

1 COOLEY LLP
SUSAN KRUMPLITSCH (241016)
2 (skrumplitsch@cooley.com)
ELIZABETH STAMESHKIN (260865)
3 (lstameshkin@cooley.com)
PRIYA ARORA (301207)
4 (parora@cooley.com)
3175 Hanover Street
5 Palo Alto, CA 94304-1130
Telephone: (650) 843-5000
6 Facsimile: (650) 849-7400

7 Attorneys for Amici Curiae

8 UNITED STATES DISTRICT COURT
9 NORTHERN DISTRICT OF CALIFORNIA

10 STATE OF CALIFORNIA, *et al.*,
11 Plaintiff,
12 v.
13 U.S. DEPARTMENT OF HOMELAND
14 SECURITY, *et al.*,
15 Defendant.

Case No. 3:19-cv-04975-PJH

**BRIEF OF AMICI CURIAE IN
SUPPORT OF PLAINTIFFS'
MOTION FOR PRELIMINARY
INJUNCTION**

Judge: Hon. Phyllis J. Hamilton

Date Filed: August 16, 2019

TABLE OF CONTENTS

	Page
STATEMENT OF INTEREST.....	1
BACKGROUND AND SUMMARY OF ARGUMENT.....	2
ARGUMENT.....	3
I. THE PUBLIC CHARGE REGULATION TARGETS KEY HEALTH AND NUTRITION PROGRAMS AND ALLOWS FOR DISCRIMINATORY DECISION MAKING.....	3
A. Utilization of Essential Health and Nutrition Programs Are Targeted By The Regulation.....	4
B. The Totality of the Circumstances Test Is So Vague It Will Result In Discriminatory Decision Making.....	4
II. BOTH CITIZEN AND NON-CITIZEN CHILDREN WILL BE HARMED BY THE PUBLIC CHARGE REGULATION.....	6
A. The Totality of Circumstances Test Will Disproportionally Impact Non-Citizen Children.....	6
B. Children’s Health Will Be Harmed By The Public Charge Regulation.....	7
III. THE PUBLIC CHARGE REGULATION WILL ACT AS A BARRIER TO HEALTH CARE FOR PREGNANT AND POSTPARTUM WOMEN.....	11
A. The Totality of Circumstances Test Will Disproportionally Impact Pregnant and Postpartum Women.....	11
B. Pregnant and Postpartum Women Will Be Directly Harmed By The Public Charge Regulation.....	12
IV. THE PUBLIC CHARGE REGULATION WILL ALSO PARTICULARLY HARM INDIVIDUALS WITH DISABILITIES AND CHRONIC HEALTH CONDITIONS.....	14
A. The Totality of Circumstances Test Will Disproportionally Impact Individuals with Disabilities.....	14
B. Individuals with Disabilities Will Suffer Negative Consequences To Their Health And Well-Being.....	14
CONCLUSION.....	16

1
2
3
4
5
6
7
8
9
10
11
12
13
14
15
16
17
18
19
20
21
22
23
24
25
26
27
28

TABLE OF AUTHORITIES

1
2
3
4
5
6
7
8
9
10
11
12
13
14
15
16
17
18
19
20
21
22
23
24
25
26
27
28

Page

Statutes

8 U.S.C. § 1182(a)(4)(A).....2
 Immigration and Nationality Act Section 212(a)(4)2
 §212.22(c)(1)(iii)8

Other Authorities

8 C.F.R.

§ 212.21.....3, 4
 § 212.21(a).....3
 § 212.21(a)(5)(iv).....8
 § 212.21(b).....4
 § 212.21(d)(2)7
 § 212.22(a).....5
 § 212.22(a), (b)3
 § 212.22(b)(1)7
 § 212.22(b)(2)7, 12
 § 212.22(b)(2)(i)6
 § 212.22(b)(2)(ii)6
 § 212.22(b)(3)7
 § 212.22(b)(5)7
 § 212.22(b), (c)5
 § 212.22(c)3
 § 212.22(c)(1)12
 § 212.22(c)(1)(iii)(B)12
 § 213.1(b).....12

42 C.F.R. §34 et seq.....6

64 Fed. Reg. 28689-01 (May 26, 1999)3

84 Fed. Reg. 41292-01 (Aug. 14, 2019) *passim*

STATEMENT OF INTEREST

1
2 The American Academy of Pediatrics (“AAP”), the American Medical Association (“AMA”),
3 the American College of Physicians (“ACP”), and the American Academy of Pediatrics, California
4 (AAP-CA) (collectively, “*Amici*”) respectfully submit this brief as *amici curiae* in support of
5 Plaintiffs’ Motion for Preliminary Injunction. *Amici* are leading medical organizations in the United
6 States whose members collectively provide medical care to the most vulnerable groups of people in
7 society, including children, pregnant women, and persons who are disabled or those who suffer from
8 chronic illnesses.

9 The AAP is a non-profit professional membership organization of 67,000 primary care
10 pediatricians and pediatric medical subspecialists, and pediatric surgical specialists dedicated to the
11 health and well-being of infants, children, adolescents, and young adults. AAP believes that the future
12 prosperity and well-being of the United States depends on the health and vitality of all of its children,
13 without exception. Access to health care, nutrition, and housing assistance programs ensures that
14 children grow up healthy and strong. AAP is uniquely positioned to understand the impact of the
15 Administration’s public charge regulation on the health of vulnerable populations, including children.

16 Amicus curiae the AMA is the largest professional association of physicians, residents and
17 medical students in the United States. Additionally, through state and specialty medical societies and
18 other physician groups seated in its House of Delegates, substantially all U.S. physicians, residents
19 and medical students are represented in the AMA’s policy making process. AMA members practice
20 in every state and in every medical specialty. The AMA was founded in 1847 to promote the art and
21 science of medicine and the betterment of public health, and these remain its core purposes. The AMA
22 is exceptionally well-suited to appreciate the impact of the Regulation on the health of vulnerable
23 populations.

