



Policy solutions that work for low-income people

July 3, 2019

Submitted via [www.regulations.gov](http://www.regulations.gov)

Office of General Counsel, Rules Docket Clerk  
Department of Housing and Urban Development  
451 7<sup>th</sup> Street SW, Room 10276  
Washington, DC 20410-0500

**Re: HUD Docket No. FR-6124-P-01, RIN 2501-AD89 Comments in Response to Proposed Rulemaking: Housing and Community Development Act of 1980: Verification of Eligible Status**

Dear Secretary Carson:

The Center for Law and Social Policy (CLASP) is grateful for the opportunity to comment on the proposed changes regarding “verification of eligible status” published in the Federal Register on May 10, 2019 by the U.S. Department of Housing and Urban Development (HUD).

Established in 1969, CLASP is a national, non-partisan, non-profit, anti-poverty organization that advances policy solutions for low-income people. Our comments draw upon the work of CLASP experts in the areas of immigration and anti-poverty policies. As a national anti-poverty organization, we understand the critical importance of federal programs that support the health and economic well-being of low-income families.

CLASP submits the following comments in opposition to the proposed regulation and urge that the rule be withdrawn in its entirety, and that HUD’s longstanding regulations remain in effect. The proposed regulation would directly undermine the wellbeing of immigrant families in low-income households, including U.S. citizen children. The proposal would force “mixed-status” families to break up to continue receiving federally assisted housing or face eviction, and jeopardize others getting housing assistance if they can’t meet new citizenship documentation requirements.

The proposed rule is part of the Trump Administration’s continued coordinated attack on immigrant families,<sup>1</sup> and would serve no legitimate governmental purpose. While we are concerned that millions of U.S. households struggle to find affordable housing in the ongoing nationwide housing crisis, punishing immigrant families will not fix this problem. In fact, HUD’s own analysis finds that fewer, not more, families are likely to receive assistance as a result of the rule.<sup>2</sup>

In the comments that follow, we explain in more detail the reasons why HUD should immediately withdraw this proposed regulation.

## BACKGROUND

HUD rental assistance programs enable millions of low-income households in the United States to rent modest housing at an affordable cost. Without these supports, many families would be homeless, living in substandard or overcrowded conditions, or struggling to meet other basic needs because too much of their limited income would go to paying rent. Housing assistance is one of the most effective ways to lift families out of poverty. Analysis by the Center on Budget and Policy Priorities shows that housing assistance lifted 4 million people, including 1.3 million children, over the poverty line in 2015.<sup>3</sup>

### **Access to HUD Assistance Has Positive Effects on Individuals' Long-Term Economic and Educational Attainment, Which in Turn Contribute to Self-Sufficiency**

Eviction due to inability to afford rent often leads to residential instability, moving into poor quality housing, overcrowding, and homelessness, all of which are associated with negative health among adults and children. Even just the threat of eviction can lead to high blood pressure, depression, anxiety, and psychological distress.<sup>4</sup> Research also shows that children whose families take up a housing voucher to move to a lower-poverty neighborhood when they are less than 13 years of age have significantly higher college attendance rates and an annual income that is 31 percent higher, on average.<sup>5</sup>

Children whose families receive housing assistance are more likely to have a healthy weight and to rate higher on measures of well-being—especially when housing assistance is accompanied by food assistance.<sup>6</sup> Without housing assistance, children are more likely to live in overcrowded conditions, become homeless, and move frequently.<sup>7</sup> They are also more likely to remain in high-poverty neighborhoods, which is associated with poor health and educational outcomes.<sup>8</sup> Research demonstrates that when housing subsidies are permanent, reliable, and consistent, they are more likely to have positive impacts on children's behavior, access to health care, and food security.<sup>9</sup>

