

1 Russell L. Hirschhorn*
(NY Bar No. RH3394)
2 PROSKAUER ROSE LLP
Eleven Times Square
3 New York, NY 10036
212.696.3286
4 rhirschhorn@proskauer.com

5 Vanessa Soriano Power
(WSBA # 30777)
6 STOEL RIVES LLP
7 600 University St.
Suite 3600
8 SEATTLE, WA 98101
206.386.7553
9 vanessa.power@stoel.com

10 *Admission Pro Hac Vice Pending
11 [Additional Counsel on Signature Page]

12 **UNITED STATES DISTRICT COURT**
13 **EASTERN DISTRICT OF WASHINGTON**
14 **AT RICHLAND**

14 STATE OF WASHINGTON, et al.,

15 Plaintiffs,

16 v.

17 UNITED STATES DEPARTMENT
18 OF HOMELAND SECURITY, et al.,

19 Defendants.

Case No. 4:19-cv-4980-PJH

**BRIEF OF AMICI CURIAE
JUSTICE IN AGING, AMERICAN
SOCIETY ON AGING, CARING
ACROSS GENERATIONS,
JEWISH FAMILY SERVICE OF
LOS ANGELES, THE NATIONAL
ASIAN PACIFIC CENTER ON
AGING, NATIONAL COUNCIL
ON AGING, NATIONAL
HISPANIC COUNCIL ON
AGING, MAZON, AND PHI**

20 BRIEF OF *AMICI CURIAE*
21 JUSTICE IN AGING ET AL. – i

22 103590801.1 0099865-10005

1
2
3
4
5
6
7
8
9
10
11
12
13
14
15
16
17
18
19
20
21
22

TABLE OF CONTENTS

Page

TABLE OF AUTHORITIES.....iii

INTEREST OF AMICI CURIAE 1

PRELIMINARY STATEMENT 7

THE FINAL RULE WILL MAKE IT IMPOSSIBLE FOR OLDER
IMMIGRANTS TO PASS THE PUBLIC CHARGE TEST AND WILL
IRREPARABLY HARM OLDER ADULTS AND THEIR FAMILIES..... 9

CONCLUSION.....22

1
2
3
4
5
6
7
8
9
10
11
12
13
14
15
16
17
18
19
20
21
22

TABLE OF AUTHORITIES

Page(s)

Cases

Lau v. Nichols,
414 U.S. 563 (1974) 16

Statutes

8 U.S.C. § 1152(a)(1)(A)..... 16
 8 U.S.C. § 1153(a)..... 15
 29 U.S.C. § 794..... 14
 42 U.S.C. § 2000d..... 16
 42 U.S.C. § 2000e..... 16

Regulations

6 C.F.R. § 15.30..... 14
 64 Fed. Reg. 28,689, 28,689 (May 26, 1999)..... 7, 8
 84 Fed. Reg. 41,292 - 41,504 (Aug. 14, 2019)..... passim

Other Authorities

*2013-2017 American Community Survey 5-Year Public Use
 Microdata Sample (PUMS)*, United States Census Bureau
[https://factfinder.census.gov/faces/nav/jsf/pages/searchresults.xhtml
 ?refresh=t#](https://factfinder.census.gov/faces/nav/jsf/pages/searchresults.xhtml?refresh=t#)..... 18
 AARP Public Policy Institute, *Chronic Care: A Call to Action for
 Health Reform* (Mar. 2009), [www.aarp.org/health/medicare-
 insurance/info-03-2009/beyond_50_hcr.html](http://www.aarp.org/health/medicare-insurance/info-03-2009/beyond_50_hcr.html); 13

1 Allison B. Orris et al., *DHS Public Charge Regulation Could Drive*
 2 *Medicaid Coverage Losses*, Manatt (Aug. 29, 2019),
 3 [https://www.manatt.com/Insights/Newsletters/Manatt-on-Health-](https://www.manatt.com/Insights/Newsletters/Manatt-on-Health-Medicaid-Edition/DHS-Public-Charge-Regulation-Could-Drive-Medicaid)
 4 [Medicaid-Edition/DHS-Public-Charge-Regulation-Could-Drive-](https://www.manatt.com/Insights/Newsletters/Manatt-on-Health-Medicaid-Edition/DHS-Public-Charge-Regulation-Could-Drive-Medicaid)
 5 [Medicaid](https://www.manatt.com/Insights/Newsletters/Manatt-on-Health-Medicaid-Edition/DHS-Public-Charge-Regulation-Could-Drive-Medicaid) 21

6 Centers for Medicare & Medicaid Services, *People Dually Eligible for*
 7 *Medicare and Medicaid Fact Sheet* (Mar. 2019),
 8 [www.cms.gov/Medicare-Medicaid-Coordination/Medicare-and-](http://www.cms.gov/Medicare-Medicaid-Coordination/Medicare-and-Medicaid-Coordination/Medicare-Medicaid-Coordination-Office/Downloads/MMCO_Factsheet.pdf)
 9 [Medicaid-Coordination/Medicare-Medicaid-Coordination-](http://www.cms.gov/Medicare-Medicaid-Coordination/Medicare-Medicaid-Coordination-Office/Downloads/MMCO_Factsheet.pdf)
 10 [Office/Downloads/MMCO_Factsheet.pdf](http://www.cms.gov/Medicare-Medicaid-Coordination/Medicare-Medicaid-Coordination-Office/Downloads/MMCO_Factsheet.pdf) 14

11 DHS, Office of Immigration Statistics, *2017 Yearbook of Immigration*
 12 *Statistics*, Table 7. Persons Obtaining Lawful Permanent Resident
 13 Status by Type and Detailed Class of Admission: Fiscal Year
 14 2017 (Oct. 2, 2018), [https://www.dhs.gov/immigration-](https://www.dhs.gov/immigration-statistics/yearbook/2017/table7)
 15 [statistics/yearbook/2017/table7](https://www.dhs.gov/immigration-statistics/yearbook/2017/table7) 15