24 Amicus curiae AAP-CA, a nonprofit incorporated in California, represents the over 5,000
25 board-certified pediatrician members of the four California AAP regional Chapters. Its organizational
26 mission is to support the optimal physical, mental, and social health and well being for all infants,
27 children, adolescents and young adults in California.

28 Amicus curiae WSMA represents 11,300 physicians, residents, medical students and physician

1 assistants throughout Washington state. Our mission is to advance strong physician leadership and
 2 advocacy to shape the future of medicine and advance quality care for all Washingtonians. Our vision:
 3 to make Washington the best place to practice medicine and to receive care.

4 *Amici* submit this brief in support of Plaintiffs’ motion for preliminary injunction to highlight
 5 for the Court the immediate and irreparable harm that will impact millions of vulnerable individuals
 6 if Plaintiffs’ motion is denied.

7 BACKGROUND AND SUMMARY OF ARGUMENT

8 The United States Department of Homeland Security (“DHS”) has drastically overhauled
 9 decades of precedent and Congressional intent by promulgating *Inadmissibility on Public Charge*
 10 *Grounds*, 84 Fed. Reg. 41292-01 (Aug. 14, 2019) (the “Regulation”). The Regulation dramatically
 11 alters the factors considered by immigration officials in evaluating whether a non-citizen seeking to
 12 immigrate or adjust their immigration status will become a “public charge.”¹ Prior to this Regulation,
 13 public charge referred to an individual who was likely to become primarily dependent on the
 14 government, such as someone who received cash assistance for income maintenance or was
 15 institutionalized in a government-funded long-term care facility.² The use of benefits such as health
 16 services or nutrition assistance were not considered in the public charge determination.

17 The Regulation now interprets public charge to be an immigrant “who receives one or more
 18 public benefits,...for more than 12 months in the aggregate within any 36-month period (such that, for
 19 instance, receipt of two benefits in one month counts as two months.)”³ The definition of “public
 20 benefits” has also been enlarged to now include health, nutrition, and housing programs such as non-
 21 emergency Medicaid for non-pregnant adults and Supplemental Nutritional Assistance Program
 22 (“SNAP”).

23 Application of the Regulation’s totality of the circumstances test and consideration of the
 24

25 _____
 26 ¹ Under Section 212(a)(4) of the Immigration and Nationality Act (“INA”), an individual seeking
 admission to the United States or seeking to adjust status is inadmissible if the individual is likely at
 any time to become a public charge. See 8 U.S.C. § 1182(a)(4)(A).

27 ² Field Guidance on Deportability and Inadmissibility on Public Charge Grounds, 64 Fed. Reg.
 28689-01 (May 26, 1999).

28 ³ 8 C.F.R. § 212.21(a).

1 minimum factors⁴ (age, health, family status, education and skills, and financial status) will have a
 2 disparate impact on certain groups including children, pregnant women, and persons suffering from
 3 disabilities and chronic health conditions. The receipt of public benefits is deemed to be a “*heavily*
 4 *weighted*” negative factor,⁵ and by expanding the definition of public benefits to include health and
 5 nutrition programs,⁶ the impact of the Regulation on vulnerable populations is amplified. Though
 6 DHS claims the Regulation is intended to promote self-sufficiency, there is no evidence that chilling
 7 the use of health and nutrition benefits will result in an increase in income, employment, or educational
 8 status of immigrants. Amici submit this brief to describe the deleterious impact this Regulation will
 9 have on the health of vulnerable populations. These sweeping and detrimental changes will ultimately
 10 result in far greater costs to the public’s health than any purported benefit offered by DHS.

11 ARGUMENT

12 I. THE PUBLIC CHARGE REGULATION TARGETS KEY HEALTH AND 13 NUTRITION PROGRAMS AND ALLOWS FOR DISCRIMINATORY DECISION MAKING

14 The Regulation upends decades of settled policy with regard to public charge. Historically, an
 15 immigrant could be deemed inadmissible if an immigration official concluded that the immigrant was
 16 likely to become a public charge—interpreted to mean *primarily dependent on public assistance*. The
 17 Regulation now broadly defines “public charge” to include anyone who has received or is likely to
 18 receive a wide range of public benefits. The programs targeted by the Regulation include medical
 19 benefits such as Medicaid, nutrition benefits such as SNAP, and housing assistance—all of which may
 20 be integral to keep immigrants and their family members healthy, fed, and sheltered.⁷ The Regulation
 21 employs a “totality of the circumstances” test which is so all-encompassing that vulnerable populations
 22 such as children, pregnant women and individuals with disabilities are uniquely at risk for
 23 discrimination under the test simply because of their age or health status.

24
 25
 26 ⁴ 8 C.F.R. § 212.22(a), (b).

⁵ 8 C.F.R. § 212.22(c).

27 ⁶ 8 C.F.R. § 212.21 ((except for non-citizen immigrants under 21 years old or pregnant women or up
 to 60 days postpartum).

28 ⁷ 8 C.F.R. § 212.21.

1 **A. Utilization of Essential Health and Nutrition Programs Are Targeted By The**
 2 **Regulation**

3 The Regulation expands the definition of “[p]ublic benefit” to include significant non-cash
 4 benefit programs including SNAP, Medicaid, and Section 8 housing benefits.⁸ These types of non-
 5 cash public benefit programs have been key to upward mobility for generations of immigrants. This
 6 expansion of the definition of public benefit will affect many immigrant families, especially those with
 7 low to moderate incomes. For example, the Regulation gives immigration officers broad discretion to
 8 make a public charge determination based on whether an immigrant may utilize, at some point in the
 9 future, Medicaid, SNAP, or housing benefits. Certain groups of immigrants, such as parolees or those
 10 subject to withholding of removal, would be penalized for utilizing Medicaid if they ever sought to
 11 adjust their immigration status through a family member. Immigrants with health conditions that
 12 require “extensive treatment” who receive health coverage through state-funded programs would be
 13 penalized if they cannot demonstrate an ability to purchase private insurance.