Housing instability represents one of the greatest threats to children's health and development.<sup>10</sup> Various forms of housing instability have adverse outcomes on child development, including poor health and developmental risk.<sup>11</sup> Mothers who experience homelessness or frequent moves while pregnant are more likely to have preterm deliveries and babies with low birth weights.<sup>12</sup> Children in poverty who move frequently during early childhood have higher rates of attention difficulties and behavior problems.<sup>13</sup> Housing instability in childhood is also associated with poor health and more hospitalizations over the course of a child's life.<sup>14</sup> Housing instability is directly correlated to decreases in student retention rates and contributes to homeless students' high suspension rates, school turnover, truancy, and expulsions, limiting students' opportunity to obtain the education they need to succeed later in life.<sup>15</sup>

Further, lack of affordable housing can hurt families' abilities to make ends meet.<sup>16</sup> Severely cost-burdened renters are more likely to face difficulty putting food on the table than those with less severe cost-burdens.<sup>17</sup> The opposite is also true – when families pay affordable rents, their discretionary income increases. Based on a study of families in New York City with affordable rents, researchers found that freeing up funds allowed families to buy health insurance, pay down debt, build savings to pay for education or a down payment on a home.<sup>18</sup>

Taken together, this research on access to housing assistance shows the strong, positive, and long-run effects on children and individual's health, educational, and economic attainment. The proposed rule would deny families and children impacted from these beneficial effects, to their detriment and that of their communities.

## **HARM TO PEOPLE IN LOW-INCOME HOUSEHOLDS, IMMIGRANT FAMILIES, AND CHILDREN**

Mixed-status families are households that include both eligible and ineligible people for housing assistance based on their immigration status. Just because a household member is ineligible for housing assistance does not mean that they are undocumented. Immigrants can have legal status and still not be eligible for housing assistance. At 24 CFR §5.506, HUD proposes to make a family ineligible for assistance unless every member of the family residing in the unit is determined to have eligible status. This proposal is harmful, contrary to Congressional intent, and serves no legitimate purpose.

### **Proposal Would Directly Harm Tens of Thousands of Immigrant Families**

The proposed rule threatens to undermine the well-being of low-income U.S. citizens, immigrants, and their families. The rule would force mixed status families to make an impossible decision—either break up to allow eligible family members to continue receiving assistance or forgo the subsidies so that the families can stay together. Family separations undermine family stability, and leads to toxic stress, trauma, and attachment issues in children. Even a temporary separation has an enormous negative impact on the health and educational attainment of these children later in life, and many parents struggle to restore the parent-child bond once it has been disrupted by a separation.<sup>19</sup>

Since 70% of mixed status families currently receiving HUD assistance are composed of eligible children and at least one ineligible parent, it is likely that these families will forgo the subsidies to avoid separation. In fact, HUD is banking on this, noting in their regulatory impact analysis that “HUD expects that fear of the family being separated would lead to prompt evacuation by most mixed households, whether that fear is justified.”<sup>20</sup> Therefore, this rule would effectively evict as many as 108,000 individuals in mixed status families (in which nearly 3 out of 4 are eligible for assistance) from public housing, Section 8, and other programs covered by the proposed rule.<sup>21</sup> These mass evictions and departures from housing assistance will cause increased rates of homelessness and unstable housing among an already vulnerable population.<sup>22</sup>

These outcomes will not only hurt families while they struggle to find housing in the short term, but will also lead to reduced opportunities and increased health problems for these families in the long term.<sup>23</sup> These effects will be particularly prominent in the children, nearly all of whom are U.S. citizens, in these mixed status families.

