211	217	226	(x)	(x)	206	(x)	
1994	372	400	331	384	(x)	(x)	317	(x)	262	292	234	260	(x)	(x)	228	(x)	
1995	443	400	442	486	(x)	(x)	317	329	284	292	254	306	(x)	(x)	233	112	
1996	388	384	404	375	(x)	(x)	307	274	235	243	228	235	(x)	(x)	213	131	
1997	390	384	396	389	(x)	(x)	310	178	225	243	211	223	(x)	(x)	217	128	
1998	507	551	476	494	(x)	(x)	373	262	292	328	274	276	(x)	(x)	261	151	
1999	496	551	537	625	352	413	418	302	312	328	322	373	303	236	282	263	
2000	530	559	569	756	364	400	459	310	326	349	358	374	286	261	281	257	
2001	437	570	436	(x)	379	364	472	311	282	357	312	(x)	193	267	277	252	
2002	378	461	427	(x)	301	322	(x)	(x)	244	292	269	(x)	192	224	(x)	(x)	
2003	369	452	416	(x)	266	343	(x)	(x)	228	280	264	(x)	159	210	(x)	(x)	
2004	459	448	507	(x)	496	384	(x)	(x)	241	276	249	(x)	219	219	(x)	(x)	
Start	'92-'97	376	379	366	382	(x)	(x)	310	260	241	249	229	246	(x)	(x)	217	124
Peak	'99-'00	513	555	553	691	358	407	438	306	319	338	340	373	294	249	282	260
End	'02-'04	402	454	450	(x)	354	350	(x)	(x)	238	282	261	(x)	190	218	(x)	(x)
<b>Change (Amount)</b>																	
	to Peak	137	176	187	309	(x)	(x)	128	46	78	90	111	127	(x)	(x)	65	136
	to End	-111	-102	-103	(x)	-4	-57	(x)	(x)	-81	-56	-79	(x)	-104	-31	(x)	(x)
<b>Change (%)</b>																	
	to Peak	37%	46%	51%	81%	(x)	(x)	41%	17%	32%	36%	49%	52%	(x)	(x)	30%	110%
	to End	-22%	-18%	-19%	(x)	-1%	-14%	(x)	(x)	-25%	-17%	-23%	(x)	-35%	-12%	(x)	(x)

Detailed Table  
2b.

Average Annual Immigration for Calendar Years, 1990-2004, by Country or Region of Birth and by Estimation Method based on CPS, ACS, and Census 2000 Data

(In thousands)

Calendar Year	Average (2000-Based)	2000-Based					1990-Based		Average (2000-Based)	2000-Based					'90-Based	
		CPS (arrival)	ACS (arrival)	Cen. 2000 (arrival)	CPS (yr ago)	ACS (yr ago)	CPS (arrival)	CPS (yr ago)		CPS (arrival)	ACS (arrival)	Cen. 2000 (arrival)	CPS (yr ago)	ACS (yr ago)	CPS (arrival)	CPS (yr ago)
<b>Born in Europe &amp; Canada</b>																
1990	142	134	142	150	(x)	(x)	162	(x)	39	41	40	37	(x)	(x)	29	(x)
1991	143	134	143	151	(x)	(x)	162	(x)	38	41	35	37	(x)	(x)	29	(x)
1992	153	149	152	159	(x)	(x)	155	(x)	39	34	44	41	(x)	(x)	35	(x)
1993	148	149	142	153	(x)	(x)	155	(x)	38	34	41	39	(x)	(x)	35	(x)
1994	162	152	166	167	(x)	(x)	160	(x)	45	53	44	39	(x)	(x)	37	(x)
1995	161	152	156	175	(x)	(x)	157	148	50	53	47	52	(x)	(x)	38	47
1996	167	157	168	176	(x)	(x)	166	159	60	70	53	58	(x)	(x)	57	54
1997	180	157	180	203	(x)	(x)	165	172	71	70	69	72	(x)	(x)	61	52
1998	218	212	208	233	(x)	(x)	203	173	83	92	78	79	(x)	(x)	69	35
1999	255	212	221	292	265	285	216	253	91	92	91	89	85	96	76	67
2000	241	192	230	226	261	294	231	257	89	91	104	63	90	95	74	68
2001	217	183	198	(x)	211	275	236	254	84	91	81	(x)	87	78	72	66
2002	150	152	150	(x)	92	205	(x)	(x)	62	73	65	(x)	49	60	(x)	(x)
2003	143	144	152	(x)	108	169	(x)	(x)	55	67	58	(x)	37	58	(x)	(x)
2004	147	143	146	(x)	122	175	(x)	(x)	73	66	77	(x)	88	60	(x)	(x)
<b>Start '92-'97</b>	<b>162</b>	<b>153</b>	<b>161</b>	<b>172</b>	<b>(x)</b>	<b>(x)</b>	<b>160</b>	<b>160</b>	<b>51</b>	<b>52</b>	<b>50</b>	<b>50</b>	<b>(x)</b>	<b>(x)</b>	<b>44</b>	<b>51</b>
<b>Peak '99-'00</b>	<b>248</b>	<b>202</b>	<b>226</b>	<b>259</b>	<b>263</b>	<b>289</b>	<b>223</b>	<b>255</b>	<b>90</b>	<b>92</b>	<b>98</b>	<b>76</b>	<b>88</b>	<b>96</b>	<b>75</b>	<b>68</b>
<b>End '02-'04</b>	<b>147</b>	<b>147</b>	<b>150</b>	<b>(x)</b>	<b>107</b>	<b>183</b>	<b>(x)</b>	<b>(x)</b>	<b>63</b>	<b>69</b>	<b>67</b>	<b>(x)</b>	<b>58</b>	<b>59</b>	<b>(x)</b>	<b>(x)</b>
<b>Change (Amount)</b>																
to Peak	86	49	65	87	(x)	(x)	63	95	39	39	48	26	(x)	(x)	32	17
to End	-101	-55	-76	(x)	-156	-106	(x)	(x)	-27	-23	-31	(x)	-30	-36	(x)	(x)
<b>Change (%)</b>																
to Peak	53%	32%	40%	51%	(x)	(x)	40%	60%	77%	75%	97%	51%	(x)	(x)	72%	32%
to End	-41%	-27%	-34%	(x)	-59%	-37%	(x)	(x)	-30%	-25%	-32%	(x)	-34%	-38%	(x)	(x)

Detailed Table  
2b.

Average Annual Immigration for Calendar Years, 1990-2004, by Country or Region of Birth and by Estimation Method based on CPS, ACS, and Census 2000 Data

(In thousands)

Calendar Year	Average (2000-Based)	2000-Based					1990-Based		Average (2000-Based)	2000-Based					'90-Based		
		CPS (arrival)	ACS (arrival)	Cen. 2000 (arrival)	CPS (yr ago)	ACS (yr ago)	CPS (arrival)	CPS (yr ago)		CPS (arrival)	ACS (arrival)	Cen. 2000 (arrival)	CPS (yr ago)	ACS (yr ago)	CPS (arrival)	CPS (yr ago)	
<b>Born in Middle Eastern Countries*</b>									<b>Born in Other Asian Countries</b>								
1990	27	20	30	32	(x)	(x)	31	(x)	274	273	268	280	(x)	(x)	325	(x)	
1991	23	20	25	24	(x)	(x)	31	(x)	257	273	242	257	(x)	(x)	325	(x)	
1992	24	23	22	27	(x)	(x)	21	(x)	251	238	257	258	(x)	(x)	248	(x)	
1993	24	23	25	24	(x)	(x)	21	(x)	225	238	208	228	(x)	(x)	248	(x)	
1994	26	26	25	27	(x)	(x)	32	(x)	217	227	200	223	(x)	(x)	228	(x)	
1995	28	26	26	32	(x)	(x)	34	30	231	227	221	246	(x)	(x)	220	209	
1996	32	29	36	31	(x)	(x)	37	46	221	233	209	223	(x)	(x)	218	212	
1997	32	29	30	36	(x)	(x)	35	32	230	233	222	234	(x)	(x)	213	190	
1998	32	29	33	34	(x)	(x)	32	25	247	228	246	265	(x)	(x)	213	212	
1999	42	29	36	42	44	57	30	40	246	228	240	302	226	236	209	208	
2000	41	41	43	31	42	49	31	46	245	263	266	239	210	244	210	212	
2001	44	44	57	(x)	30	44	32	47	237	270	262	(x)	165	253	211	213	
2002	36	34	35	(x)	30	43	(x)	(x)	231	232	231	(x)	231	232	(x)	(x)	
2003	30	30	23	(x)	32	34	(x)	(x)	220	223	227	(x)	222	210	(x)	(x)	
2004	30	29	29	(x)	31	30	(x)	(x)	205	221	208	(x)	185	208	(x)	(x)	
<b>Start '92-'97</b>	<b>28</b>	<b>26</b>	<b>27</b>	<b>29</b>	<b>(x)</b>	<b>(x)</b>	<b>30</b>	<b>36</b>	<b>229</b>	<b>233</b>	<b>219</b>	<b>235</b>	<b>(x)</b>	<b>(x)</b>	<b>229</b>	<b>204</b>	
<b>Peak '99-'00</b>	<b>41</b>	<b>35</b>	<b>40</b>	<b>37</b>	<b>43</b>	<b>53</b>	<b>30</b>	<b>43</b>	<b>246</b>	<b>246</b>	<b>253</b>	<b>271</b>	<b>218</b>	<b>240</b>	<b>209</b>	<b>210</b>	
<b>End '02-'04</b>	<b>32</b>	<b>31</b>	<b>29</b>	<b>(x)</b>	<b>31</b>	<b>36</b>	<b>(x)</b>	<b>(x)</b>	<b>219</b>	<b>225</b>	<b>222</b>	<b>(x)</b>	<b>212</b>	<b>217</b>	<b>(x)</b>	<b>(x)</b>	
<b>Change (Amount)</b>																	
to Peak	14	9	12	7	(x)	(x)	1	8	16	13	34	35	(x)	(x)	-20	6	
to End	-10	-4	-10	(x)	-12	-17	(x)	(x)	-26	-21	-31	(x)	-5	-23	(x)	(x)	
<b>Change (%)</b>																	
to Peak	51%	36%	44%	25%	(x)	(x)	2%	21%	7%	6%	15%	15%	(x)	(x)	-9%	3%	
to End	-23%	-11%	-26%	(x)	-28%	-32%	(x)	(x)	-11%	-8%	-12%	(x)	-3%	-10%	(x)	(x)	