14 Equally significant, the Regulation’s chilling effect will impact many additional families. The
 15 Regulation has already resulted in widespread confusion and fear throughout the immigrant
 16 community, causing many to forego such assistance including assistance for which they are legally
 17 entitled under federal or state law. In fact, there was an increase in the child uninsurance rate in 2018
 18 to 5.5% which is largely because of a decline in children’s Medicaid and CHIP coverage rates.⁹ Rates
 19 of decline were highest for Hispanic children. Sadly, this puts parents and children at risk for poorer
 20 health outcomes, additional economic hardship, and long-term consequences.

21 **B. The Totality of the Circumstances Test Is So Vague It Will Result In**
 22 **Discriminatory Decision Making**

23 The Regulation is problematic in that its application by immigration officers is likely to result
 24 in inconsistent and discriminatory outcomes. The Regulation states that the public charge
 25

26 ⁸ 8 C.F.R. § 212.21(b).

27 ⁹ <https://www.census.gov/library/stories/2019/09/uninsured-rate-for-children-in-2018.html>
 28 (reporting that Hispanic children were more likely to be uninsured than children from other races
 and non-Hispanic origin groups. Between 2017 and 2018, the uninsured rate increased 1.0
 percentage point for Hispanic children and 0.5 percentage points for non-Hispanic Whites).

1 determination “must be based on the totality of the alien’s circumstances by weighing all factors that
 2 are relevant to whether the alien is more likely than not...to receive one or more public benefits . . .
 3 .”¹⁰ While on its face, the Regulation describes the determination as based on a totality of the
 4 circumstances, it is anything but. The immigration officer is instructed to consider a set of minimum
 5 factors (age, health, family status, education and skills, and financial status), heavily weighted negative
 6 factors (e.g., employment status, receipt of public benefits, diagnosis of an extensive medical condition
 7 without adequate private insurance), and heavily weighted positive factors (household income of at
 8 least 250% of the federal poverty guidelines, employment with an income of at least 250% of federal
 9 poverty guidelines, and private health insurance).¹¹ There is no guidance provided on how to balance
 10 the competing factors, especially when in many cases some factors have more impact than others.

11 Most significantly, the application of each of these factors will have a disparate impact on
 12 vulnerable populations. For example, as discussed in more detail below, children will automatically
 13 have their age counted against them. In addition, the inclusion of one factor in particular—“health”—
 14 will likely result in discrimination across the board. The Regulation states:

15 DHS will consider whether the alien’s health makes the alien more likely than not to
 16 become a public charge at any time in the future, including whether the alien has been
 17 diagnosed with a medical condition that is likely to require extensive medical treatment
 18 or institutionalization or that will interfere with the alien’s ability to provide and care
 19 for himself or herself, to attend school, or to work upon admission or adjustment of
 20 status.¹²

21 This implicit definition of “medical condition” is so broad as to be unworkable. There is no guidance
 22 provided as to what “extensive medical treatment” consists of, or what type of medical condition
 23 would rise to the level of “interfer[ing]” with work or school. This vague standard could include
 24 anything from a condition requiring the use of expensive medical equipment such as a power
 25 wheelchair to a child’s learning disability that requires an Individualized Education Plan.

26
 27 _____
 28 10 8 C.F.R. § 212.22(a) (emphasis added).

11 8 C.F.R. § 212.22(b), (c).

12 8 C.F.R. § 212.22(b)(2)(i).

1 The Regulation further provides that the immigration official can rely on evidence that
 2 includes, *but is not limited to*, (i) an immigration medical examination, or if the immigration officer
 3 finds the report to be incomplete (ii) evidence of such a medical condition.¹³ There is no further
 4 requirement of the type or quality of such “evidence,” including whether the evidence must be
 5 documented by a medical professional. Moreover, the Regulation expressly states that the
 6 immigration officer is not limited to these two categories of evidence. The Regulation provides no
 7 restrictions on what the immigration officer can consider when evaluating an immigrant’s health. This
 8 provision has the potential of allowing an immigration official to act as an unqualified medical expert,
 9 with no oversight.¹⁴

10 The Regulation expands the definition of public benefit and relies on an ambiguous “totality
 11 of circumstances” test to evaluate whether an immigrant is or will become a public charge. The
 12 application of this Regulation will have a negative impact on the health of immigrants and their
 13 families and an even more severe effect on the health of vulnerable populations, including children,
 14 pregnant women, and disabled individuals. The impact of this rule on each of these vulnerable
 15 populations is set forth in more detail below.

16 **II. BOTH CITIZEN AND NON-CITIZEN CHILDREN WILL BE HARMED BY THE** 17 **PUBLIC CHARGE REGULATION**

18 The Regulation will have a devastating impact on children in this country—increasing the
 19 likelihood that immigrant children will be designated a public charge and reducing access to health
 20 and nutrition benefits for all children, including U.S. citizens.

21 **A. The Totality of Circumstances Test Will Disproportionally Impact Non-Citizen** 22 **Children**

23 Immigrant children are plainly disadvantaged by the Regulation’s “totality of circumstances”
 24 public charge test. At the very least, a child’s age will count against him or her as a negative factor.¹⁵

25 _____
 26 13 8 C.F.R. § 212.22(b)(2)(ii).