16 *The Emerging Needs of Asian American and Pacific Islander Older*
 17 *Adults*, National Asian Pacific Center on Aging (Feb. 2017),
 18 [napca.org/wp-content/uploads/2017/10/NAPCA-The-Emerging-](http://napca.org/wp-content/uploads/2017/10/NAPCA-The-Emerging-Needs-of-AAPI-Older-Adults_Final-Report_Feb2017.pdf)
 19 [Needs-of-AAPI-Older-Adults_Final-Report_Feb2017.pdf](http://napca.org/wp-content/uploads/2017/10/NAPCA-The-Emerging-Needs-of-AAPI-Older-Adults_Final-Report_Feb2017.pdf) 17

20 Immigration & Naturalization Service, Office of Policy & Planning,
 21 *Legal Immigration, Fiscal Year 1997*, Table 1,
 22 [www.dhs.gov/sites/default/files/publications/INS_AnnualReport_L](http://www.dhs.gov/sites/default/files/publications/INS_AnnualReport_LegalImmigration_1997_1.pdf)
[egalImmigration_1997_1.pdf](http://www.dhs.gov/sites/default/files/publications/INS_AnnualReport_LegalImmigration_1997_1.pdf) 15

Jeanne Batalova et al., *Chilling Effects: The Expected Public Charge*
Rule and Its Impact on Legal Immigrant Families’ Public Benefits
Use, Migration Policy Institute (June 2018),
[www.migrationpolicy.org/research/chilling-effects-expected-](http://www.migrationpolicy.org/research/chilling-effects-expected-public-charge-rule-impact-legal-immigrant-families)
[public-charge-rule-impact-legal-immigrant-families](http://www.migrationpolicy.org/research/chilling-effects-expected-public-charge-rule-impact-legal-immigrant-families) 19

Jeanne Batalova, *Senior Immigrants in the United States*, Migration
 Policy Institute (May 30, 2012),
[https://www.migrationpolicy.org/article/senior-immigrants-united-](https://www.migrationpolicy.org/article/senior-immigrants-united-states)
[states](https://www.migrationpolicy.org/article/senior-immigrants-united-states) 12, 17

1 Karthick Ramakrishnan & Farah Ahmad, *Language Diversity and*
English Proficiency, Center for American Progress (May 27, 2014)
2 [https://cdn.americanprogress.org/wp-](https://cdn.americanprogress.org/wp-content/uploads/2014/04/A-API-LanguageAccess1.pdf)
3 [content/uploads/2014/04/A-API-LanguageAccess1.pdf](https://cdn.americanprogress.org/wp-content/uploads/2014/04/A-API-LanguageAccess1.pdf)..... 17

4 *Public Charge Proposed Rule: Potentially Chilled Population Data*
Dashboard, Manatt (Oct. 11, 2018),
5 [https://www.manatt.com/Insights/Articles/2018/Public-Charge-](https://www.manatt.com/Insights/Articles/2018/Public-Charge-Rule-Potentially-Chilled-Population#DataDashboard)
6 [Rule-Potentially-Chilled-Population#DataDashboard](https://www.manatt.com/Insights/Articles/2018/Public-Charge-Rule-Potentially-Chilled-Population#DataDashboard) 11, 12, 15, 19

7 Robert Espinoza, *Immigrants and the Direct Care Workforce*, PHI
8 (June 20, 2017), [https://phinational.org/resource/immigrants-and-](https://phinational.org/resource/immigrants-and-the-direct-care-workforce)
9 [the-direct-care-workforce](https://phinational.org/resource/immigrants-and-the-direct-care-workforce) 19, 20

10 University of New Hampshire Institute on Disability/UCED, *2017*
11 *Disability Statistics Annual Report* (2018),
12 [https://disabilitycompendium.org/sites/default/files/user-](https://disabilitycompendium.org/sites/default/files/user-uploads/2017_AnnualReport_2017_FINAL.pdf)
13 [uploads/2017_AnnualReport_2017_FINAL.pdf](https://disabilitycompendium.org/sites/default/files/user-uploads/2017_AnnualReport_2017_FINAL.pdf)..... 14

11
12
13
14
15
16
17
18
19
20
21
22

BRIEF OF *AMICI CURIAE*
JUSTICE IN AGING ET AL. – v

103590801.1 0099865-10005

1 **INTEREST OF AMICI CURIAE**

2 Justice in Aging is a non-profit organization with the mission of improving
3 the lives of low-income older adults living in the United States. For 47 years,
4 Justice in Aging has used the power of law to fight senior poverty by securing
5 access to affordable health care, economic security, and the courts for older adults
6 with limited resources. Justice in Aging works to secure the opportunity for older
7 adults to live with dignity, regardless of financial circumstances—free from the
8 worry, harm, and injustice caused by lack of health care, food, or a safe place to
9 sleep. Using its deep expertise in Social Security, Supplemental Security Income,
10 Medicare, and Medicaid, Justice in Aging works to strengthen the social safety net
11 and remove the barriers that low-income seniors face in trying to access the
12 services they need. Justice in Aging also provides technical expertise to thousands
13 of advocates across the country on how to help low-income older adults access the
14 programs and services they need to meet their basic needs. Justice in Aging’s
15 advocacy centers on policies and practices that have failed older adults who are
16 people of color, people with limited English proficiency, women, and/or LGBTQ
17 individuals.

18 Founded in 1954 as the Western Gerontological Society, the American
19 Society on Aging (“ASA”) is an association of diverse individuals bound by a
20 common goal: to support the commitment and enhance the knowledge and skills
21 of those who seek to improve the quality of life of older adults and their families.

22 The membership of ASA is multidisciplinary and inclusive of professionals who

BRIEF OF AMICI CURIAE
JUSTICE IN AGING ET AL. – 1

1 are concerned with the physical, emotional, social, economic and spiritual aspects
2 of aging. No other organization in the field of aging represents the diversity of
3 settings and professional disciplines reached by ASA. ASA’s 5,000 members are
4 practitioners, educators, administrators, policymakers, caregivers, business people,
5 researchers, and students. ASA is the go-to source to cultivate leadership, advance
6 knowledge and strengthen the skills of our members and others who work with and
7 on behalf of older adults.