Detailed Table  
2b.

Average Annual Immigration for Calendar Years, 1990-2004, by Country or Region of Birth and by Estimation Method based on CPS, ACS, and Census 2000 Data

(In thousands)

Calendar Year	Average (2000-Based)	2000-Based					1990-Based		Average (2000-Based)	2000-Based					'90-Based	
		CPS (arrival)	ACS (arrival)	Cen. 2000 (arrival)	CPS (yr ago)	ACS (yr ago)	CPS (arrival)	CPS (yr ago)		CPS (arrival)	ACS (arrival)	Cen. 2000 (arrival)	CPS (yr ago)	ACS (yr ago)	CPS (arrival)	CPS (yr ago)
<b>Born in All Other Countries</b>																
1990	38	35	39	41	(x)	(x)	59	(x)								
1991	35	35	35	34	(x)	(x)	59	(x)								
<b>1992</b>	<b>39</b>	<b>46</b>	<b>35</b>	<b>36</b>	<b>(x)</b>	<b>(x)</b>	<b>61</b>	<b>(x)</b>								
<b>1993</b>	<b>40</b>	<b>46</b>	<b>35</b>	<b>37</b>	<b>(x)</b>	<b>(x)</b>	<b>61</b>	<b>(x)</b>								
<b>1994</b>	<b>46</b>	<b>58</b>	<b>42</b>	<b>40</b>	<b>(x)</b>	<b>(x)</b>	<b>55</b>	<b>(x)</b>								
<b>1995</b>	<b>59</b>	<b>58</b>	<b>59</b>	<b>60</b>	<b>(x)</b>	<b>(x)</b>	<b>52</b>	<b>59</b>								
<b>1996</b>	<b>68</b>	<b>76</b>	<b>63</b>	<b>65</b>	<b>(x)</b>	<b>(x)</b>	<b>69</b>	<b>47</b>								
<b>1997</b>	<b>71</b>	<b>76</b>	<b>64</b>	<b>72</b>	<b>(x)</b>	<b>(x)</b>	<b>72</b>	<b>64</b>								
1998	83	99	73	76	(x)	(x)	91	62								
<b>1999</b>	<b>87</b>	<b>99</b>	<b>90</b>	<b>93</b>	<b>66</b>	<b>88</b>	<b>99</b>	<b>65</b>								
<b>2000</b>	<b>82</b>	<b>99</b>	<b>94</b>	<b>77</b>	<b>56</b>	<b>83</b>	<b>103</b>	<b>58</b>								
2001	86	98	86	(x)	90	69	104	57								
<b>2002</b>	<b>67</b>	<b>79</b>	<b>66</b>	<b>(x)</b>	<b>64</b>	<b>60</b>	<b>(x)</b>	<b>(x)</b>								
<b>2003</b>	<b>55</b>	<b>77</b>	<b>55</b>	<b>(x)</b>	<b>29</b>	<b>60</b>	<b>(x)</b>	<b>(x)</b>								
<b>2004</b>	<b>69</b>	<b>77</b>	<b>68</b>	<b>(x)</b>	<b>74</b>	<b>58</b>	<b>(x)</b>	<b>(x)</b>								
<b>Start '92-'97</b>	<b>54</b>	<b>60</b>	<b>50</b>	<b>52</b>	<b>(x)</b>	<b>(x)</b>	<b>62</b>	<b>57</b>								
<b>Peak '99-'00</b>	<b>85</b>	<b>99</b>	<b>92</b>	<b>85</b>	<b>61</b>	<b>86</b>	<b>101</b>	<b>62</b>								
<b>End '02-'04</b>	<b>64</b>	<b>78</b>	<b>63</b>	<b>(x)</b>	<b>56</b>	<b>59</b>	<b>(x)</b>	<b>(x)</b>								
<b>Change (Amount)</b>																
to Peak	31	39	42	34	(x)	(x)	39	5								
to End	-21	-21	-29	(x)	-5	-26	(x)	(x)								
<b>Change (%)</b>																
to Peak	57%	65%	85%	65%	(x)	(x)	63%	9%								
to End	-24%	-21%	-31%	(x)	-8%	-31%	(x)	(x)								

Source: Passel (2005), Pew Hispanic Center.

Note: See text for details of estimation methods.

\* "Middle East" for these tabulations is defined as countries in southwestern Asia from Turkey in the north and west to Iran/Afghanistan in the east and Saudi Arabia/Yemen in the south.

(x) -- not available.

Detailed Table  
2c.

Average Annual Immigration for Calendar Years, 1990-2004, by Legal Status and by Estimation Method  
based on CPS, ACS, and Census 2000 Data

(In thousands)

Calendar Year	Average (2000-Based)	2000-Based					1990-Based		Average (2000-Based)	2000-Based					'90-Based		
		CPS (arrival)	ACS (arrival)	Cen. 2000 (arrival)	CPS (yr ago)	ACS (yr ago)	CPS (arrival)	CPS (yr ago)		CPS (arrival)	ACS (arrival)	Cen. 2000 (arrival)	CPS (yr ago)	ACS (yr ago)	CPS (arrival)	CPS (yr ago)	
		<b>Legal Permanent Residents (LPR) # *</b>								<b>Unauthorized Migrants #</b>							
1990	800	762	(na)	839	(x)	(na)	734	(x)	473	449	(na)	497	(x)	(na)	417	(x)	
1991	711	762	(na)	660	(x)	(na)	734	(x)	395	449	(na)	342	(x)	(na)	417	(x)	
1992	675	667	(na)	682	(x)	(na)	638	(x)	394	403	(na)	385	(x)	(na)	335	(x)	
1993	646	667	(na)	626	(x)	(na)	638	(x)	401	403	(na)	399	(x)	(na)	335	(x)	
1994	630	652	(na)	608	(x)	(na)	590	(x)	519	536	(na)	503	(x)	(na)	357	(x)	
1995	671	652	(na)	690	(x)	(na)	590	513	581	536	(na)	626	(x)	(na)	358	268	
1996	573	604	(na)	542	(x)	(na)	556	513	503	539	(na)	468	(x)	(na)	395	268	
1997	573	604	(na)	542	(x)	(na)	557	423	517	539	(na)	496	(x)	(na)	398	228	
1998	615	655	(na)	575	(x)	(na)	571	484	668	705	(na)	631	(x)	(na)	466	274	
1999	659	655	(na)	712	609	(na)	579	645	656	705	(na)	781	483	(na)	525	400	
2000	635	606	(na)	771	529	(na)	559	517	667	729	(na)	784	488	(na)	563	415	
2001	578	617	(na)	(x)	539	(na)	548	486	549	740	(na)	(x)	357	(na)	571	413	
2002	484	510	(na)	(x)	457	(na)	(x)	(x)	450	604	(na)	(x)	295	(na)	(x)	(x)	
2003	417	472	(na)	(x)	361	(na)	(x)	(x)	451	576	(na)	(x)	326	(na)	(x)	(x)	
2004	455	455	(na)	(x)	(x)	(na)	(x)	(x)	562	562	(na)	(x)	(x)	(na)	(x)	(x)	
<b>Start</b>	<b>'92-'97</b>	<b>628</b>	<b>641</b>	<b>(na)</b>	<b>615</b>	<b>(x)</b>	<b>(na)</b>	<b>595</b>	<b>483</b>	<b>486</b>	<b>492</b>	<b>(na)</b>	<b>479</b>	<b>(x)</b>	<b>(na)</b>	<b>363</b>	<b>255</b>
<b>Peak</b>	<b>'99-'00</b>	<b>647</b>	<b>631</b>	<b>(na)</b>	<b>741</b>	<b>569</b>	<b>(na)</b>	<b>569</b>	<b>581</b>	<b>662</b>	<b>717</b>	<b>(na)</b>	<b>783</b>	<b>485</b>	<b>(na)</b>	<b>544</b>	<b>407</b>
<b>End</b>	<b>'02-'04</b>	<b>452</b>	<b>479</b>	<b>(na)</b>	<b>(x)</b>	<b>409</b>	<b>(na)</b>	<b>(x)</b>	<b>(x)</b>	<b>488</b>	<b>581</b>	<b>(na)</b>	<b>(x)</b>	<b>311</b>	<b>(na)</b>	<b>(x)</b>	<b>(x)</b>
<b>Change (Amount)</b>																	
	to Peak	19	-10	(na)	126	(x)	(na)	-26	98	176	224	(na)	303	(x)	(na)	181	152
	to End	-195	-152	(na)	(x)	-159	(na)	(x)	(x)	-174	-136	(na)	(x)	-175	(na)	(x)	(x)
<b>Change (%)</b>																	
	to Peak	3%	-2%	(na)	21%	(x)	(na)	-4%	20%	36%	46%	(na)	63%	(x)	(na)	50%	60%
	to End	-30%	-24%	(na)	(x)	-28%	(na)	(x)	(x)	-26%	-19%	(na)	(x)	-36%	(na)	(x)	(x)