27 14 Not only is it manifestly unjust for an immigration officer, with no medical training, to make a
 28 determination about the health status of an immigrant, such a scenario contravenes 42 C.F.R. §34 et
 seq (setting forth the requirements for medical examinations of aliens).

15 8 C.F.R. § 212.22(b)(1) (“When considering an alien’s age, DHS will consider whether the
 alien’s age makes the alien more likely than not to become a public charge at any time in the future,

1 A child will also be penalized by the “education and skills” factor, as it is unlikely the child could
 2 demonstrate “adequate education and skills to either obtain or maintain lawful employment.”¹⁶
 3 Additional negative factors are related to larger family size (implicated if the child has siblings) or if
 4 the child resides in a single parent household.¹⁷ If the child has a medical condition that requires
 5 “extensive medical treatment” or “interfere[s]” with the child’s ability to attend school, this will count
 6 as a negative factor.¹⁸ One study reported that 4.8 million children in need of medical attention live
 7 in households with at least one noncitizen adult and are insured by Medicaid or CHIP.¹⁹ This includes
 8 a significant number of children with at least one potentially life-threatening condition or illness,
 9 including asthma, influenza, diabetes, epilepsy, or cancer.²⁰ Children who live with such medical
 10 conditions and who reside in households that cannot obtain or afford private health insurance would
 11 be penalized with a heavily weighted negative factor under §212.22(c)(1)(iii).

12 While the Regulation exempts from the public benefits definition the receipt of Medicaid
 13 benefits by immigrants under the age of 21,²¹ consideration of all the factors in the “totality of
 14 circumstances” test will make it uniquely difficult for children, particularly those with health
 15 challenges or those in lower income households, to avoid being determined a public charge.

16 **B. Children’s Health Will Be Harmed By The Public Charge Regulation**

17 The impact of the Regulation on the health and well-being of all children in immigrant families
 18 cannot be understated. Many such families rely on government programs for preventive,
 19 rehabilitative, habilitative, and emergency health needs as well as supplemental nutrition. This
 20 Regulation will cause, or already has caused, families to disenroll from these programs.

21
 22 such as by impacting the alien’s ability to work, including whether the alien is between the age of 18
 23 and the minimum ‘early retirement age’ for Social Security . . .”).

24 16 8 C.F.R. § 212.22(b)(5).

25 17 8 C.F.R. § 212.21(d)(2); 8 C.F.R. § 212.22(b)(3).

26 18 8 C.F.R. § 212.22(b)(2).

27 19 “[I]n need of medical attention” was defined in the study to be “children with a current or recent
 28 medical diagnosis, disability, and/or need for specific therapy.” Leah Zallman, Changing Public
 Charge Immigration Rules: The Potential Impact on Children Who Need Care, California Health
 Care Foundation, (October 23, 2018), <https://www.chcf.org/publication/changing-public-charge-immigration-rules/>.

²⁰ Id.

21 8 C.F.R. § 212.21(a)(5)(iv).

1 The Regulation will have a chilling effect on programs specifically identified, such as SNAP
 2 and Medicaid. The fear and confusion over what is covered by the Regulation will also result in a
 3 chilling effect on programs that are not explicitly called out, such as the Children’s Health Insurance
 4 Program (CHIP), the Special Supplemental Nutrition Program for Women, Infants, and Children
 5 (WIC), and state-funded Medicaid programs.

6 This chilling effect is real, measurable, and exacerbated by the final Regulation. When the
 7 Regulation was published, before it was even finalized, immigrant families shied away from
 8 government healthcare programs and regular doctor’s appointments.²² A study reported that one-
 9 seventh of all adults in immigrant families reported avoiding non-cash public benefits over the past
 10 year because of fear that their legal immigration status would be harmed.²³ Low-income members of
 11 immigrant families reported even higher rates of avoidance.²⁴ Of this group that avoided benefits,
 12 46% avoided nutrition benefits (SNAP), 42% avoided medical benefits (Medicaid and CHIP), and
 13 33% avoided public housing subsidies.²⁵ Notably, this chilling effect was measurable before the final
 14 Regulation was published, and it is expected that the rates of avoidance will be markedly higher once
 15 it is enforced.

16 Children will lose health coverage—whether due to chilling effects or their households being
 17 directly targeted by this Regulation—to potentially disastrous effects.²⁶ A study found that
 18 disenrollment of children in need of medical care would likely contribute to child deaths and future
 19 disability.²⁷ Foregoing regular treatment for such children will likely lead to increased health care
 20

21 22 See Lena O’Rourke, *Trump’s Public Charge Proposal Is Hurting Immigrant Families Now*,
 22 Protecting Immigrant Families (Apr. 2019), [https://www.chn.org/wp-](https://www.chn.org/wp-content/uploads/2019/04/ProtectingImmigrantFamilies.pdf)
[content/uploads/2019/04/ProtectingImmigrantFamilies.pdf](https://www.chn.org/wp-content/uploads/2019/04/ProtectingImmigrantFamilies.pdf).

23 Hamutal Bernstein et al., *One in Seven Adults in Immigrant Families Reported Avoiding Public
 23 Benefit Programs* in 2018, Urban Institute (May 2019),
 24 [https://www.urban.org/sites/default/files/publication/100270/one_in_seven_adults_in_immigrant_fa-](https://www.urban.org/sites/default/files/publication/100270/one_in_seven_adults_in_immigrant_families_reported_avoiding_publi_2.pdf)
[milies_reported_avoiding_publi_2.pdf](https://www.urban.org/sites/default/files/publication/100270/one_in_seven_adults_in_immigrant_families_reported_avoiding_publi_2.pdf).

25 ²⁴ *Id.*

26 ²⁵ *Id.*

26 26 Karpman, M. and G. Kenney. “Health Insurance Coverage for Children and Parents: Changes
 27 Between 2013 and 2017” Urban Institute, September 7, 2017.

