

Potential Stafford Act Assistance for Migration Activity

Updated May 18, 2023

After more than three years, the Centers for Disease Control and Prevention (CDC) order directing U.S. immigration officials to expel certain migrants (often called “Title 42”) terminated on May 11, 2023—in concert with the [conclusion of different federal emergency declarations](#). It is too soon to know how [this change](#) might affect migration activity [at the border](#) over the long term; currently, [reports are mixed](#). However, communities across the country have reportedly [sought federal support](#) for costs related to hosting migrants (e.g., shelter), [including](#) through the Robert T. Stafford Emergency Assistance and Disaster Relief Act (Stafford Act, P.L. 93-288, as amended) administered by the Federal Emergency Management Act (FEMA).

Potential Stafford Act Assistance

A state or territorial governor or tribal chief executive may request Stafford Act assistance for response and recovery from specific incidents. The Stafford Act authorizes the President to issue [two types of declarations](#): an “[emergency declaration](#)” or a “[major disaster declaration](#).” The Stafford Act [defines emergencies](#) broadly as occasions warranting supplemental federal assistance to save lives and protect public health and safety. By contrast, the Stafford Act [defines major disasters](#) exclusively as “natural catastrophes” or fires, floods, and explosions.

Public Assistance for Emergencies

Emergency declarations often authorize Public Assistance (PA), funding that supplements state, territorial, or tribal resources in response to an incident. An emergency declaration may authorize one form of PA potentially relevant to hosting migrants: [emergency protective measures](#), defined as activities undertaken to reduce an immediate threat to life, public health, or safety. When authorized, state, local, tribal, and territorial governments (and [in certain cases](#), eligible nonprofits) may receive reimbursement or direct support (e.g., personnel, facilities) for certain types of work, including the provision of [emergency shelter](#) and transportation, emergency communications, and emergency commodities.

Congressional Research Service

<https://crsreports.congress.gov>

IN12163

In the past, [the PA program has delivered assistance](#) to jurisdictions that host evacuees from certain domestic Stafford-declared incidents. Agency policy specifies that [FEMA reimburses 100%](#) of eligible costs of emergency protective measures delivered to host-states or host-tribes.

However, FEMA has not delivered Stafford Act assistance specifically for international migration activity under current law. The Secretary of the Department of Homeland Security (DHS) [recently suggested](#) that current migration activity would not qualify as a Stafford Act emergency. Congress has [repeatedly raised](#) concern regarding FEMA's role at the border.

Individual Assistance for Emergencies

Although uncommon, emergency declarations can also authorize the provision of two forms of Individual Assistance (IA) to help address individuals' disaster-caused needs: (1) [Crisis Counseling](#), which supplements nonfederal resources to alleviate incident-related mental/emotional crises; and (2) the [Individuals and Households Program \(IHP\)](#), which provides financial and/or direct assistance for housing and financial assistance for other needs.

Crisis Counseling services are available regardless of an individual's [citizenship/immigration status](#); however, [only U.S. citizens, non-citizen nationals, and qualified aliens are eligible for IHP assistance](#). [Statutory eligibility requirements](#) could also inhibit the provision of aid to migrants through the IHP.

Historical Emergency Declarations for Migrants/Evacuees

Only two Presidents have issued Stafford Act declarations specifically for the costs of hosting migrants and disaster evacuees. At the time of the declarations, some Members of Congress expressed concern regarding both cases, as detailed below. More recently, the Biden Administration denied [Governor Greg Abbott's request](#) (and [subsequent appeal](#)) for Stafford Act assistance for migration activity in Texas.

[Mariel Boatlift—Cuban Refugees \(Florida, approved, 1980\)](#)

President Jimmy Carter [declared an emergency](#) in the State of Florida “due to the large numbers of undocumented aliens,” finding that “the humanitarian aspects of this exodus from Cuba cannot be ignored.” Subsequently, the U.S. General Accounting Office (now the U.S. Government Accountability Office (GAO)) issued a [report](#) noting that the declaration, among others, “[stirred considerable controversy](#) regarding whether non-natural ‘catastrophes’ are within the purview of existing law” and recommended that Congress “[spell\[\] out](#) as clearly as possible the type of incidents which may receive disaster assistance.” Subsequently, Congress passed the Stafford Act and [narrowed the definition of major disaster](#) to include only “natural” catastrophes and fires, floods, or explosions. The definition of emergency remained broad.

[Hurricane Katrina Evacuees \(Multiple States, approved, 2005\)](#)

President George W. Bush issued [emergency declarations](#) for 44 states and the District of Columbia following Hurricane Katrina to reimburse host states for up to 100% of the costs of [transporting, sheltering, schooling, and feeding survivors](#). Following the declarations, Some Members of Congress raised concern regarding the difficulties of delivering Stafford Act assistance to host jurisdictions—including the administrative burdens associated with establishing independent declarations for host states. FEMA subsequently [modified its regulations](#) to enable the delivery of PA to host states, thereby avoiding the need for separate evacuation declarations.

Request for “Ongoing Border Crisis” (Texas, denied, 2021)

President Joe Biden denied Texas’s request for a Stafford Act emergency declaration for increased migration activity, as well as its subsequent appeal (supported by Senators John Cornyn and Ted Cruz). Texas Governor Greg Abbott reported that the request was denied due to the deployment of other federal resources (among other reasons). FEMA Administrator Deanne Criswell reportedly explained that “supplemental federal assistance under the Stafford Act is not warranted for this event.”

Other Assistance Programs

Congress has recognized that local organizations often bear significant financial and social burdens resulting from migration activity. Beginning in 2019 and several times thereafter, Congress enacted legislation authorizing FEMA to supplement the humanitarian relief efforts of local governmental, nonprofit, and faith-based organizations that provide food, shelter, and supportive services to migrants encountered by DHS through the Emergency Food and Shelter Program (EFSP)—referred to as the EFSP-H (humanitarian). The EFSP-H is the only DHS grant program that provides funding to nonprofits assisting migrants released from DHS custody. In FY2023, Congress enacted P.L. 117-328, establishing a new Shelter and Services Program (SSP), which will replace the EFSP-H, and approved FEMA’s use of some SSP funding to implement the EFSP-H while establishing the SSP.

There are also some federal assistance programs through which migrants may be eligible to receive assistance (eligibility varies by program). Additionally, nonfederal resources, such as nonprofit organizations, may also provide assistance to support migrants.

Author Information

Erica A. Lee
Analyst in Emergency Management and Disaster
Recovery

Elizabeth M. Webster
Analyst in Emergency Management and Disaster
Recovery

Disclaimer

This document was prepared by the Congressional Research Service (CRS). CRS serves as nonpartisan shared staff to congressional committees and Members of Congress. It operates solely at the behest of and under the direction of Congress. Information in a CRS Report should not be relied upon for purposes other than public understanding of information that has been provided by CRS to Members of Congress in connection with CRS’s institutional role. CRS Reports, as a work of the United States Government, are not subject to copyright protection in the United States. Any CRS Report may be reproduced and distributed in its entirety without permission from CRS. However, as a CRS Report may include copyrighted images or material from a third party, you may need to obtain the permission of the copyright holder if you wish to copy or otherwise use copyrighted material.