Detailed Table  
2c.

Average Annual Immigration for Calendar Years, 1990-2004, by Legal Status and by Estimation Method based on CPS, ACS, and Census 2000 Data

(In thousands)

Calendar Year	Average (2000-Based)	2000-Based					1990-Based		Average (2000-Based)	2000-Based					'90-Based	
		CPS (arrival)	ACS (arrival)	Cen. 2000 (arrival)	CPS (yr ago)	ACS (yr ago)	CPS (arrival)	CPS (yr ago)		CPS (arrival)	ACS (arrival)	Cen. 2000 (arrival)	CPS (yr ago)	ACS (yr ago)	CPS (arrival)	CPS (yr ago)
<b>Temporary Legal Migrants (Nonimmigrants) # **</b>																
1990	(x)	(na)	(na)	(na)	(x)	(x)	(na)	(x)	(na)	(na)	(na)	(na)	(na)	(na)	(na)	
1991	(x)	(na)	(na)	(na)	(x)	(x)	(na)	(x)	(na)	(na)	(na)	(na)	(na)	(na)	(na)	
<b>1992</b>	<b>161</b>	<b>(na)</b>	<b>(na)</b>	<b>(na)</b>	<b>(x)</b>	<b>(x)</b>	<b>161</b>	<b>(x)</b>	<b>161</b>	<b>(x)</b>	<b>(x)</b>	<b>161</b>	<b>(x)</b>	<b>(x)</b>	<b>(x)</b>	
<b>1993</b>	<b>161</b>	<b>(na)</b>	<b>(na)</b>	<b>(na)</b>	<b>(x)</b>	<b>(x)</b>	<b>161</b>	<b>(x)</b>	<b>161</b>	<b>(x)</b>	<b>(x)</b>	<b>161</b>	<b>(x)</b>	<b>(x)</b>	<b>(x)</b>	
<b>1994</b>	<b>158</b>	<b>(na)</b>	<b>(na)</b>	<b>(na)</b>	<b>(x)</b>	<b>(x)</b>	<b>158</b>	<b>(x)</b>	<b>158</b>	<b>(x)</b>	<b>(x)</b>	<b>158</b>	<b>(x)</b>	<b>(x)</b>	<b>(x)</b>	
<b>1995</b>	<b>154</b>	<b>(na)</b>	<b>(na)</b>	<b>(na)</b>	<b>(x)</b>	<b>(x)</b>	<b>156</b>	<b>(x)</b>	<b>156</b>	<b>153</b>	<b>(x)</b>	<b>156</b>	<b>153</b>	<b>(x)</b>	<b>(x)</b>	
<b>1996</b>	<b>157</b>	<b>(na)</b>	<b>(na)</b>	<b>(na)</b>	<b>(x)</b>	<b>(x)</b>	<b>162</b>	<b>(x)</b>	<b>162</b>	<b>153</b>	<b>(x)</b>	<b>162</b>	<b>153</b>	<b>(x)</b>	<b>(x)</b>	
<b>1997</b>	<b>167</b>	<b>(na)</b>	<b>(na)</b>	<b>192</b>	<b>(x)</b>	<b>(x)</b>	<b>163</b>	<b>(x)</b>	<b>163</b>	<b>146</b>	<b>(x)</b>	<b>163</b>	<b>146</b>	<b>(x)</b>	<b>(x)</b>	
1998	258	264	(na)	251	(x)	(x)	206	(x)	206	163	(x)	206	163	(x)	(x)	
<b>1999</b>	<b>279</b>	<b>264</b>	<b>(na)</b>	<b>324</b>	<b>250</b>	<b>(x)</b>	<b>225</b>	<b>(x)</b>	<b>225</b>	<b>154</b>	<b>(x)</b>	<b>225</b>	<b>154</b>	<b>(x)</b>	<b>(x)</b>	
<b>2000</b>	<b>257</b>	<b>265</b>	<b>(na)</b>	<b>212</b>	<b>293</b>	<b>(x)</b>	<b>267</b>	<b>(x)</b>	<b>267</b>	<b>277</b>	<b>(x)</b>	<b>267</b>	<b>277</b>	<b>(x)</b>	<b>(x)</b>	
2001	260	261	(na)	(x)	258	(x)	285	(x)	285	302	(x)	285	302	(x)	(x)	
<b>2002</b>	<b>206</b>	<b>207</b>	<b>(na)</b>	<b>(x)</b>	<b>206</b>	<b>(x)</b>	<b>(x)</b>	<b>(x)</b>	<b>(x)</b>	<b>(x)</b>	<b>(x)</b>	<b>(x)</b>	<b>(x)</b>	<b>(x)</b>	<b>(x)</b>	
<b>2003</b>	<b>173</b>	<b>182</b>	<b>(na)</b>	<b>(x)</b>	<b>165</b>	<b>(x)</b>	<b>(x)</b>	<b>(x)</b>	<b>(x)</b>	<b>(x)</b>	<b>(x)</b>	<b>(x)</b>	<b>(x)</b>	<b>(x)</b>	<b>(x)</b>	
<b>2004</b>	<b>174</b>	<b>174</b>	<b>(na)</b>	<b>(x)</b>	<b>(x)</b>	<b>(x)</b>	<b>(x)</b>	<b>(x)</b>	<b>(x)</b>	<b>(x)</b>	<b>(x)</b>	<b>(x)</b>	<b>(x)</b>	<b>(x)</b>	<b>(x)</b>	
<b>Start '92-'97</b>	<b>160</b>	<b>(na)</b>	<b>(na)</b>	<b>192</b>	<b>(x)</b>	<b>(na)</b>	<b>160</b>	<b>(x)</b>	<b>160</b>	<b>150</b>	<b>(x)</b>	<b>160</b>	<b>150</b>	<b>(x)</b>	<b>(x)</b>	
<b>Peak '99-'00</b>	<b>268</b>	<b>265</b>	<b>(na)</b>	<b>268</b>	<b>271</b>	<b>(na)</b>	<b>246</b>	<b>(x)</b>	<b>246</b>	<b>215</b>	<b>(x)</b>	<b>246</b>	<b>215</b>	<b>(x)</b>	<b>(x)</b>	
<b>End '02-'04</b>	<b>185</b>	<b>188</b>	<b>(na)</b>	<b>(x)</b>	<b>185</b>	<b>(na)</b>	<b>(x)</b>	<b>(x)</b>	<b>(x)</b>	<b>(x)</b>	<b>(x)</b>	<b>(x)</b>	<b>(x)</b>	<b>(x)</b>	<b>(x)</b>	
<b>Change (Amount)</b>																
to Peak	108	(na)	(na)	76	(x)	(na)	86	(x)	86	65	(x)	86	65	(x)	(x)	
to End	-83	-77	(na)	(x)	-86	(na)	(x)	(x)	(x)	(x)	(x)	(x)	(x)	(x)	(x)	
<b>Change (%)</b>																
to Peak	68%	(na)	(na)	40%	(x)	(na)	54%	(x)	54%	43%	(x)	54%	43%	(x)	(x)	
to End	-31%	-29%	(na)	(x)	-32%	(na)	(x)	(x)	(x)	(x)	(x)	(x)	(x)	(x)	(x)	

Source: Passel (2005), Pew Hispanic Center.

(x) -- not available.