27 <http://hrms.urban.org/quicktakes/health-insurance-coveragechildrenparents-march-2017.html>

28 27 See Leah Zallman et al., *Implications of Changing Public Charge Immigration Rules for Children
 Who Need Medical Care*, JAMA Pediatr., at E4, E5 (July 1, 2019).

1 costs and disastrous outcomes.²⁸ For these vulnerable children, the loss of health coverage would be
2 catastrophic.

3 While the loss of health coverage by parents has a significant negative impact on their
4 children's health coverage, the converse is also true. When parents gain access to health coverage,
5 their children also gain access to health coverage.²⁹ It is well documented that children who access
6 health care early on have long-term improved health and educational outcomes. For example,
7 increased access to health insurance such as Medicaid in early childhood leads to long-term health
8 improvements such as a decline in prevalence of high blood pressure, reduced adult hospitalizations,
9 reduction in self-reported rates of disability, and reduced mortality in teenage and adult years.³⁰ The
10 benefits to providing insurance coverage to children are wide ranging, including improving children's
11 access to health and dental care, improving parental satisfaction, and saving money.³¹ Access to health
12 insurance during childhood also increases the likelihood of graduating from high school and attending
13 college, as well as achieving a higher earning potential.³²

14 Furthermore, access to nutritious food is fundamental to the healthy development of all
15 children. SNAP is the largest federal nutrition program that allows recipients to buy healthy food.
16 Children in immigrant families that receive SNAP benefits are more likely to be in good or excellent
17 health, be food secure, and reside in stable housing.³³ These families have more resources to afford

18 _____
28 See Id.

19 29 Hudson, J. L., & Moriya, A. S. (2017). Medicaid Expansion For Adults Had Measurable
20 'Welcome Mat' Effects On Their Children. *Health Affairs*, 36(9), 1643-1651.

21 doi:10.1377/hlthaff.2017.0347. <https://www.healthaffairs.org/doi/pdf/10.1377/hlthaff.2017.0347>

22 30 Karina Wagnerman et al., *Medicaid Is A Smart Investment in Children* (March 2017), at 4-5,
23 <https://ccf.georgetown.edu/wpcontent/uploads/2017/03/MedicaidSmartInvestment.pdf>

24 31 Lisa Clemens et al., How Well Is CHIP Addressing Oral Health Care Needs and Access for
25 Children?, *Academic Pediatrics* 15:13 Suppl., (May-June 2015),

26 <https://www.sciencedirect.com/science/article/pii/S1876285915000649>; Zhou J. Yu et al.,

27 *Associations among dental insurance, dental visits, and unmet needs of US children*, *The Journal of*
28 *the American Dental Association*, 148:2 (February 2017);

29 <https://www.sciencedirect.com/science/article/abs/pii/S0002817716309047>; Glenn Flores et al., The
30 health and healthcare impact of providing insurance coverage to uninsured children: A prospective
31 observational study, *BMC Public Health*, 17:553 (May 23, 2017),

32 <https://www.ncbi.nlm.nih.gov/pmc/articles/PMC5463460/>

33 *Id.* at 5, 6.

34 33 Children's HealthWatch, *Report Card On Food Security & Immigration: Helping Our Youngest*
35 *First-Generation Americans To Thrive*, (February 2018), [http://childrenshealthwatch.org/wp-](http://childrenshealthwatch.org/wp-content/uploads/Report-Card-on-Food-Insecurity-and-Immigration-Helping-Our-Youngest-First-)
36 [content/uploads/Report-Card-on-Food-Insecurity-and-Immigration-Helping-Our-Youngest-First-](http://childrenshealthwatch.org/wp-content/uploads/Report-Card-on-Food-Insecurity-and-Immigration-Helping-Our-Youngest-First-)

1 medical care and prescription medications, compared to families who do not participate in SNAP.³⁴
 2 Significantly, an additional year of SNAP eligibility for young children with immigrant parents is
 3 associated with significant health benefits in later childhood and adolescence.³⁵

4 These results are not surprising: nutrition is one of the greatest environmental influences on
 5 the development of babies in the womb and during infancy.³⁶ A healthy balance of essential nutrients
 6 during a child's formative periods is imperative for normal brain development.³⁷ Neuroscientists
 7 describe such formative periods as "critical periods" and "sensitive periods" to emphasize the
 8 vulnerability of a child's developing brain.³⁸ During such periods, nutrient deficiencies can have
 9 irreversible long-term consequences such as preventing children from fully developing their potentials
 10 in sensori-motor, cognitive-language, and social-emotional functions.³⁹ Such failures to optimize
 11 brain development early in life have substantial and long-lasting ramifications. Studies have shown
 12 that children that do not meet certain developmental milestones are less likely to remain and succeed
 13 in school, less likely to earn higher incomes as adults, and less likely to provide adequate nutrition and
 14 educational opportunities to their own children.⁴⁰

15 Disincentivizing the use of SNAP or other public food security benefits by immigrant families
 16 will result in enduring damage to the collective health and proper development of all children in such
 17 families.⁴¹ Such damage will only be compounded over time as affected children suffer from higher

18 _____
 19 Generation-Americans-to-Thrive.pdf.

20 ³⁴ *Id.*

21 ³⁵ Chloe N. East, *The Effect of Food Stamps on Children's Health: Evidence from Immigrants' Changing Eligibility*, Working Paper, (August 6, 2017),

22 http://www.chloeneast.com/uploads/8/9/9/7/8997263/east_fskids_r_r.pdf

23 ³⁶ See Peter J. Morgane et al., *Effects of prenatal protein malnutrition on the hippocampal formation*, 26 *Neuroscience and Biobehavioral Rev.* 471, 474 (2002).