8 Caring Across Generations is a national movement of families, caregivers,
9 people with disabilities and aging Americans working to transform the way we
10 care in this country. Caring Across Generations works with state and national
11 organizations to elevate and center the voices, strengths, and needs of people who
12 need care and the paid and unpaid caregivers who provide that care to demand and
13 win change. By harnessing the power of online and grassroots organizing and
14 culture change work, Caring Across Generations is shifting how our nation values
15 caregiving and calling for policy solutions that enable all of us to live well and age
16 with dignity.

17 Jewish Family Service of Los Angeles (“JFS”) has 165 years of experience
18 meeting the evolving needs of our diverse and changing community. Each year,
19 JFS’s comprehensive family of services improves the quality of life for tens of
20 thousands of people throughout Los Angeles, regardless of age, economic status,
21 religion, ethnicity, nationality, sexual orientation, or gender identity. JFS staff and
22 volunteers feed families, provide Los Angeles’s aging population with

BRIEF OF AMICI CURIAE
JUSTICE IN AGING ET AL. – 2

103590801.1 0099865-10005

STOEL RIVES LLP
ATTORNEYS
600 University Street, Suite 3600, Seattle, WA 98101
Telephone 206.624.0900

1 life-changing care, empower and shelter victims of domestic violence and their
2 children, treat mental illness, and offer counseling to at-risk children and their
3 families. JFS is a leading provider of services for older adults, including Survivors
4 of the Holocaust, providing a comprehensive array of programs including care
5 management, family consultation, counseling, support groups, advocacy, and other
6 culturally appropriate, multilingual services.

7 The National Asian Pacific Center on Aging (“NAPCA”) is a nonprofit
8 organization with the mission to preserve and promote the dignity, well-being, and
9 quality of life of Asian Americans and Pacific Islanders (“AAPI”) as they age.
10 AAPI aging adults are a diverse group who represent over 50 ethnicities and a
11 linguistic heritage of over 100 languages. AAPI aging adults (as a whole) enjoy
12 higher levels of educational attainment than the general population but also
13 experience higher levels of health disparities, economic, housing, and
14 transportation insecurity, and lower rates of civic participation as a result of
15 prejudice and invisibility, limited English proficiency, cultural differences, and a
16 lack of culturally competent and linguistically appropriate services and programs.
17 In 40 years, NAPCA has served tens of thousands of AAPI seniors and indirectly
18 aided approximately 100,000 more to overcome their barriers toward economic
19 security and healthy living. Each year, NAPCA continues to serve over 1,000
20 low-income diverse aging adults, and partners with over 400 local nonprofits
21 throughout the country, with community service contributing more than \$1.1M of
22 in-kind support back into their local communities.

BRIEF OF *AMICI CURIAE*
JUSTICE IN AGING ET AL. – 3

103590801.1 0099865-10005

STOEL RIVES LLP
ATTORNEYS
600 University Street, Suite 3600, Seattle, WA 98101
Telephone 206.624.0900

1 For almost 70 years, the National Council on Aging (“NCOA”) has been a
2 respected national leader and trusted partner to help people aged 60+ meet the
3 challenges of aging. NCOA’s mission is to improve the lives of millions of older
4 adults, especially those who are struggling. Through innovative community
5 programs and services, online help, and advocacy, NCOA is partnering with
6 nonprofit organizations, government, and business to improve the health and
7 economic security of 10 million older adults by 2020. NCOA’s Center for
8 Benefits Access helps community-based organizations find and enroll seniors and
9 younger adults with disabilities with limited means into benefits programs for
10 which they are eligible, so they can remain healthy, secure, and independent. The
11 center develops and shares tools, resources, best practices, and strategies for
12 benefits outreach and enrollment.

13 The National Hispanic Council on Aging is a non-profit, non-partisan
14 organization devoted to improving the lives of Hispanic older adults, their families
15 and their caregivers. For 50 years, the National Hispanic Council on Aging has
16 been a strong voice dedicated to promoting, educating, and advocating for
17 research, policy, and practice in the priority areas of economic security, health,
18 housing and leadership development. To achieve its mission, the National
19 Hispanic Council on Aging has developed a Hispanic Aging Network of
20 community-based organizations across the continental U.S., the District of
21 Columbia, and Puerto Rico that reaches millions of Latinos each year. The

22

BRIEF OF *AMICI CURIAE*
JUSTICE IN AGING ET AL. – 4

103590801.1 0099865-10005

STOEL RIVES LLP
ATTORNEYS
600 University Street, Suite 3600, Seattle, WA 98101
Telephone 206.624.0900

1 National Hispanic Council on Aging also works to ensure the Hispanic community
2 is better understood and fairly represented in U.S. policies.

3 MAZON: A Jewish Response to Hunger is a national nonprofit organization
4 working to end hunger among people of all faiths and backgrounds in the U.S. For
5 over 35 years, MAZON has been a national leader in identifying and assisting
6 underserved and vulnerable populations who struggle with food insecurity. Since
7 2012, MAZON's policy and legislative priorities have included a specific focus on
8 the escalating number of seniors struggling to meet their basic food and nutritional
9 needs MAZON works to ensure that there is a robust government nutrition safety
10 net that is well-funded and easily accessed by those millions of seniors who must
11 rely on it. MAZON works nationwide with hundreds of anti-hunger organizations
12 to provide them with strategies to address the rising number of senior clients
13 turning to those programs, and to ensure that federal programs and policies are
14 responsive to the nutrition needs of these seniors. MAZON's work includes a
15 particular focus on LGBT seniors in partnership with leading advocacy groups like
16 SAGE (Services & Advocacy for GLBT Elders) and the Williams Institute at
17 UCLA School of Law to explore the unique barriers to food security faced by
18 seniors who are LGBT and to craft viable actions to remove barriers they face to
19 nutrition safety net programs.