Note: See text for details of estimation methods.

# Legal status at time of survey.

\* LPRs, or Legal Permanent Residents, include those arriving as refugees and those who have naturalized.

\*\* Data on temporary migrants are available only from the Census and CPSs in the 1-3 years following arrival.

Detailed Table  
2d1.

Average Annual Immigration for Calendar Years, 1990-2004, by Region of Residence and by Estimation Method  
based on CPS, ACS, and Census 2000 Data

(In thousands)

Calendar Year	Average (2000-Based)	2000-Based					1990-Based		Average (2000-Based)	2000-Based					'90-Based		
		CPS (arrival)	ACS (arrival)	Cen. 2000 (arrival)	CPS (yr ago)	ACS (yr ago)	CPS (arrival)	CPS (yr ago)		CPS (arrival)	ACS (arrival)	Cen. 2000 (arrival)	CPS (yr ago)	ACS (yr ago)	CPS (arrival)	CPS (yr ago)	
		<b>"Big 6" States *</b>								<b>"New Growth" States **</b>							
1990	936	898	947	963	(x)	(x)	868	(x)	193	168	204	207	(x)	(x)	157	(x)	
1991	758	898	673	702	(x)	(x)	868	(x)	159	168	147	163	(x)	(x)	157	(x)	
1992	727	712	725	746	(x)	(x)	699	(x)	182	193	175	180	(x)	(x)	165	(x)	
1993	693	712	665	701	(x)	(x)	699	563	181	193	167	183	(x)	(x)	165	188	
1994	761	834	690	758	(x)	(x)	689	563	201	198	191	215	(x)	(x)	187	188	
1995	833	834	779	886	(x)	(x)	680	580	239	198	244	274	(x)	(x)	191	190	
1996	741	751	741	731	(x)	(x)	657	560	240	244	236	240	(x)	(x)	219	198	
1997	741	751	717	754	(x)	(x)	655	475	254	244	254	263	(x)	(x)	221	174	
1998	875	914	845	867	(x)	(x)	718	521	334	350	312	339	(x)	(x)	278	232	
1999	901	914	925	1,060	803	802	767	717	355	350	347	440	303	335	299	270	
2000	909	936	987	1,083	724	816	781	634	356	354	385	413	290	337	321	281	
2001	818	952	847	(x)	693	778	780	610	303	355	316	(x)	221	318	331	282	
2002	667	765	720	(x)	535	649	(x)	(x)	269	305	289	(x)	214	269	(x)	(x)	
2003	629	722	714	(x)	474	604	(x)	(x)	262	303	281	(x)	189	276	(x)	(x)	
2004	695	708	728	(x)	707	637	(x)	(x)	325	303	349	(x)	337	312	(x)	(x)	
Start	'92-'97	749	765	720	763	(x)	(x)	680	548	216	212	211	226	(x)	(x)	191	188
Peak	'99-'00	905	925	956	1,071	764	809	774	675	355	352	366	426	297	336	310	276
End	'02-'04	663	732	720	(x)	572	630	(x)	(x)	286	304	306	(x)	247	286	(x)	(x)
<b>Change (Amount)</b>																	
	to Peak	156	160	236	308	(x)	(x)	94	127	139	141	155	201	(x)	(x)	119	88
	to End	-241	-193	-235	(x)	-192	-179	(x)	(x)	-70	-48	-60	(x)	-50	-50	(x)	(x)
<b>Change (%)</b>																	
	to Peak	21%	21%	33%	40%	(x)	(x)	14%	23%	64%	66%	73%	89%	(x)	(x)	62%	47%
	to End	-27%	-21%	-25%	(x)	-25%	-22%	(x)	(x)	-20%	-14%	-16%	(x)	-17%	-15%	(x)	(x)

Detailed Table  
2d1.

Average Annual Immigration for Calendar Years, 1990-2004, by Region of Residence and by Estimation Method  
based on CPS, ACS, and Census 2000 Data

(In thousands)

Calendar Year	Average (2000-Based)	2000-Based					1990-Based		Average (2000-Based)	2000-Based					'90-Based	
		CPS (arrival)	ACS (arrival)	Cen. 2000 (arrival)	CPS (yr ago)	ACS (yr ago)	CPS (arrival)	CPS (yr ago)		CPS (arrival)	ACS (arrival)	Cen. 2000 (arrival)	CPS (yr ago)	ACS (yr ago)	CPS (arrival)	CPS (yr ago)
<b>All Other States</b>																
1990	158	146	157	172	(x)	(x)	146	(x)								
1991	143	146	139	143	(x)	(x)	146	(x)								
1992	156	173	146	150	(x)	(x)	166	(x)								
1993	158	173	149	152	(x)	(x)	166	116								
1994	167	175	159	167	(x)	(x)	181	116								
1995	185	175	182	197	(x)	(x)	180	164								
1996	191	197	185	189	(x)	(x)	191	165								
1997	204	197	201	212	(x)	(x)	195	168								
1998	253	275	231	252	(x)	(x)	246	169								
1999	273	275	264	318	235	275	263	212								
2000	287	304	293	271	295	273	286	294								
2001	267	307	269	(x)	239	254	294	308								
2002	232	254	235	(x)	210	229	(x)	(x)								
2003	211	248	201	(x)	190	203	(x)	(x)								
2004	202	248	202	(x)	172	185	(x)	(x)								
Start '92-'97	177	182	170	178	(x)	(x)	180	146								
Peak '99-'00	280	290	278	295	265	274	275	253								
End '02-'04	215	250	213	(x)	190	206	(x)	(x)								
<b>Change (Amount)</b>																
to Peak	104	108	108	117	(x)	(x)	95	107								
to End	-66	-40	-66	(x)	-75	-68	(x)	(x)								
<b>Change (%)</b>																
to Peak	59%	59%	63%	66%	(x)	(x)	53%	73%								
to End	-23%	-14%	-24%	(x)	-28%	-25%	(x)	(x)								

Source: Passel (2005), Pew Hispanic Center.

(x) -- not available.

Note: See text for details of estimation methods.

\* The 6 states with the largest immigrant populations: CA, NY, TX, FL, IL, and NJ.

\*\* "New Growth States" are states other than the 6 largest immigration states where the foreign-born population grew faster during 1990-2000 than in the fastest growing large state (TX). The 22 New Growth States are: Southeast -- DE, NC, SC, GA, KY, TN, AL, MS, AR, OK; Mid-West -- IN, MN, IA, NE, KS; and Mountain/West -- ID, CO, AZ, UT, NV, WA, OR.

Detailed Table

2d2.

Average Annual Immigration for Calendar Years, 1990-2004, for the Six Largest Immigration States by Estimation Method based on CPS, ACS, and Census 2000 Data

(In thousands)

Calendar Year	Average (2000-Based)	2000-Based					1990-Based		Average (2000-Based)	2000-Based					'90-Based		
		CPS (arrival)	ACS (arrival)	Cen. 2000 (arrival)	CPS (yr ago)	ACS (yr ago)	CPS (arrival)	CPS (yr ago)		CPS (arrival)	ACS (arrival)	Cen. 2000 (arrival)	CPS (yr ago)	ACS (yr ago)	CPS (arrival)	CPS (yr ago)	
		<b>California</b>						<b>New York</b>									
1990	425	399	432	446	(x)	(x)	437	(x)	168	167	168	167	(x)	(x)	155	(x)	
1991	333	399	291	310	(x)	(x)	437	(x)	141	167	121	133	(x)	(x)	155	(x)	
1992	290	274	294	301	(x)	(x)	283	(x)	144	141	140	151	(x)	(x)	145	(x)	
1993	262	274	249	264	(x)	(x)	283	242	140	141	135	145	(x)	(x)	145	103	
1994	271	281	253	278	(x)	(x)	251	242	158	190	133	153	(x)	(x)	145	103	
1995	290	281	275	314	(x)	(x)	241	218	163	190	138	161	(x)	(x)	145	83	
1996	276	296	271	262	(x)	(x)	240	196	136	127	137	143	(x)	(x)	124	117	
1997	282	296	267	282	(x)	(x)	242	169	132	127	131	138	(x)	(x)	122	107	
1998	321	337	309	318	(x)	(x)	268	222	136	134	126	147	(x)	(x)	116	64	
1999	330	337	333	379	325	276	290	302	137	134	137	173	125	119	118	109	
2000	332	334	348	432	265	281	301	241	128	148	131	149	98	112	114	93	
2001	305	339	308	(x)	305	266	304	226	112	153	120	(x)	76	100	111	88	
2002	230	262	259	(x)	176	224	(x)	(x)	87	108	110	(x)	45	85	(x)	(x)	
2003	221	263	223	(x)	176	222	(x)	(x)	90	98	117	(x)	62	81	(x)	(x)	
2004	265	265	283	(x)	270	242	(x)	(x)	94	95	108	(x)	86	88	(x)	(x)	
<b>Start</b>	<b>'92-'97</b>	<b>279</b>	<b>284</b>	<b>268</b>	<b>283</b>	<b>(x)</b>	<b>(x)</b>	<b>257</b>	<b>214</b>	<b>145</b>	<b>152</b>	<b>135</b>	<b>149</b>	<b>(x)</b>	<b>(x)</b>	<b>138</b>	<b>103</b>
<b>Peak</b>	<b>'99-'00</b>	<b>331</b>	<b>336</b>	<b>340</b>	<b>406</b>	<b>295</b>	<b>278</b>	<b>296</b>	<b>271</b>	<b>133</b>	<b>141</b>	<b>134</b>	<b>161</b>	<b>111</b>	<b>115</b>	<b>116</b>	<b>101</b>
<b>End</b>	<b>'02-'04</b>	<b>239</b>	<b>263</b>	<b>255</b>	<b>(x)</b>	<b>207</b>	<b>229</b>	<b>(x)</b>	<b>(x)</b>	<b>90</b>	<b>101</b>	<b>112</b>	<b>(x)</b>	<b>64</b>	<b>85</b>	<b>(x)</b>	<b>(x)</b>
<b>Change (Amount)</b>																	
to Peak	52	52	72	122	(x)	(x)	39	58	-13	-11	-2	13	(x)	(x)	-22	-1	
to End	-92	-72	-85	(x)	-88	-49	(x)	(x)	-42	-41	-22	(x)	-47	-31	(x)	(x)	
<b>Change (%)</b>																	
to Peak	19%	18%	27%	43%	(x)	(x)	15%	27%	-9%	-7%	-1%	9%	(x)	(x)	-16%	-1%	
to End	-28%	-22%	-25%	(x)	-30%	-18%	(x)	(x)	-32%	-29%	-17%	(x)	-42%	-27%	(x)	(x)	