24 ³⁷ See Sarah E. Cusick & Michael K. Georgieff, *The Role of Nutrition in Brain Development: The Golden Opportunity of the "First 1000 Days"*, 175 *J. Pediatrics* 16 (Aug. 2016).

25 ³⁸ *See id.*

26 ³⁹ *See id.*, see also Susan P. Walker et al., *Child development: risk factors for adverse outcomes in developing countries*, 369 *Lancet* 145 (2007).

27 ⁴⁰ See e.g., Anthony Lake, *Early childhood development – global action is overdue*, 378 *Lancet* 1277 (Oct. 8, 2011); Patrice L. Engle et al., *Strategies for reducing inequalities and improving developmental outcomes for young children in low-income and middle-income countries*, 378 *Lancet* 1339 (Oct. 8, 2011); See Susan P. Walker et al., *Inequality in early childhood: risk and protective factors for early child development*, 378 *Lancet* 1325, 1334 (Oct. 8, 2011).

28 ⁴¹ See Leah Zallman et al., *Implications of Changing Public Charge Immigration Rules for Children Who Need Medical Care*, *JAMA Pediatr.*, at E4-E5 (July 1, 2019).

1 likelihoods of falling short of their full developmental potential, lower achievement in school, and
2 having less satisfaction from their professional careers.⁴² Access to medical care and adequate
3 nutrition allows early identification of any issues before they become more serious or costly to treat.
4 Given the serious and irreparable health risks to children that will directly result from a lack of access
5 to health and nutrition programs, enforcement of the Regulation should be enjoined.

6 **III. THE PUBLIC CHARGE REGULATION WILL ACT AS A BARRIER TO HEALTH**
7 **CARE FOR PREGNANT AND POSTPARTUM WOMEN**

8 In addition to children, the Regulation will greatly hamper the ability of pregnant and
9 postpartum women to obtain or maintain legal immigration status. Equally important, the Regulation
10 will have a tragic effect on the health of this population.

11 **A. The Totality of Circumstances Test Will Disproportionally Impact Pregnant and**
12 **Postpartum Women**

13 Under the Regulation’s totality of circumstances test, women could be penalized for being
14 pregnant or for having given birth. As discussed above in Section I.B., the Regulation explicitly
15 mandates that a heavily-weighted negative factor is the immigrant’s “health,” including diagnosis of
16 a medical condition requiring extensive medical treatment or interfering with care, school, or work.”⁴³
17 If the individual does not have private health insurance, this will be considered as an additional heavily
18 weighted negative factor.⁴⁴ If an individual has one or more heavily weighted negative factor, “DHS
19 generally will not favorably exercise discretion to allow submission of a public charge [surety]
20 bond.”⁴⁵ A pregnant woman (or one who has recently given birth)—especially a woman who has
21 suffered serious pregnancy-related complications—who is unable to afford private insurance to cover
22 the birth or post-partum care will plainly be penalized. Moreover, while the Regulation exempts
23 receipt of Medicaid benefits for women who are pregnant and for 60 days post-partum as a factor in
24 the public charge determination, Medicaid-eligible immigrants who utilize the program after the 60-

25
26 _____
27 ⁴² *Id.* at E5.

28 ⁴³ 8 C.F.R. § 212.22(b)(2).

⁴⁴ 8 C.F.R. § 212.22(c)(1)(iii)(B).

⁴⁵ 8 C.F.R. § 213.1(b).

1 day postpartum period would be given a “heavily weighted negative factor.”⁴⁶

2 **B. Pregnant and Postpartum Women Will Be Directly Harmed By The Public**
 3 **Charge Regulation**

4 As with other vulnerable populations, the Regulation will have the effect of reducing the use
 5 of social safety net programs by pregnant women and those who recently gave birth. These barriers
 6 to prenatal and postnatal care will have a drastic impact on the health of these women, their babies,
 7 and other family members. Regular prenatal care is proven to help prevent and detect serious
 8 pregnancy complications in the mother, including hypertension, infection, and anemia.⁴⁷ Not
 9 surprisingly, lack of adequate prenatal care contributes to higher rates of maternal mortality.⁴⁸
 10 Foregoing postpartum care, which is crucial to the health and well-being of mothers, newborns, and
 11 families, could also mean that women endure postpartum depression without proper medical, social,
 12 and psychological care, skip doctor’s visits that address infant feeding, nutrition, and physical activity,
 13 or leave other postpartum health issues unaddressed.⁴⁹

14 The lack of prenatal care can have serious implications for children, affecting their birth and
 15 early health outcomes.⁵⁰ Prenatal care has been shown to be associated with decreased incidence of
 16

17 ⁴⁶ 8 C.F.R. § 212.22(c)(1).

18 ⁴⁷ Swartz JJ et al., *Expanding prenatal care to unauthorized immigrant women and the effect on*
 19 *infant health*, *Obstet Gynecol.*, 130(5): 938–945 (November 2017) (citing Mbuagbaw L, Medley N,
 20 Darzi AJ, Richardson M, Habiba Garga K, Ongolo-Zogo P. Health system and community level
 interventions for improving antenatal care coverage and health outcomes. *Cochrane Database Syst*
 Rev. 2015; (12) CD010994. doi: 10.1002/14651858.CD010994.pub2.)

21 ⁴⁸ Jacques Balayla & Haim Arie Abenheim, *Inadequate Prenatal Care Utilization and Risks of*
 22 *Infant Mortality and Poor Birth Outcome: A Retrospective Analysis of 28,729,765 U.S. Deliveries*
 23 *over 8 Years*, *American Journal of Perinatology* (2012),
 24 https://www.researchgate.net/profile/Jacques_Balayla2/publication/230573498_Inadequate_Prenatal_Care_Utilization_and_Risks_of_Infant_Mortality_and_Poor_Birth_Outcome_A_Retrospective_Analysis_of_28729765_US_Deliveries_over_8_Years/links/0deec526dabeb49c3f000000/Inadequate-Prenatal-Care-Utilization-and-Risks-of-Infant-Mortality-and-Poor-Birth-Outcome-A-Retrospective-Analysis-of-28-729-765-US-Deliveries-over-8-Years.pdf.