20 PHI is a national non-profit based in the Bronx, New York, that works to
21 transform eldercare and disability services by promoting quality direct care jobs as
22 the foundation for quality care. For more than 25 years, PHI has established itself

BRIEF OF AMICI CURIAE
JUSTICE IN AGING ET AL. – 5

103590801.1 0099865-10005

1 as the nation’s leading expert on the direct care workforce, drawing our knowledge
2 from research, policy analysis, and hands-on work with long-term care providers,
3 direct care workers, and their clients in cities, suburbs, and small towns across
4 America. PHI has a long and distinguished track record of bipartisan policy action.
5 PHI believes that the new public charge rule will hurt many skilled and
6 compassionate immigrant direct care workers across the country, as well as the
7 millions of people who depend on these workers to support themselves and their
8 families. Across the country, 4.5 million home care workers and nursing assistants
9 provide daily support to older people and people with disabilities. As the U.S.
10 population quickly ages, direct care workers will be in greater demand—and
11 immigrants will play a significant part in meeting this need.

12 Amici Justice in Aging, American Society on Aging, Caring Across
13 Generations, Jewish Family Service of Los Angeles, The National Asian Pacific
14 Center on Aging, National Council on Aging, National Hispanic Council on
15 Aging, MAZON, and PHI (collectively, “Amici”) submit this brief to focus
16 primarily on the harms the Inadmissibility on Public Charge Grounds final rule
17 will have by specifically targeting older adults and their families.¹

18
19 ¹ No party to the above-captioned action or any of their counsel authored this brief
20 in whole or in part or contributed money that was intended to fund preparing or
21 submitting this brief.
22

1 **PRELIMINARY STATEMENT**

2 For well over a century, the public charge test has been a part of federal
3 immigration law in determining inadmissibility into the United States. Under this
4 test, immigration officers have been authorized to identify immigrants who are
5 “likely to become primarily dependent” on the government for subsistence by
6 receiving public cash assistance—*e.g.*, Supplemental Security Income (“SSI”),
7 Temporary Assistance for Needy Families (“TANF”) and comparable state and
8 local cash assistance programs, and government-funded institutional long-term
9 care (including through Medicaid)—and deny them entry into the United States.
10 But immigration officers have never been authorized to consider noncash
11 benefits—*e.g.*, publicly-funded health care, nutrition assistance, public housing
12 programs—an arbitrary income threshold, or heavily weigh certain factors greater
13 than others, as part of the test.

14 In fact, longstanding field guidance issued by the Immigration and
15 Naturalization Services made it clear that a public charge is an individual who is
16 likely to become “primarily dependent on the government for subsistence, as
17 demonstrated by either (i) the receipt of *public cash assistance* for income
18 maintenance or (ii) institutionalization for long-term care at government expense.”
19 Field Guidance on Deportability and Inadmissibility on Public Charge Grounds,
20 64 Fed. Reg. 28,689, 28,689 (May 26, 1999) (emphasis added). It did not,
21 however, permit immigration officers to consider publicly-funded health care, such
22 as Medicaid (except for long-term institutional care), nutrition assistance, such as

1 Supplemental Nutrition Assistance Program (“SNAP”), or public housing
2 programs because “participation in such non-cash programs is not evidence of
3 poverty or dependence.” *Id.* at 28,692–93.

4 Shoving aside existing law, the U.S. Department of Homeland Security (the
5 “DHS”) published the Inadmissibility on Public Charge Grounds final rule (the
6 “Final Rule”), which erects new—and in numerous cases insurmountable—barriers
7 to entry into the United States for older immigrants. The Final Rule makes
8 sweeping changes: it abolishes the “primarily dependent” test and provides that a
9 public charge is an immigrant who receives one or more public benefits for more
10 than 12 months in the aggregate within any 36-month period (such that, for
11 instance, receipt of two benefits in one month counts as two months), establishes
12 an arbitrary minimum income threshold of 125% of the federal poverty level so as
13 not to be considered a public charge, and introduces a weighting system that
14 weighs factors in ways that directly disadvantage older immigrants. It also adds a
15 multitude of public benefits that have never before been considered in determining
16 whether an immigrant is likely to be a public charge—many of which are critical to
17 the livelihood of older adults—and abandons settled law that only cash assistance
18 for income maintenance and government-funded long-term institutional care be
19 considered (and even then only when it represents the majority of an immigrant’s
20 support).

21 These radical alterations unlawfully target older immigrants and their
22 families and will cause serious and irreparable harm to them as well as their

1 communities and health care systems. In fact, as discussed below, the Final Rule
2 will make it nearly impossible for older immigrants to pass the public charge test.
3 Accordingly, for the reasons stated herein, as well as those advanced by merits
4 counsel, Amici respectfully encourage the Court to grant Plaintiffs’ motion for a
5 preliminary injunction.

6 **THE FINAL RULE WILL MAKE IT IMPOSSIBLE FOR OLDER**
7 **IMMIGRANTS TO PASS THE PUBLIC CHARGE TEST AND WILL**
8 **IRREPARABLY HARM OLDER ADULTS AND THEIR FAMILIES.**

8 As discussed below, the Final Rule creates a multitude of ways for
9 individuals, and particularly low-income older adults, to fail the public charge test,
10 and very few ways to overcome it. In particular—**(1)** the Final Rule will make it
11 impossible for older immigrants to pass the public charge test by expanding the
12 public benefits to be considered, adding biased and heavily weighted factors, and
13 adding an arbitrary income test; **(2)** the Final Rule targets older immigrants and, in
14 particular, those with disabilities or chronic health conditions; **(3)** the Final Rule
15 will prevent United States citizens from welcoming their noncitizen parents and
16 harms older adults who rely on their families for support; **(4)** the Final Rule
17 disfavors immigrants who are not proficient in English notwithstanding the
18 unlawfulness of such a rule and that a majority of older immigrants have limited
19 English proficiency; **(5)** the Final Rule will disproportionately harm older
20 immigrants of color; **(6)** the Final Rule threatens the wellbeing of caregivers,
21 leaving many older adults and people with disabilities who are United States
22 citizens without access to the caregiving they need; and **(7)** the Final Rule will

1 harm older immigrants and their families by discouraging enrollment in programs
2 that improve health, food security, nutrition, and economic security.