Detailed Table

2d2.

Average Annual Immigration for Calendar Years, 1990-2004, for the Six Largest Immigration States by Estimation Method based on CPS, ACS, and Census 2000 Data

(In thousands)

Calendar Year	Average (2000-Based)	2000-Based					1990-Based		Average (2000-Based)	2000-Based					'90-Based																
		CPS (arrival)	ACS (arrival)	Cen. 2000 (arrival)	CPS (yr ago)	ACS (yr ago)	CPS (arrival)	CPS (yr ago)		CPS (arrival)	ACS (arrival)	Cen. 2000 (arrival)	CPS (yr ago)	ACS (yr ago)	CPS (arrival)	CPS (yr ago)															
<b>Texas</b>																<b>Florida</b>															
1990	129	130	129	130	(x)	(x)	97	(x)	91	95	91	88	(x)	(x)	76	(x)															
1991	104	130	94	90	(x)	(x)	97	(x)	78	95	69	69	(x)	(x)	76	(x)															
1992	104	109	98	104	(x)	(x)	103	(x)	87	98	83	80	(x)	(x)	76	(x)															
1993	105	109	102	105	(x)	(x)	103	56	86	98	78	82	(x)	(x)	76	93															
1994	111	111	105	116	(x)	(x)	95	56	105	131	89	95	(x)	(x)	99	93															
1995	134	111	143	149	(x)	(x)	92	66	121	131	103	129	(x)	(x)	103	116															
1996	128	125	135	123	(x)	(x)	99	98	88	91	86	87	(x)	(x)	102	80															
1997	126	125	125	128	(x)	(x)	99	68	89	91	91	85	(x)	(x)	102	76															
1998	154	152	162	147	(x)	(x)	102	59	123	151	108	109	(x)	(x)	135	89															
1999	147	152	158	179	106	141	107	91	157	151	143	156	180	154	150	147															
2000	163	167	177	195	139	135	114	118	152	154	161	151	132	158	141	111															
2001	138	175	146	(x)	104	128	117	122	140	152	139	(x)	122	147	133	102															
2002	133	173	120	(x)	132	108	(x)	(x)	110	111	113	(x)	98	120	(x)	(x)															
2003	124	163	132	(x)	111	90	(x)	(x)	101	98	134	(x)	53	118	(x)	(x)															
2004	126	159	131	(x)	126	90	(x)	(x)	110	94	114	(x)	106	128	(x)	(x)															
<b>Start</b>	<b>'92-'97</b>	<b>118</b>	<b>115</b>	<b>118</b>	<b>121</b>	<b>(x)</b>	<b>(x)</b>	<b>99</b>	<b>69</b>	<b>96</b>	<b>107</b>	<b>88</b>	<b>93</b>	<b>(x)</b>	<b>(x)</b>	<b>93</b>	<b>92</b>														
<b>Peak</b>	<b>'99-'00</b>	<b>155</b>	<b>159</b>	<b>167</b>	<b>187</b>	<b>122</b>	<b>138</b>	<b>111</b>	<b>104</b>	<b>154</b>	<b>153</b>	<b>152</b>	<b>154</b>	<b>156</b>	<b>156</b>	<b>145</b>	<b>129</b>														
<b>End</b>	<b>'02-'04</b>	<b>128</b>	<b>165</b>	<b>128</b>	<b>(x)</b>	<b>123</b>	<b>96</b>	<b>(x)</b>	<b>(x)</b>	<b>107</b>	<b>101</b>	<b>120</b>	<b>(x)</b>	<b>86</b>	<b>122</b>	<b>(x)</b>	<b>(x)</b>														
<b>Change (Amount)</b>																															
to Peak	37	45	49	66	(x)	(x)	12	35	58	46	64	61	(x)	(x)	52	38															
to End	-27	5	-39	(x)	1	-42	(x)	(x)	-47	-52	-32	(x)	-70	-34	(x)	(x)															
<b>Change (%)</b>																															
to Peak	31%	39%	42%	55%	(x)	(x)	12%	52%	61%	43%	72%	65%	(x)	(x)	56%	41%															
to End	-17%	3%	-24%	(x)	0%	-30%	(x)	(x)	-30%	-34%	-21%	(x)	-45%	-22%	(x)	(x)															

Detailed Table

2d2.

Average Annual Immigration for Calendar Years, 1990-2004, for the Six Largest Immigration States by Estimation Method based on CPS, ACS, and Census 2000 Data

(In thousands)

Calendar Year	Average (2000-Based)	2000-Based					1990-Based		Average (2000-Based)	2000-Based					'90-Based				
		CPS (arrival)	ACS (arrival)	Cen. 2000 (arrival)	CPS (yr ago)	ACS (yr ago)	CPS (arrival)	CPS (yr ago)		CPS (arrival)	ACS (arrival)	Cen. 2000 (arrival)	CPS (yr ago)	ACS (yr ago)	CPS (arrival)	CPS (yr ago)			
<b>Illinois</b>															<b>New Jersey</b>				
1990	61	52	66	67	(x)	(x)	55	(x)	60	55	62	64	(x)	(x)	48	(x)			
1991	50	52	49	50	(x)	(x)	55	(x)	51	55	48	50	(x)	(x)	48	(x)			
1992	50	42	50	59	(x)	(x)	38	(x)	53	48	60	52	(x)	(x)	54	(x)			
1993	51	42	52	58	(x)	(x)	38	17	48	48	50	48	(x)	(x)	54	51			
1994	62	61	65	61	(x)	(x)	48	17	54	60	46	55	(x)	(x)	51	51			
1995	66	61	66	72	(x)	(x)	50	37	58	60	55	60	(x)	(x)	50	60			
1996	59	56	61	60	(x)	(x)	44	40	54	56	50	55	(x)	(x)	47	28			
1997	59	56	57	64	(x)	(x)	42	24	53	56	47	56	(x)	(x)	47	31			
1998	78	77	78	78	(x)	(x)	52	51	64	63	61	68	(x)	(x)	46	36			
1999	68	77	83	90	28	62	57	30	61	63	72	81	40	51	46	38			
2000	72	64	87	86	53	72	62	42	63	69	83	69	36	58	49	29			
2001	61	62	67	(x)	43	72	64	46	61	71	66	(x)	43	65	51	27			
2002	55	59	50	(x)	55	54	(x)	(x)	51	52	67	(x)	28	58	(x)	(x)			
2003	51	52	62	(x)	41	49	(x)	(x)	42	48	46	(x)	32	44	(x)	(x)			
2004	53	49	44	(x)	67	53	(x)	(x)	46	47	47	(x)	52	36	(x)	(x)			
<b>Start</b>	<b>'92-'97</b>	<b>58</b>	<b>53</b>	<b>59</b>	<b>62</b>	<b>(x)</b>	<b>(x)</b>	<b>43</b>	<b>27</b>	<b>53</b>	<b>55</b>	<b>51</b>	<b>54</b>	<b>(x)</b>	<b>(x)</b>	<b>51</b>	<b>44</b>		
<b>Peak</b>	<b>'99-'00</b>	<b>70</b>	<b>71</b>	<b>85</b>	<b>88</b>	<b>40</b>	<b>67</b>	<b>59</b>	<b>36</b>	<b>62</b>	<b>66</b>	<b>78</b>	<b>75</b>	<b>38</b>	<b>54</b>	<b>48</b>	<b>33</b>		
<b>End</b>	<b>'02-'04</b>	<b>53</b>	<b>54</b>	<b>52</b>	<b>(x)</b>	<b>54</b>	<b>52</b>	<b>(x)</b>	<b>(x)</b>	<b>46</b>	<b>49</b>	<b>53</b>	<b>(x)</b>	<b>37</b>	<b>46</b>	<b>(x)</b>	<b>(x)</b>		
<b>Change (Amount)</b>																			
to Peak		12	18	26	26	(x)	(x)	16	9	9	11	27	21	(x)	(x)	-3	-11		
to End		-17	-17	-32	(x)	14	-15	(x)	(x)	-16	-17	-25	(x)	-1	-8	(x)	(x)		
<b>Change (%)</b>																			
to Peak		21%	34%	45%	41%	(x)	(x)	36%	33%	16%	20%	52%	38%	(x)	(x)	-6%	-24%		
to End		-24%	-24%	-38%	(x)	34%	-22%	(x)	(x)	-26%	-26%	-32%	(x)	-2%	-15%	(x)	(x)		

Source: Passel (2005), Pew Hispanic Center.