25 ⁴⁹ See The American College of Obstetricians and Gynecologists, *Ob-Gyns Stress the Importance of*
 26 *Postpartum Care: The Fourth Trimester* (2016), <https://www.acog.org/About-ACOG/News-Room/News-Releases/2016/Ob-Gyns-Stress-the-Importance-of-Postpartum-Care-The-Fourth-Trimester>.

27 ⁵⁰ Megan M. Shellinger, et al., *Improved Outcomes for Hispanic Women with Gestational Diabetes*
 28 *Using the Centering Pregnancy Group Prenatal Care Model*, *Maternal and Child Health Journal*
 (2016), <https://link.springer.com/article/10.1007/s10995-016-2114-x>.

1 low birth weight and newborn death.⁵¹ For example, researchers studying the expansion of Emergency
 2 Medicaid Plus program in Oregon which resulted in expanding access to prenatal care found “a
 3 significant decrease in both the probability of extremely low birth weight infants and infant death with
 4 access to prenatal care.”⁵² The decrease in infant mortality associated with expanded access to prenatal
 5 care was so great that it measured “greater than the 30-year reduction in infant mortality from Sudden
 6 Infant Death Syndrome (SIDS) associated with the “Back to Sleep” campaign.”⁵³

7 Moreover, the United States already has the highest rate of maternal deaths in the developed
 8 world and one of the highest rates of infant mortality.⁵⁴ These rates are even higher in low-income
 9 communities and among women of color.⁵⁵ The CDC has identified contributing factors to maternal
 10 mortality and strategies to prevent future pregnancy-related deaths. These factors include community
 11 factors (e.g., unstable housing, access to clinical care, and limited access to transportation) and system
 12 factors (e.g., inadequate receipt of care and case coordination or management). Strategies to address
 13 community factors include “increasing availability and use of group prenatal care, prioritizing
 14 pregnant and postpartum women for temporary housing programs, improving availability of
 15 transportation services covered by Medicaid, and improving access to healthy foods and promoting
 16 healthy eating habits and weight management strategies.” Strategies to address system factors include
 17 “extend[ing] expanded Medicaid coverage eligibility for pregnant women to include one year of
 18 postpartum care.” Thus even if immigrant women are not penalized for using Medicaid during their
 19 pregnancy and immediately after birth, they will be penalized for accessing these types of medical
 20 safety-net programs that are demonstrated to reduce maternal mortality.

21 Moreover, DHS trivializes the immense cost of inadequate prenatal care to society. Inadequate
 22 prenatal care is associated with an increased risk of preterm babies, and the Institute of Medicine
 23

24 _____
 25 ⁵¹ *Id.*

26 ⁵² *Id.*

27 ⁵³ *Id.*

28 ⁵⁴ Emily E. Petersen et al., *Vital Signs: Pregnancy-Related Deaths, United States, 2011–2015, and
 Strategies for Prevention, 13 States, 2013–2017*, CDC, *Morb Mortal Wkly Rep (MMWR)* 68(18):
 423-29 (May 10, 2019) (available at <http://dx.doi.org/10.15585/mmwr.mm6818e1>)

⁵⁵ *Id.*

1 estimates that the medical costs for a preterm baby are much greater than for a healthy newborn.⁵⁶
 2 Specifically, the economic burden associated with preterm birth in the United States was at least \$26.2
 3 billion annually, or \$51,600 per infant born preterm.⁵⁷ To put it in perspective, the average
 4 preterm/low birth weight hospitalization cost \$15,100 with a 12.9 day length of stay, whereas, an
 5 uncomplicated newborn hospitalization cost \$600 with a 1.9 day stay.⁵⁸

6 Unless enjoined, the Regulation is highly likely to cause irreparable damage to the health and
 7 well-being of immigrant pregnant and postpartum women, as well as the health and cognitive
 8 development of millions of infants and young children.

9 **IV. THE PUBLIC CHARGE REGULATION WILL ALSO PARTICULARLY HARM**
 10 **INDIVIDUALS WITH DISABILITIES AND CHRONIC HEALTH CONDITIONS**

11 The Public Charge Regulation would directly harm the health of immigrants with disabilities
 12 and make it harder for them to successfully apply for a visa or permanent legal status. Of even greater
 13 concern, the Regulation creates a strong incentive for these individuals to avoid accessing necessary
 14 health and other non-cash benefit programs.

15 **A. The Totality of Circumstances Test Will Disproportionally Impact Individuals**
 16 **with Disabilities**

17 Receipt of non-cash public benefits including Medicaid, inadequate private insurance, and a
 18 diagnosis with a medical condition that “will require extensive medical treatment” or “interfere with
 19 the individual’s ability to support himself or herself” are all heavily weighted negative factors in the
 20 public charge determination. As a result, this Regulation will have a devastating impact on the ability
 21 of immigrants with disabilities and chronic health conditions to obtain, adjust, or maintain legal
 22 residency in the United States.

23 **B. Individuals with Disabilities Will Suffer Negative Consequences To Their Health**
 24 **And Well-Being**

25 The Regulation acts as a significant roadblock for disabled immigrants and their families to

26 ⁵⁶ Behrman RE, Butler AS. (Eds) (2007) *Preterm Birth. Causes, Consequences and Prevention*.
 Washington, DC National Academies Press.

27 ⁵⁷ *Id.*

28 ⁵⁸ R. B. Russell et al., *Cost of Hospitalization for Preterm and Low Birth Weight Infants in the United States*, *Pediatrics* 120.1 (2007): E1-E9.