3 **1. The Final Rule will make it impossible for older immigrants to**
4 **pass the public charge test by expanding the public benefits to be considered,**
5 **and adding biased heavily weighted factors and an arbitrary income test.** The
6 Final Rule dramatically expands the public benefits to be considered in making a
7 public charge determination by adding many forms of noncash public assistance,
8 *e.g.*, Medicaid (with certain exceptions), SNAP, and public housing and rental
9 assistance. *See* Final Rule, 84 Fed. Reg. 41,292 (Aug. 14, 2019). This expansion
10 of the public benefits to be considered, particularly the inclusion of Medicaid,
11 perversely targets older adults: the use of public benefits is heavily weighted
12 negatively and, when considered with the other factors, renders it virtually
13 impossible for older immigrants to pass the public charge test. Medicaid is a
14 lifeline for many older adults to fill in the significant gaps in Medicare coverage,
15 including access to oral health, transportation, and home and community-based
16 services (“HCBS”). Medicaid HCBS, like personal care services and adult day
17 health (both of which are not covered under Medicare) are critical in allowing
18 older adults to stay healthy and maintain vibrant lives with their families and in the
19 community, often delaying and sometimes preventing admission to nursing
20 facilities. Similarly, older adults, particularly those with limited means, rely on
21 Medicaid-funded Medicare Savings Programs (“MSPs”) to afford their Medicare
22 premiums and cost-sharing, and some MSPs even protect individuals from

1 improper billing by their Medicare providers. MSPs are only available to people
2 who qualify for Medicare, which means that they or their spouses have the
3 requisite work history to access this benefit. It defies logic and reason to penalize
4 individuals who, by definition, have contributed to society for using these benefits
5 to which they are legally entitled.

6 The Final Rule also introduces a weighting system under which some factors
7 receive greater significance than others in the public charge determination. *See*
8 Final Rule, 84 Fed. Reg. at 41,504. Being over 62 is a negative factor, and older
9 immigrants are not likely to benefit from the heavily weighted *positive* factors,
10 which include having household income, assets, or resources, and support of at
11 least 250% of the federal poverty level, being currently employed in an industry
12 with an annual income of at least 250% of the federal poverty level for the
13 immigrant’s household size, or has private health insurance. It also weighs having
14 an income of less than 125% of the federal poverty level as a negative factor, in
15 essence applying an arbitrary and unprecedented income test in the evaluation of
16 whether an immigrant will be a public charge. Over half of noncitizens age 62 and
17 older live in low or moderate income households. *See Public Charge Proposed*
18 *Rule: Potentially Chilled Population Data Dashboard*, Manatt (Oct. 11, 2018),
19 [https://www.manatt.com/Insights/Articles/2018/Public-Charge-Rule-Potentially-](https://www.manatt.com/Insights/Articles/2018/Public-Charge-Rule-Potentially-Chilled-Population#DataDashboard)
20 [Chilled-Population#DataDashboard](https://www.manatt.com/Insights/Articles/2018/Public-Charge-Rule-Potentially-Chilled-Population#DataDashboard). In fact, nearly 600,000 immigrants over age
21 61 have household incomes below 125% of the federal poverty level, and over
22 1.1 million have household incomes below 250% of the federal poverty level.

1 *See id.* Under the Final Rule, these immigrants will have no “heavily weighed”
2 positive factor to offset the fact that their age and income are considered negative
3 factors.

4 The Final Rule’s arbitrary income test discredits even full-time work at low
5 wages—work performed by many immigrant older adults. *See* Final Rule, 84 Fed.
6 Reg. at 41,502-04. Five million immigrants ages 65 and older, *see* Jeanne
7 Batalova, *Senior Immigrants in the United States*, Migration Policy Institute
8 (May 30, 2012), [https://www.migrationpolicy.org/article/senior-immigrants-](https://www.migrationpolicy.org/article/senior-immigrants-united-states)
9 [united-states](https://www.migrationpolicy.org/article/senior-immigrants-united-states), are likely to have supported their families, have contributed to our
10 nation’s economy by, for example, paying taxes and contributing to Social
11 Security, and have been integrated into the fabric of our country. Yet, under the
12 Final Rule, they will be viewed as having failed to contribute to society.

13 The Final Rule also considers whether someone is a “primary caregiver”—
14 meaning the person “has significant responsibility for actively caring for and
15 managing the well-being of a child or an elderly, ill, or disabled person in [their]
16 household.” *See* Final Rule, 84 Fed. Reg. at 41,502, 41,504. But the DHS’s
17 recognition of caregiving as a valuable, creditable contribution is meaningless for
18 older immigrants who face so many other factors expressly weighed against them
19 by virtue of who they are.

20 In short, the Final Rule significantly expands the definition of public
21 benefits, creates an arbitrary income test that most low-wage workers cannot meet,
22 and assigns negative weight to other factors that are associated with having low-

1 income, including, for example, if the immigrant: (i) is over the minimum early
2 retirement age for Social Security (currently age 62); (ii) has a household size that
3 makes the immigrant more likely than not to become a public charge; or (iii) lacks
4 sufficient household assets to cover reasonably foreseeable medical costs related to
5 a medical condition. *See* 84 Fed. Reg. at 41,502–04. The Final Rule will thus
6 inhibit immigrants who are not wealthy from being self-sufficient and make it
7 nearly impossible for older immigrants to pass the public charge test. In fact,
8 under the Final Rule, possessing any one negative factor and, in particular, one
9 heavily weighted negative factor, will likely be dispositive in denying an
10 immigrant admission to the United States.