(x) -- not available.

Note: See text for details of estimation methods.

Detailed Table  
2d3.

Average Annual Immigration for Calendar Years, 1990-2004, by Region of Residence for Smaller Immigration States and  
by Estimation Method based on CPS, ACS, and Census 2000 Data

(In thousands)

Calendar Year	Average (2000-Based)	2000-Based					1990-Based		Average (2000-Based)	2000-Based					'90-Based			
		CPS (arrival)	ACS (arrival)	Cen. 2000 (arrival)	CPS (yr ago)	ACS (yr ago)	CPS (arrival)	CPS (yr ago)		CPS (arrival)	ACS (arrival)	Cen. 2000 (arrival)	CPS (yr ago)	ACS (yr ago)	CPS (arrival)	CPS (yr ago)		
		<b>New Growth States -- Southeast *</b>								<b>New Growth States -- Midwest *</b>								
1990	59	41	66	68	(x)	(x)	45	(x)	29	33	25	29	(x)	(x)	23	(x)		
1991	48	41	49	54	(x)	(x)	45	(x)	25	33	20	22	(x)	(x)	23	(x)		
1992	63	63	62	64	(x)	(x)	52	(x)	28	29	26	29	(x)	(x)	30	(x)		
1993	64	63	62	66	(x)	(x)	52	99	26	29	23	27	(x)	(x)	30	39		
1994	72	64	73	79	(x)	(x)	58	99	32	30	32	35	(x)	(x)	31	39		
1995	87	64	94	103	(x)	(x)	57	43	35	30	32	42	(x)	(x)	31	26		
1996	92	91	91	95	(x)	(x)	71	41	38	41	36	38	(x)	(x)	37	40		
1997	101	91	107	104	(x)	(x)	74	44	41	41	37	44	(x)	(x)	37	35		
1998	135	136	127	140	(x)	(x)	105	95	52	52	48	56	(x)	(x)	45	47		
1999	145	136	142	185	128	132	116	111	58	52	60	72	48	59	44	45		
2000	136	132	157	172	94	126	125	84	56	58	66	57	34	64	48	29		
2001	111	132	129	(x)	68	116	128	79	50	58	54	(x)	26	62	50	25		
2002	113	143	128	(x)	75	107	(x)	(x)	39	43	41	(x)	29	44	(x)	(x)		
2003	120	154	127	(x)	77	121	(x)	(x)	42	41	48	(x)	37	42	(x)	(x)		
2004	159	157	169	(x)	171	140	(x)	(x)	47	40	47	(x)	49	52	(x)	(x)		
<b>Start '92-'97</b>	<b>80</b>	<b>72</b>	<b>82</b>	<b>85</b>	<b>(x)</b>	<b>(x)</b>	<b>61</b>	<b>65</b>	<b>33</b>	<b>33</b>	<b>31</b>	<b>36</b>	<b>(x)</b>	<b>(x)</b>	<b>33</b>	<b>36</b>		
<b>Peak '99-'00</b>	<b>140</b>	<b>134</b>	<b>149</b>	<b>178</b>	<b>111</b>	<b>129</b>	<b>120</b>	<b>98</b>	<b>57</b>	<b>55</b>	<b>63</b>	<b>65</b>	<b>41</b>	<b>61</b>	<b>46</b>	<b>37</b>		
<b>End '02-'04</b>	<b>131</b>	<b>152</b>	<b>142</b>	<b>(x)</b>	<b>107</b>	<b>123</b>	<b>(x)</b>	<b>(x)</b>	<b>43</b>	<b>41</b>	<b>45</b>	<b>(x)</b>	<b>38</b>	<b>46</b>	<b>(x)</b>	<b>(x)</b>		
<b>Change (Amount)</b>																		
to Peak	61	62	68	93	(x)	(x)	60	33	24	22	32	29	(x)	(x)	13	1		
to End	-9	17	-8	(x)	-3	-6	(x)	(x)	-14	-13	-18	(x)	-2	-15	(x)	(x)		
<b>Change (%)</b>																		
to Peak	76%	85%	83%	109%	(x)	(x)	99%	50%	71%	65%	103%	80%	(x)	(x)	41%	3%		
to End	-7%	13%	-5%	(x)	-3%	-5%	(x)	(x)	-25%	-24%	-28%	(x)	-6%	-25%	(x)	(x)		

Detailed Table  
2d3.

Average Annual Immigration for Calendar Years, 1990-2004, by Region of Residence for Smaller Immigration States and  
by Estimation Method based on CPS, ACS, and Census 2000 Data

(In thousands)

Calendar Year	Average (2000-Based)	2000-Based					1990-Based		Average (2000-Based)	2000-Based					'90-Based	
		CPS (arrival)	ACS (arrival)	Cen. 2000 (arrival)	CPS (yr ago)	ACS (yr ago)	CPS (arrival)	CPS (yr ago)		CPS (arrival)	ACS (arrival)	Cen. 2000 (arrival)	CPS (yr ago)	ACS (yr ago)	CPS (arrival)	CPS (yr ago)
<b>New Growth States -- Mountain/West *</b>									<b>Other States -- Northeast &amp; South</b>							
1990	105	93	112	109	(x)	(x)	89	(x)	90	80	89	100	(x)	(x)	65	(x)
1991	86	93	78	86	(x)	(x)	89	(x)	80	80	79	80	(x)	(x)	65	(x)
1992	92	101	88	87	(x)	(x)	83	(x)	88	103	78	83	(x)	(x)	88	(x)
1993	91	101	82	90	(x)	(x)	83	50	90	103	85	83	(x)	(x)	88	57
1994	97	104	86	101	(x)	(x)	99	50	90	94	85	92	(x)	(x)	98	57
1995	117	104	118	129	(x)	(x)	102	120	98	94	95	106	(x)	(x)	96	96
1996	109	112	109	107	(x)	(x)	111	117	102	107	99	101	(x)	(x)	102	105
1997	112	112	110	114	(x)	(x)	109	95	110	107	109	114	(x)	(x)	105	87
1998	147	162	137	142	(x)	(x)	128	90	140	155	127	137	(x)	(x)	133	113
1999	152	162	146	183	127	143	139	114	151	155	144	177	148	134	140	135
2000	164	164	163	184	162	148	148	168	159	174	157	148	174	141	152	160
2001	141	164	133	(x)	127	140	152	178	153	178	145	(x)	151	137	156	165
2002	117	119	120	(x)	110	118	(x)	(x)	132	146	122	(x)	139	122	(x)	(x)
2003	100	108	106	(x)	75	113	(x)	(x)	111	138	103	(x)	100	103	(x)	(x)
2004	119	106	132	(x)	118	120	(x)	(x)	99	137	102	(x)	70	89	(x)	(x)
<b>Start '92-'97</b>	<b>103</b>	<b>106</b>	<b>99</b>	<b>105</b>	<b>(x)</b>	<b>(x)</b>	<b>98</b>	<b>87</b>	<b>97</b>	<b>102</b>	<b>92</b>	<b>96</b>	<b>(x)</b>	<b>(x)</b>	<b>96</b>	<b>81</b>
<b>Peak '99-'00</b>	<b>158</b>	<b>163</b>	<b>154</b>	<b>183</b>	<b>145</b>	<b>145</b>	<b>144</b>	<b>141</b>	<b>155</b>	<b>165</b>	<b>150</b>	<b>162</b>	<b>161</b>	<b>137</b>	<b>146</b>	<b>147</b>
<b>End '02-'04</b>	<b>112</b>	<b>111</b>	<b>119</b>	<b>(x)</b>	<b>101</b>	<b>117</b>	<b>(x)</b>	<b>(x)</b>	<b>114</b>	<b>140</b>	<b>109</b>	<b>(x)</b>	<b>103</b>	<b>105</b>	<b>(x)</b>	<b>(x)</b>
<b>Change (Amount)</b>																
to Peak	55	57	56	79	(x)	(x)	46	54	58	63	58	66	(x)	(x)	50	67
to End	-46	-52	-35	(x)	-44	-28	(x)	(x)	-41	-24	-41	(x)	-58	-33	(x)	(x)
<b>Change (%)</b>																
to Peak	53%	54%	56%	75%	(x)	(x)	47%	63%	60%	62%	63%	68%	(x)	(x)	52%	83%
to End	-29%	-32%	-23%	(x)	-30%	-19%	(x)	(x)	-26%	-15%	-28%	(x)	-36%	-24%	(x)	(x)