1 become and remain self-sufficient. Public benefit programs, including Medicaid, are essential to
 2 facilitate educational and employment opportunities for people with disabilities and chronic
 3 conditions. Medicaid covers primary care, preventative care, medical treatment, and supportive
 4 services for people with disabilities.⁵⁹ For many, Medicaid is the *only* source for critical community
 5 living supports (like personal care services, nursing services, respite, intensive mental health services
 6 and employment supports).

7 There is a strong link between Medicaid and the ability of individuals with disabilities to live
 8 independently, and Medicaid is critical to help ensure that individuals with disabilities disabled
 9 individuals can attend school and work.⁶⁰ For example, more than 150,000 individuals with
 10 disabilities participate in Medicaid buy-in programs, which provides Medicaid coverage for those who
 11 participate in the labor force.⁶¹ It is well documented that these Medicaid buy-in participants earn
 12 more, work more, contribute more in taxes, and rely less on food stamps than people with disabilities
 13 who are not enrolled.⁶² For individuals with intellectual or developmental disabilities, Medicaid
 14 provides more supportive services to facilitate employment.⁶³ The role of Medicaid to support
 15 individuals with disabilities so that they can remain productive members of their community cannot
 16 be understated.

17 The number of individuals who will be irreparably harmed by the Regulation is significant.
 18

19 ⁵⁹ Congressional Research Service, *Who Pays For Long-Term Services and Supports?* (Aug. 22,
 20 2018), <https://fas.org/sgp/crs/misc/IF10343.pdf>

21 ⁶⁰ The Center on Budget and Policy Priorities, *Medicaid Works for People with Disabilities* (Aug.
 22 29, 2017), <https://www.cbpp.org/research/health/medicaid-works-for-people-with-disabilities>.

23 ⁶¹ Brigitte Gavin and Marci McCoy-Roth, *Review of studies regarding the Medicaid Buy-In*
 24 *Program*, Boston University, Sargent College, Center for Psychiatric Rehabilitation, (2011),
 25 <http://www.bu.edu/drrk/research-syntheses/psychiatric-disabilities/medicaid-buy-in/>; Social Security
 26 Administration, *Continued Medicaid Eligibility (Section 1619(B))*,
 27 <https://www.ssa.gov/disabilityresearch/wi/1619b.htm>; Medicaid and CHIP Payment and Access
 28 Commission, *Promoting Continuity of Medicaid Coverage among Adults under Age 65* (Mar. 2014),
<https://www.macpac.gov/publication/ch-2-promoting-continuity-of-medicaid-coverage-among-adults-under-age-65/>.

⁶² Brigitte Gavin and Marci McCoy-Roth, *supra*

⁶³ Department of Health and Human Services, Centers for Medicare and Medicaid Services, *Updates to the §1915 (c) Waiver Instructions and Technical Guide regarding employment and employment related services* (Sept. 16, 2011), at <https://downloads.cms.gov/cmsgov/archived-downloads/CMCSBulletins/downloads/CIB-9-16-11.pdf> (discussing the use of waiver supports to increase employment opportunities for individuals with disabilities).

1 Approximately one-third of working age adults enrolled in Medicaid have a disability.⁶⁴ In 2015
2 people with disabilities made up 26 percent of SNAP participants.⁶⁵ Blocking or disincentivizing
3 access to medical and nutrition benefits will result in worse medical outcomes and food insecurity for
4 an already vulnerable population.

5 **CONCLUSION**

6 The Regulation dramatically increases the likelihood that lawfully present immigrants and
7 their families will forego health and nutrition benefits to avoid negatively impacting their immigration
8 status. The harmful impact of this Regulation will most severely threaten the health and well-being
9 of vulnerable children, pregnant women, and individuals with disabilities. On behalf of their patients,
10 members, and the communities they serve, amici curiae urge this Court to grant Plaintiffs’ preliminary
11 injunction and to prevent further harm and damage to the health of these groups.

12
13 Dated: September 13, 2019

/s/ Susan Krumplitsch
COOLEY LLP
SUSAN KRUMPLITSCH (241016)
(skrumplitsch@cooley.com)
ELIZABETH STAMESHKIN (260865)
(lstameshkin@cooley.com)
PRIYA ARORA (301207)
(parora@cooley.com)
3175 Hanover Street
Palo Alto, CA 94304-1130
Telephone: (650) 843-5000
Facsimile: (650) 849-7400

17
18
19
20 Attorneys for Amici Curiae

21
22
23
24 ⁶⁴ See, e.g., Nationwide Adult Medicaid CAHPS, Health Care Experiences of Adults with
25 Disabilities Enrolled in Medicaid Only: Findings from a 2014-2015 Nationwide Survey of Medicaid
26 Beneficiaries (2016), [https://www.medicaid.gov/medicaid/quality-of-care/downloads/performance-](https://www.medicaid.gov/medicaid/quality-of-care/downloads/performance-measurement/namcahpsdisabilitybrief.pdf)
[measurement/namcahpsdisabilitybrief.pdf](https://www.medicaid.gov/medicaid/quality-of-care/downloads/performance-measurement/namcahpsdisabilitybrief.pdf).

27 ⁶⁵ Steven Carlson et al., SNAP Provides Needed Food Assistance to Millions of People with
28 Disabilities, CENTER FOR BUDGET AND POLICY PRIORITIES (June 14, 2017),
[https://www.cbpp.org/research/food-assistance/snap-provides-needed-food-assistance-to-millions-](https://www.cbpp.org/research/food-assistance/snap-provides-needed-food-assistance-to-millions-of-people-with)
[of-people-with](https://www.cbpp.org/research/food-assistance/snap-provides-needed-food-assistance-to-millions-of-people-with).