11 **2. The Final Rule specifically targets older immigrants, particularly**
12 **those with disabilities and chronic health conditions.** Under the Final Rule’s
13 weighting system, being age 62 or older or having a treatable medical condition
14 will be held against immigrants seeking permanent legal status or lawful entry into
15 the United States. *See* 84 Fed. Reg. at 41,504. An older immigrant, in fact, is
16 more likely to be detrimentally impacted by the heavily weighted *negative*
17 factors—such as having been diagnosed with a medical condition that is likely to
18 require extensive medical treatment or that will interfere with the immigrant’s
19 ability to provide for him- or herself. The negative factors disproportionately
20 target older immigrants because the vast majority of adults over age 50 have at
21 least one chronic health condition and over a third of adults age 65 and older have
22 a disability. *See* AARP Public Policy Institute, *Chronic Care: A Call to Action for*

1 *Health Reform*, 11–12, 16 (Mar. 2009), www.aarp.org/health/medicare-
2 insurance/info-03-2009/beyond_50_hcr.html; University of New Hampshire
3 Institute on Disability/UCED, *2017 Disability Statistics Annual Report* (2018),
4 <https://disabilitycompendium.org/sites/default/files/user->
5 [uploads/2017_AnnualReport_2017_FINAL.pdf](https://disabilitycompendium.org/sites/default/files/user-uploads/2017_AnnualReport_2017_FINAL.pdf). The Final Rule is so broad that
6 virtually every older immigrant with any type of significant disability or health
7 condition, as well as many immigrants with less significant disabilities, will have
8 their disability or other chronic health conditions count against them in the public
9 charge test.

10 Furthermore, the Final Rule’s discrimination based on one’s disability
11 violates federal antidiscrimination laws, including the Rehabilitation Act of 1973,
12 which prohibits any program or activity receiving federal financial assistance,
13 including those conducted by the DHS, from excluding, denying benefits to, or
14 discriminating against persons with disabilities. 29 U.S.C. § 794; 6 C.F.R. § 15.30.
15 It also unfairly tips the balance of factors against older adults dually eligible for
16 Medicare and Medicaid, who already have the receipt of Medicaid benefits held
17 against them. 41% of dually eligible individuals have at least one mental health
18 diagnosis, 49% receive long-term care services and supports, and 60% have
19 multiple chronic conditions. *See* Centers for Medicare & Medicaid Services,
20 *People Dually Eligible for Medicare and Medicaid Fact Sheet* (Mar. 2019),
21 www.cms.gov/Medicare-Medicaid-Coordination/Medicare-and-Medicaid-
22

1 Coordination/Medicare-Medicaid-Coordination-
2 Office/Downloads/MMCO_Factsheet.pdf.

3 **3. The Final Rule will prevent United States citizens from welcoming**
4 **their noncitizen parents and will harm older adults who rely on their families**

5 **for support.** United States citizens have long been able to welcome their parents
6 because immigration law historically has favored family unification. *See, e.g.,*
7 8 U.S.C. § 1153(a) (“Preference allocation for family-sponsored immigrants.”).

8 The number of noncitizen parents of United States citizens who have been
9 admitted as lawful permanent residents nearly tripled between 1994 and 2017 and
10 now accounts for almost 15% of all admissions and almost 30% of family-based
11 admissions. *Compare* DHS, Office of Immigration Statistics, *2017 Yearbook of*
12 *Immigration Statistics*, Table 7. Persons Obtaining Lawful Permanent Resident
13 Status by Type and Detailed Class of Admission: Fiscal Year 2017 (Oct. 2, 2018),
14 <https://www.dhs.gov/immigration-statistics/yearbook/2017/table7>, *with*

15 Immigration & Naturalization Service, Office of Policy & Planning, *Legal*
16 *Immigration, Fiscal Year 1997*, Table 1,

17 www.dhs.gov/sites/default/files/publications/INS_AnnualReport_LegalImmigratio
18 [n_1997_1.pdf](http://www.dhs.gov/sites/default/files/publications/INS_AnnualReport_LegalImmigratio). Yet, the Final Rule penalizes families for living together and

19 disincentivizes children from supporting their noncitizen parents or grandparents
20 because adding a household member necessitates an increase in the household
21 income required to avoid being deemed a public charge. *See* 84 Fed. Reg. at

22 41,501-04; *see also Public Charge Proposed Rule: Potentially Chilled Population*

BRIEF OF AMICI CURIAE

JUSTICE IN AGING ET AL. – 15

103590801.1 0099865-10005

1 *Data Dashboard*, Manatt (Oct. 11, 2018),
2 [https://www.manatt.com/Insights/Articles/2018/Public-Charge-Rule-Potentially-](https://www.manatt.com/Insights/Articles/2018/Public-Charge-Rule-Potentially-Chilled-Population#DataDashboard)
3 [Chilled-Population#DataDashboard](https://www.manatt.com/Insights/Articles/2018/Public-Charge-Rule-Potentially-Chilled-Population#DataDashboard) (explaining that over 750,000 immigrants over
4 61 and their families have household incomes below 125% of the federal poverty
5 level, and over 1.6 million have household incomes below 250% of the federal
6 poverty level). The Final Rule will prevent many United States citizens from
7 welcoming noncitizen parents into the country even after they signed a
8 commitment to support them.

9 **4. The Final Rule targets immigrants who do not speak English well**
10 **or at all, which is particularly harmful to older adults because a majority of**
11 **older immigrants have limited English proficiency.** The United States does not
12 have a national language. As such, United States immigration law does not include
13 English proficiency as a factor and, in fact, affirmatively prohibits discrimination
14 based on nationality. *See* 8 U.S.C. § 1152(a)(1)(A) (“no person shall receive any
15 preference or priority or be discriminated against in the issuance of an immigrant
16 visa because of the person’s race, sex, nationality, place of birth, or place of
17 residence”). Furthermore, federal civil rights laws protect limited English
18 proficient persons from discrimination on the basis of English proficiency. *See,*
19 *e.g.*, 42 U.S.C. § 2000d (prohibiting discrimination on the basis of race, color, and
20 national origin in programs and activities receiving federal financial assistance,
21 including the DHS); 42 U.S.C. § 2000e (prohibiting discrimination in employment
22 on the basis of race, color, national origin, sex, or religion); *see also Lau v.*

1 *Nichols*, 414 U.S. 563 (1974) (holding lack of supplemental language instruction
2 for students with limited English proficiency violated the Civil Rights Act of
3 1964).