**Detailed Table 2d3. Average Annual Immigration for Calendar Years, 1990-2004, by Region of Residence for Smaller Immigration States and by Estimation Method based on CPS, ACS, and Census 2000 Data**

(In thousands)

Calendar Year	Average (2000-Based)	2000-Based					1990-Based		Average (2000-Based)	2000-Based					'90-Based	
		CPS (arrival)	ACS (arrival)	Cen. 2000 (arrival)	CPS (yr ago)	ACS (yr ago)	CPS (arrival)	CPS (yr ago)		CPS (arrival)	ACS (arrival)	Cen. 2000 (arrival)	CPS (yr ago)	ACS (yr ago)	CPS (arrival)	CPS (yr ago)
<b>Other States -- Midwest &amp; West</b>																
1990	68	66	67	72	(x)	(x)	81	(x)								
1991	63	66	60	63	(x)	(x)	81	(x)								
<b>1992</b>	<b>68</b>	<b>69</b>	<b>67</b>	<b>67</b>	<b>(x)</b>	<b>(x)</b>	<b>78</b>	<b>(x)</b>								
<b>1993</b>	<b>67</b>	<b>69</b>	<b>64</b>	<b>69</b>	<b>(x)</b>	<b>(x)</b>	<b>78</b>	<b>59</b>								
<b>1994</b>	<b>77</b>	<b>81</b>	<b>74</b>	<b>74</b>	<b>(x)</b>	<b>(x)</b>	<b>84</b>	<b>59</b>								
<b>1995</b>	<b>86</b>	<b>81</b>	<b>86</b>	<b>91</b>	<b>(x)</b>	<b>(x)</b>	<b>83</b>	<b>68</b>								
<b>1996</b>	<b>88</b>	<b>90</b>	<b>86</b>	<b>89</b>	<b>(x)</b>	<b>(x)</b>	<b>89</b>	<b>60</b>								
<b>1997</b>	<b>93</b>	<b>90</b>	<b>92</b>	<b>98</b>	<b>(x)</b>	<b>(x)</b>	<b>90</b>	<b>81</b>								
1998	113	120	104	115	(x)	(x)	113	55								
<b>1999</b>	<b>122</b>	<b>120</b>	<b>120</b>	<b>141</b>	<b>87</b>	<b>141</b>	<b>123</b>	<b>77</b>								
<b>2000</b>	<b>129</b>	<b>130</b>	<b>136</b>	<b>123</b>	<b>121</b>	<b>132</b>	<b>134</b>	<b>133</b>								
2001	115	129	125	(x)	88	117	138	144								
<b>2002</b>	<b>100</b>	<b>108</b>	<b>112</b>	<b>(x)</b>	<b>71</b>	<b>107</b>	<b>(x)</b>	<b>(x)</b>								
<b>2003</b>	<b>100</b>	<b>110</b>	<b>99</b>	<b>(x)</b>	<b>90</b>	<b>100</b>	<b>(x)</b>	<b>(x)</b>								
<b>2004</b>	<b>102</b>	<b>111</b>	<b>100</b>	<b>(x)</b>	<b>102</b>	<b>96</b>	<b>(x)</b>	<b>(x)</b>								
<b>Start '92-'97</b>	<b>80</b>	<b>80</b>	<b>78</b>	<b>81</b>	<b>(x)</b>	<b>(x)</b>	<b>84</b>	<b>65</b>								
<b>Peak '99-'00</b>	<b>125</b>	<b>125</b>	<b>128</b>	<b>132</b>	<b>104</b>	<b>137</b>	<b>129</b>	<b>105</b>								
<b>End '02-'04</b>	<b>100</b>	<b>110</b>	<b>104</b>	<b>(x)</b>	<b>87</b>	<b>101</b>	<b>(x)</b>	<b>(x)</b>								
<b>Change (Amount)</b>																
to Peak	45	45	50	51	(x)	(x)	45	40								
to End	-25	-16	-24	(x)	-17	-36	(x)	(x)								
<b>Change (%)</b>																
to Peak	57%	56%	64%	62%	(x)	(x)	54%	61%								
to End	-20%	-12%	-19%	(x)	-16%	-26%	(x)	(x)								

Source: Passel (2005), Pew Hispanic Center.

(x) -- not available.

Note: See text for details of estimation methods.

\* "New Growth States" are states other than the 6 largest immigration states where the foreign-born population grew faster during 1990-2000 than in the fastest growing large state (TX). The 22 New Growth States are: Southeast -- DE, NC, SC, GA, KY, TN, AL, MS, AR, OK; Mid-West -- IN, MN, IA, NE, KS; and Mountain/West -- ID, CO, AZ, UT, NV, WA, OR.

**Detailed  
Table 3.**

**Annual Legal Admissions and Foreign-Born Population, from March Current Population Survey and American Community Survey, by Year: 1991-2005**

(In thousands)

"CPS" Year (Ending March 1)	"Green cards" -- Non-IRCA LPRs			Change in Foreign-Born Population						Foreign-Born Population					
	Total	New Arrivals	Adjust- ments	Total			Post-'90 Entrants			Total			Post-'90 Entrants		
				March CPS			March CPS			March CPS			March CPS		
				'90-wts.	'00-wts.	ACS	'90-wts.	'00-wts.	ACS	'90-wts.	'00-wts.	ACS	'90-wts.	'00-wts.	ACS
1991	676	439	237	--	--	--	--	--	--	--	--	--	--	--	--
1992	748	472	277	--	--	--	--	--	--	--	--	--	--	--	--
1993	840	522	318	--	--	--	--	--	--	--	--	--	--	--	--
1994*	846	517	329	--	--	--	--	--	--	23,389	--	--	4,744	--	--
1995*	764	445	320	1,084	--	--	1,122	--	--	24,473	--	--	5,865	--	--
1996	797	397	400	84	--	--	714	--	--	24,557	--	--	6,579	--	--
1997	863	404	459	1,221	--	--	959	--	--	25,779	--	--	7,539	--	--
1998	737	371	366	503	--	--	1,089	--	--	26,281	--	--	8,628	--	--
1999	651	376	275	167	--	--	662	--	--	26,448	--	--	9,290	--	--
2000	731	404	327	1,932	--	--	1,916	--	--	28,379	30,089	30,273 #	11,206	12,126	13,149 #
2001	939	409	530	1,548	1,725	1,275	2,065	2,420	1,172	29,927	31,814	31,548	13,271	14,546	14,322
2002	1,064	400	664	--	646	1,548	--	1,235	1,381	--	32,460	33,096	--	15,781	15,703
2003	915	374	541	--	1,010	572	--	990	970	--	33,471	33,668	--	16,771	16,673
2004	806	360	446	--	773	590	--	1,249	839	--	34,244	34,258	--	18,020	17,512
2005**	946	362	584	--	912	--	--	1,469	--	--	35,156	--	--	19,488	--

Source: Tabulations and estimates from Pew Hispanic Center, Passel (2005).

Notes: "Green" card data are from *Yearbook of Immigration Statistics*, Table 4. The data exclude persons granted permanent residency under the Immigration Reform and Control Act of 1986 (IRCA). Data shown are estimates for March-February years obtained by averaging fiscal year data. \*\*For 2005, estimates assume admissions for October 2004-February 2005 at same level as fiscal 2004. See text for explanation of CPS and ACS data. \* Figures shown for 1994 and 1995 CPS use corrected weights from Passel (1996). CPS populations refer to the civilian noninstitutional population; ACS figures to the household population.

# Census 2000 values (in thousands) for total foreign-born population and post-1990 entrants are: 31,146 and 13,212, respectively.

**Detailed Immigration to the United States by Decade: 1820-2010**  
**Table 4.**

(In thousands)

Period*	Legal Admissions	Admissions less IRCA	"Other" Immigrants	Total Immigration	Census Population	Percent Immigration
1820-2010	69,869	72,842	20,200	93,042	(na)	(na)
1820	8					
1821-1830	143	143	--	143	9,638	1.5%
1831-1840	599	599	--	599	12,866	4.7%
1841-1850	1,713	1,713	--	1,713	17,069	10.0%
1851-1860	2,598	2,598	--	2,598	23,192	11.2%
1861-1870	2,315	2,315	--	2,315	31,443	7.4%
1871-1880	2,812	2,812	--	2,812	38,558	7.3%
1881-1890	5,247	5,247	--	5,247	50,189	10.5%
1891-1900	3,688	3,688	--	3,688	62,980	5.9%
1901-1910	8,795	8,795	200	8,995	76,212	11.8%
1911-1920	5,736	5,736	300	6,036	92,228	6.5%
1921-1930	4,107	4,107	--	4,107	106,022	3.9%
1931-1940	528	528	--	528	123,203	0.4%
1941-1950	1,035	1,035	--	1,035	132,165	0.8%
1951-1960	2,515	2,515	--	2,515	151,326	1.7%
1961-1970	3,322	3,322	500	3,822	179,323	2.1%
1971-1980	4,493	4,493	2,500	6,993	203,302	3.4%
1981-1990	7,338	5,979	4,000	9,979	226,542	4.4%
1991-2000	9,095	7,766	6,200	13,966	248,710	5.6%
2001-2010	3,780	9,450	6,500	15,950	281,422	5.7%

Source: *Yearbook of Immigration Statistics: 2004*, Table 1; author's estimates (Passel 2005); and *Historical Statistics of the United States*.

Notes: \* Fiscal years  
 "Legal Admissions" are shown through 2004, as follows:  
 1820-67 alien passengers arrived at seaports;  
 1868-92 immigrant aliens arrived;  
 1892-94 immigrant aliens admitted for permanent residence;  
 1895-97 immigrant aliens arrived;  
 1898-2003 immigrant aliens admitted for permanent residence;  
 1892-1903 aliens entering by cabin class not counted as immigrants;  
 -1908 land arrivals not completely enumerated.  
 "Admissions less IRCA" make two changes to "Legal Admissions":  
 (1) Persons acquiring legal status through the Immigration Reform and Control Act of 1986 (IRCA) are not included: 1,359,000 in 1981-1990 and 1,330,000 in 1991  
 (2) Admissions for 2001-2010 are assumed to continue for the rest of the decade at the average for 2001-2004.  
 "Other Immigrants" include unauthorized migrants and refugees not counted elsewhere. Persons acquiring legal status under IRCA are included here at the time of their arrival. Author's estimates and approximations.  
 Census counts are for the beginning of each decade. Percentages compare immigration during the decade to the population at the beginning.

(na) -- not applicable.

Detailed  
Table 5a.

Mexico-U.S. Migration and Labor Force and Unemployment for the United States and Mexico: 1990-2004

(Populations in thousands)

Year	Labor force*		Unemployed persons		Total employment		Percent unemployed		Change in labor force		Change in employment		Percent change in labor force		Percent change in employment		Mexico-U.S. Migration (Table 1b)
	Mexico	U.S.	Mexico	U.S.	Mexico	U.S.	Mex.	U.S.	Mex.	U.S.	Mex.	U.S.	Mex.	U.S.	Mex.	U.S.	
1990	24,063	129,045	(x)	7,047	(x)	121,998	(x)	5.5%	(x)	(x)	(x)	(x)	(x)	(x)	(x)	(x)	(na)
1991	(x)	129,491	(x)	8,628	(x)	120,863	(x)	6.7%	(x)	446	(x)	-1,135	(x)	0.3%	(x)	-0.9%	337
1992	(x)	131,085	(x)	9,613	(x)	121,472	(x)	7.3%	(x)	1,594	(x)	609	(x)	1.2%	(x)	0.5%	329
1993	32,381	131,999	(x)	8,940	(x)	123,059	(x)	6.8%	(x)	914	(x)	1,587	(x)	0.7%	(x)	1.3%	332
1994	(x)	133,704	(x)	7,996	(x)	125,708	(x)	6.0%	(x)	1,705	(x)	2,649	(x)	1.3%	(x)	2.2%	372
1995	35,559	134,848	1,980	7,404	33,578	127,444	5.6%	5.5%	(x)	1,144	(x)	1,736	(x)	0.9%	(x)	1.4%	443
1996	36,581	136,390	1,575	7,236	35,006	129,154	4.3%	5.3%	1,022	1,542	1,428	1,710	2.9%	1.1%	4.3%	1.3%	388
1997	38,345	138,673	1,302	6,739	37,043	131,934	3.4%	4.9%	1,764	2,283	2,037	2,780	4.8%	1.7%	5.8%	2.2%	390
1998	39,562	139,995	1,161	6,210	38,401	133,785	2.9%	4.4%	1,218	1,322	1,358	1,851	3.2%	1.0%	3.7%	1.4%	507
1999	39,648	141,659	825	5,880	38,823	135,779	2.1%	4.2%	86	1,664	422	1,994	0.2%	1.2%	1.1%	1.5%	496
2000	40,162	144,867	861	5,692	39,301	139,175	2.1%	3.9%	513	3,208	477	3,396	1.3%	2.3%	1.2%	2.5%	530
2001	40,073	146,023	855	6,801	39,218	139,222	2.1%	4.7%	-89	1,156	-82	47	-0.2%	0.8%	-0.2%	0.0%	437
2002	41,086	147,185	969	8,378	40,117	138,807	2.4%	5.8%	1,013	1,162	899	-415	2.5%	0.8%	2.3%	-0.3%	378
2003	41,516	148,858	1,047	8,774	40,469	140,084	2.5%	6.0%	430	1,673	352	1,277	1.0%	1.1%	0.9%	0.9%	369
2004	(x)	(x)	(x)	8,149	(x)	(x)	3.2%	5.5%	(x)	1,395	(x)	1,516	(x)	0.9%	(x)	1.1%	459
<b>Correlation with Mexican migration:</b>																	
<b>Current year --</b>																	
	(x)	(x)	(x)	(x)	(x)	(x)	-0.23	<b>-0.90</b>	-0.30	0.48	-0.24	0.48	-0.30	0.43	-0.26	0.45	(x)
<b>Migration lagged one year --</b>																	
	(x)	(x)	(x)	(x)	(x)	(x)	-0.28	-0.66	0.18	0.51	0.28	<b>0.67</b>	0.19	0.49	0.27	<b>0.66</b>	(x)

\* Economically-active population

(x) -- not available.

(na) -- not applicable.

Source: OECD Economic Statistics through 2003; Bureau of Labor Statistics for U.S. 2004; CIA for Mexico 2004.

**Detailed Mexico-U.S. Migration and Table 5b. Gross Domestic Product for the United States and Mexico: 1990-2004**

(In billions of U.S. dollars)

Year	GDP (In Current PPP)		GDP (in 2000 US\$)		Percent change in GDP (Current PPP)		Percent change in GDP (2000 US\$)		Mexico- U.S. Migration (Table 1b)
	Mexico	U.S.	Mex.	U.S.	Mex.	U.S.	Mex.	U.S.	
	1990	515	5,803	638	7,113	(x)	(x)	(x)	
1991	556	5,996	665	7,101	7.9%	3.3%	4.2%	-0.2%	337
1992	589	6,338	689	7,337	6.0%	5.7%	3.6%	3.3%	<b>329</b>
1993	614	6,657	702	7,533	4.3%	5.0%	2.0%	2.7%	<b>332</b>
1994	655	7,072	733	7,836	6.6%	6.2%	4.4%	4.0%	<b>372</b>
1995	627	7,398	688	8,032	-4.3%	4.6%	-6.2%	2.5%	<b>443</b>
1996	672	7,817	724	8,329	7.2%	5.7%	5.2%	3.7%	<b>388</b>
1997	730	8,304	773	8,704	8.6%	6.2%	6.8%	4.5%	<b>390</b>
1998	775	8,747	812	9,067	6.2%	5.3%	5.0%	4.2%	<b>507</b>
1999	816	9,268	842	9,470	5.3%	6.0%	3.8%	4.4%	<b>496</b>
2000	898	9,817	898	9,817	10.1%	5.9%	6.6%	3.7%	<b>530</b>
2001	919	10,128	897	9,891	2.4%	3.2%	0.0%	0.8%	437
2002	951	10,470	904	10,049	3.5%	3.4%	0.8%	1.6%	378
2003	983	10,971	917	10,321	3.3%	4.8%	1.4%	2.7%	<b>369</b>
2004	1,006	11,734	(x)	10,756	2.4%	7.0%	4.4%	4.2%	<b>459</b>
<b>Correlation with Mexican migration:</b>									
<b>Current year --</b>									
	(x)	(x)	(x)	(x)	-0.02	0.28	0.09	0.40	(x)
<b>Migration lagged one year --</b>									
	(x)	(x)	(x)	(x)	0.21	<b>0.58</b>	0.35	<b>0.73</b>	(x)

(x) -- not available.

(na) -- not applicable.

Source: OECD Economic Statistics through 2003; Bureau of Labor Statistics for U.S. 2004; World Bank for Mexico 2004.