4 Nevertheless, the Final Rule arbitrarily forces English proficiency under the
5 heading of “education and skills” and considers it as part of the public charge test.
6 *See* 84 Fed. Reg. at 41,503-04. The impact on older immigrants is readily
7 apparent, since noncitizen parents of United States citizens are often not proficient
8 in English. *See* Jeanne Batalova, *Senior Immigrants in the United States*,
9 Migration Policy Institute (May 30, 2012),
10 www.migrationpolicy.org/article/senior-immigrants-united-states#5. For instance,
11 approximately 56%, or about 2.8 million, of the 5 million older immigrants in 2010
12 reported speaking English less than “very well.” *See id.* The percentage is even
13 higher among Asian American older adults, 80% of whom are immigrants and
14 nearly 60% of whom have limited English proficiency. *See The Emerging Needs*
15 *of Asian American and Pacific Islander Older Adults*, National Asian Pacific
16 Center on Aging (Feb. 2017), [napca.org/wp-content/uploads/2017/10/NAPCA-](http://napca.org/wp-content/uploads/2017/10/NAPCA-The-Emerging-Needs-of-AAPI-Older-Adults_Final-Report_Feb2017.pdf)
17 [The-Emerging-Needs-of-AAPI-Older-Adults_Final-Report_Feb2017.pdf](http://napca.org/wp-content/uploads/2017/10/NAPCA-The-Emerging-Needs-of-AAPI-Older-Adults_Final-Report_Feb2017.pdf); *see also*
18 Karthick Ramakrishnan & Farah Ahmad, *Language Diversity and English*
19 *Proficiency*, Center for American Progress (May 27, 2014)
20 [https://cdn.americanprogress.org/wp-content/uploads/2014/04/AAPI-](https://cdn.americanprogress.org/wp-content/uploads/2014/04/AAPI-LanguageAccess1.pdf)
21 [LanguageAccess1.pdf](https://cdn.americanprogress.org/wp-content/uploads/2014/04/AAPI-LanguageAccess1.pdf) (explaining that over 75% of the “Asian alone” population
22 speaks a language other than English at home). By giving de-facto preference to

1 individuals from English-speaking nations, the Final Rule undermines the careful
2 balancing Congress created to move the country away from the racist quota
3 system.¹

4 **5. The Final Rule will disproportionately harm older immigrants of**
5 **color.** While people of color account for approximately 36% of the United States
6 population, they represent 90% of the 26 million people who are targeted by the
7 Final Rule. *See 2013-2017 American Community Survey 5-Year Public Use*
8 *Microdata Sample (PUMS)*, United States Census Bureau
9 <https://factfinder.census.gov/faces/nav/jsf/pages/searchresults.xhtml?refresh=t#>;

10 ¹ The Immigration Act of 1965 abolished quotas based on national origin and
11 immigrants were selected based on individual merit rather than race or national
12 origin. *See* President Lyndon B. Johnson, Remarks at the Signing of the
13 Immigration Bill Liberty Island, New York (Oct. 3, 1965) (“This bill says
14 simply that from this day forth those wishing to immigrate to America shall be
15 admitted on the basis of their skills and their close relationship to those already
16 here. . . . The fairness of this standard is so self-evident that we may well
17 wonder that it has not always been applied. Yet the fact is that for over four
18 decades the immigration policy of the United States has been twisted and has
19 been distorted by the harsh injustice of the national origins quota system
20 Today, with my signature, this system is abolished.”).

1 *see also Public Charge Proposed Rule: Potentially Chilled Population Data*
2 *Dashboard*, Manatt (Oct. 11, 2018),
3 [https://www.manatt.com/Insights/Articles/2018/Public-Charge-Rule-Potentially-](https://www.manatt.com/Insights/Articles/2018/Public-Charge-Rule-Potentially-Chilled-Population#DataDashboard)
4 [Chilled-Population#DataDashboard](https://www.manatt.com/Insights/Articles/2018/Public-Charge-Rule-Potentially-Chilled-Population#DataDashboard); Jeanne Batalova et al., *Chilling Effects: The*
5 *Expected Public Charge Rule and Its Impact on Legal Immigrant Families' Public*
6 *Benefits Use*, Migration Policy Institute (June 2018),
7 [www.migrationpolicy.org/research/chilling-effects-expected-public-charge-rule-](http://www.migrationpolicy.org/research/chilling-effects-expected-public-charge-rule-impact-legal-immigrant-families)
8 [impact-legal-immigrant-families](http://www.migrationpolicy.org/research/chilling-effects-expected-public-charge-rule-impact-legal-immigrant-families). These statistics strongly suggest that fewer
9 immigrants of color, including older adults, will be deemed admissible to the
10 United States or eligible for green cards under the Final Rule. The Final Rule's
11 disproportionate impact on communities of color provides additional evidence of
12 the radical effect it will have in reshaping the country's population going forward.
13 It will reduce the diversity of immigration to the United States and increase
14 separation among immigrant families of color, many of whom include older adults.
15 Health and economic disparities will also increase among older immigrants of
16 color due to the Final Rule's targeting of benefits that these communities
17 disproportionately rely on.

18 **6. The Final Rule threatens the wellbeing of hundreds of thousands**
19 **older immigrant caregivers.** An estimated one million immigrants work
20 providing direct care services to older adults and people with disabilities,
21 supplying critical assistance to millions of people who need help with dressing,
22 bathing, eating, and other daily tasks. *See* Robert Espinoza, *Immigrants and the*

BRIEF OF AMICI CURIAE
JUSTICE IN AGING ET AL. – 19

103590801.1 0099865-10005

1 *Direct Care Workforce*, PHI (June 20, 2017),
2 <https://phinational.org/resource/immigrants-and-the-direct-care-workforce/>.
3 Nearly 33% of immigrant caregivers are themselves over 55 years of age. *See id.*
4 at 4. Because caregiving jobs tend to be part-time and low-wage, many direct care
5 workers cannot meet the Final Rule’s income threshold and also utilize public
6 benefits programs to support themselves and their families. In fact, PHI’s research
7 shows that nearly 50% of immigrant direct care workers live at or below 200% of
8 the federal poverty level, and 45% rely on programs such as SNAP and Medicaid.
9 The vast majority of noncitizen direct care workers who access public benefits are
10 women (88%), 46% are Latino, and 64% have a high school education or less. Not
11 only will the Final Rule prevent many direct care workers from immigrating or
12 accessing a path to citizenship, but by adding SNAP and Medicaid to the public
13 charge determination, the Final Rule will chill participation in these programs and
14 harm not just the direct care workers themselves, but also the older adults for
15 whom they care.

16 **7. The Final Rule will harm older immigrants and their families by**
17 **discouraging enrollment in programs that improve health, food security,**
18 **nutrition, and economic security.** The Final Rule will impact older adults living
19 in immigrant families in the United States who may stop accessing services they
20 need, and that their own tax dollars support, out of fear of being penalized, and that
21 will in turn increase poverty, hunger, ill health, and housing insecurity. Similarly,
22 if immigrant families are afraid of being penalized for accessing nutrition

1 assistance programs, older adults will be food insecure and at risk of malnutrition,
2 which can cause or exacerbate other health conditions and unnecessarily burden
3 the healthcare system. And, if immigrant families forgo benefits for fear of being
4 penalized for seeking housing assistance, older adults with limited, fixed incomes
5 will have fewer resources to spend on other basic needs, including food, medicine,
6 transportation, and clothing.

7 These chilling effects have already been documented in immigrant
8 communities as a result of the proposed rule published in October 2018. In fact, a
9 survey of approximately 2,000 adults in immigrant families, found that “about
10 13.7% of respondents reported that they or a family member did not participate in a
11 noncash government program such as Medicaid/CHIP, SNAP, or housing subsidies
12 in 2018 for fear of risking the ability to obtain a green card.” *See* Allison B. Orris
13 et al., *DHS Public Charge Regulation Could Drive Medicaid Coverage Losses*,
14 Manatt (Aug. 29, 2019), [https://www.manatt.com/Insights/Newsletters/Manatt-on-
15 Health-Medicaid-Edition/DHS-Public-Charge-Regulation-Could-Drive-Medicaid](https://www.manatt.com/Insights/Newsletters/Manatt-on-Health-Medicaid-Edition/DHS-Public-Charge-Regulation-Could-Drive-Medicaid).
16 This trend was higher (20.7%) for adults in low-income families. *See id.* Amici
17 have heard from service providers who serve older adults that older immigrants
18 have stopped accessing these benefits as well due to fear of negative consequences
19 for themselves or their families. For instance, NCOA surveyed agencies
20 nationwide such as senior centers, State Health Insurance Assistance Programs,
21 Benefits Enrollment Centers, and SNAP grantees. Forty-seven percent of
22 responding organizations indicated they had noticed a chilling effect, and 45% had

1 clients ask about dis-enrolling from benefits or refusing services after the rule
2 change was proposed.

3 Looking ahead, the impact of the Final Rule will be significant for the
4 estimated 23 million noncitizens and citizens in immigrant families who use public
5 benefits today. Without ongoing coverage and assistance from important programs
6 like Medicaid, these older adults will likely exacerbate existing health conditions
7 and develop additional serious health care conditions, driving up the cost of care
8 and creating a new uncompensated care burden on society. The well-justified fear
9 created by the Final Rule will extend far beyond any individual, and the
10 widespread chilling effect that causes families to withdraw from benefits due to
11 that fear is already evident as a result of publicity surrounding the proposed rule
12 and now the Final Rule.

13 **CONCLUSION**

14 In short, the Final Rule will have significant negative consequences for older
15 immigrants and their families and will cause them irreparable harm by erecting
16 barriers to entry into the United States in ways that have never before been
17 permitted and specifically target older immigrants. For all of the reasons stated
18 herein and those set for in Plaintiffs’ submissions and the submissions of other
19 *amici*, Amici encourage the Court to grant the requested preliminary injunction.

20
21
22

1 Dated: September 13, 2019

2 Respectfully submitted,

3 PROSKAUER ROSE LLP

4 By: /s/ Russell L. Hirschhorn

Russell L. Hirschhorn*

5 Eleven Times Square

6 New York, NY 10036

212.696.3286

7 rhirschhorn@proskauer.com

8 By: /s/ Vanessa Soriano Power

Vanessa Soriano Power

9 (WSBA # 30777)

10 STOEL RIVES LLP

600 University St.

11 Suite 3600

SEATTLE, WA 98101

12 206.386.7553

vanessa.power@stoel.com

13 Owen T. Masters*

14 PROSKAUER ROSE LLP

1001 Pennsylvania Ave, NW

15 Suite 600 South

Washington, DC 20004

16 202.416.6890

omasters@proskauer.com

17 Denny Chan*

18 JUSTICE IN AGING

3660 Wilshire Blvd., Suite 718

19 Los Angeles, CA 90010

20 213.639.0930

dchan@justiceinaging.org

21

22

BRIEF OF *AMICI CURIAE*
JUSTICE IN AGING ET AL. – 23

103590801.1 0099865-10005

STOEL RIVES LLP
ATTORNEYS
600 University Street, Suite 3600, Seattle, WA 98101
Telephone 206.624.0900

1
2
3
4
5
6
7
8
9
10
11
12
13
14
15
16
17
18
19
20
21
22

Regan Bailey*
Natalie Kean*
JUSTICE IN AGING
1444 Eye Street NW, Suite 1100
Washington, DC 20005
202.289.6976
rbailey@justiceinaging.org
nkean@justiceinaging.org

*Counsel for Amici Justice in Aging,
American Society on Aging, Caring Across
Generations, Jewish Family Service of Los
Angeles, The National Asian Pacific Center
on Aging, National Council on Aging,
National Hispanic Council on Aging,
MAZON, and PHI*

**Admission Pro Hac Vice Pending*