### **Proposal Would Directly Harm Eligible Children, Barring them from Maintaining and Seeking Federally Subsidized Housing**

By eliminating the ability of mixed status families to receive prorated assistance on a permanent basis, the proposed rule robs eligible children of housing subsidies because they have parents with ineligible noncitizen status.<sup>24</sup> Section 214 of the Housing and Community Development Act of 1980 (Section 214)

limits access to federally subsidized housing programs to U.S. citizens and a specific list of noncitizen categories.<sup>25</sup> Nearly all of the children in mixed status families who are receiving HUD assistance covered by Section 214 are U.S. citizens and lawful permanent residents (LPR) who live with parents or other adults who do not have eligible immigration status. HUD's statistics show that 70% of mixed status families are composed of eligible children and ineligible parents. There are over 38,000 U.S. citizen and otherwise eligible children in these families, and over 55,000 eligible children in mixed status families overall.<sup>26</sup> Since these children lack the legal capacity to sign leases themselves, the adult heads of household, including those who do not receive assistance, must sign these contracts on behalf of their family. However, by prohibiting the ineligible adults from living in subsidized units, the proposed rule eliminates the possibility of these U.S. citizen and LPR children from receiving any housing assistance under the covered housing programs.

### **Proposal Would Cause a Harmful Chilling Effect on Immigrant Families**

The proposed rule would create a chilling effect by generating mass fear and confusion among immigrant families so that those eligible for programs withdraw from or forgo benefits. As a result, the proposed rule would undermine access to critical HUD assisted housing programs for *eligible* immigrants and their families. Particularly vulnerable to the chilling effect are the 250,000 federally assisted families with *eligible* noncitizens and no ineligible household member.<sup>27</sup>

Among the most harmed by the proposed rule are children, including U.S. citizen children, who would likely decrease participation, despite remaining eligible. It is important to note that immigrants and their children have historically faced unique barriers to accessing critical public benefits, including lack of transportation, language barriers, confusion regarding immigrant eligibility rules, and concerns related to becoming a public charge. Research shows that these barriers have already impacted participation rates and that anti-immigrant policies further deter immigrants from seeking out benefits that they and/or their children are eligible for.<sup>28</sup>

Previous research that studied use of benefits by immigrant and mixed status families after the eligibility changes in the 1990s showed decreased enrollment in Medicaid and CHIP even among those who remained eligible.<sup>29</sup> Based on this research, we know that immigrants' use of basic needs programs, such as HUD housing assistance, could decline significantly when there are these types of policy changes.

The current political climate, with efforts to reduce legal immigration for the first time in decades and increased arrests and deportations, fear of immigration consequences of using public benefits is already taking place and causing harm. Research conducted in 2017 and 2018 confirms that anti-immigrant federal policy and rhetoric is already creating barriers in access to basic needs programs for people in immigrant families, who have already historically faced significant barriers in accessing public benefit programs.

- Health and nutrition service providers have noticed an increase in canceled appointments and requests to disenroll from means-tested programs in 2017.<sup>30</sup>
- Preliminary data for the first half of 2018 showed a 10 percent drop in enrollment among immigrant families eligible for SNAP who have been in the country less than five years, after steady increases for the previous decade.<sup>31</sup>

- Researchers also found that early childhood education programs reported drops in attendance and applications as well as reduced participation from immigrant parents in classrooms and at events, along with an uptick in missed appointments at health clinics.<sup>32</sup>
- Another recent study found that immigrant families – including those who are lawfully present – are experiencing resounding levels of fear and uncertainty across all background and locations.<sup>33</sup>
- In a 2018 survey of health care providers in California, more than two-thirds (67 percent) noted an increase in parents’ concerns about enrolling their children in Medi-Cal (California’s Medicaid program), WIC, and CalFresh (California’s SNAP program), and nearly half (42 percent) reported an increase in skipped scheduled health care appointments.<sup>34</sup>
- In the first systemic national study on chilling effects, the Urban Institute recently found that about one in seven adults in immigrant families avoided basic needs programs – such as housing assistance – in 2018 because of immigration-related concerns.<sup>35</sup>

Further, CLASP documented the climate of fear in immigrant communities around the country firsthand in our report, *Our Children’s Fear: Immigration Policy’s Effects on Young Children*, based on focus groups and interviews conducted in 2017. Among our findings, we heard that immigrant families are increasingly wary of utilizing government services, including for their US citizen children. For example:

- A home visitor in North Carolina said, “We’ve seen a major reluctance to enroll or re-enroll in public benefits. Moms are afraid to sign back up for Medicaid, food stamps, and other [governmental] services.”
- A parent in California shared, “We don’t feel safe even taking our kids to child care.”<sup>36</sup>

Many of the service providers and parents we spoke to told us that immigrant families hesitate to access public benefits and government services out of fear that it will impact their immigration status in the future. These studies reveal that harsh proposals restricting immigrant access to basic needs programs – despite not yet being in effect – have already done harm. If finalized, the proposed rule will continue to contribute to this harm, increasing poverty and unstable housing by discouraging enrollment in HUD assisted housing programs.

## **CITIZENSHIP DOCUMENTATION PROVISIONS WOULD HARM CURRENT AND FUTURE HUD RECIPIENTS**

This proposed rule creates a bureaucratic hurdle for 9.5 million U.S. citizens currently receiving HUD assistance and all future U.S. citizens seeking these benefits. At 24 CFR §5.508, HUD proposes to require that all applicants and recipients who are U.S. citizens provide documentary evidence of their citizenship to establish eligibility for Section 214 housing assistance. This practice, known as citizenship documentation, has proven to be burdensome, costly and unnecessary to protect program integrity.<sup>37</sup>

Under current policy, U.S. citizens provide a declaration signed under penalty of perjury of their citizenship or nationality status in order to establish their eligibility for housing assistance and other public programs. The proposed rule would require that these individuals *also* provide documentary proof of citizenship or nationality, such as a birth certificate.

For many U.S. citizens, providing documentation of their citizenship or nationality is not possible or takes a significant amount of time and resources. It presents a particular challenge for U.S. citizens over the age of 50, citizens of color, citizens with disabilities, and citizens with low-incomes.

One survey from 2006 showed that as many as seven percent of citizens did not have citizen documentation readily available.<sup>38</sup> That same survey suggests that:

- At least 12 percent of citizens earning less than \$25,000 a year do not have proof of citizenship;
- Many people who do have documentation have birth certificates or IDs that don't reflect their current name or address, such as people who changed their name;
- 18 percent of citizens over the age 65 do not have a photo ID; and
- 25 percent of African American citizens lacked a photo ID.

Individuals face many challenges in getting this kind of documentation, including difficulties getting to government offices to replace lost records, coming up with the funds to replace these records, and some may have never been issued a birth certificate in the first place.<sup>39</sup> Obtaining passports is costly and can be difficult for low-income people. Groups particularly likely to have a problem obtaining documents include Native Americans, people with disabilities who do not receive Medicare, SSI, or SSDI; and victims of natural disasters.<sup>40</sup>

The proposed documentation requirements will be particularly burdensome for recipients of rental assistance who were formerly homeless, as well as for people experiencing homelessness who could be assisted by Section 214 programs in the future. People experiencing homelessness often lose important documents such as photo identification, birth certificates, and social security cards because they have no safe places to store them.<sup>41</sup>

The proposed rule places additional documentation burdens on 120,000 noncitizen seniors as well, by requiring noncitizens 62 years old or older to provide documentation of their immigration status.<sup>42</sup> Presently, these noncitizen seniors are required to submit a signed declaration of their eligible immigration status and proof of age. Many immigrant seniors will struggle in the same way as citizen seniors to produce this documentation.

Experience with citizenship documentation requirements in Medicaid demonstrates that the policy negatively impacts eligible *U.S. citizens*. In 2006 after implementing the paper-based citizenship documentation requirement under the Deficit Reduction Act of 2005, there were delays and outright denials of coverage for individuals who were eligible for Medicaid—but could not provide the necessary documents. Half of the 44 states responding to a Government Accountability Office survey indicated that Medicaid enrollment fell because of the citizenship documentation requirement.<sup>43</sup> One state that had begun tracking the effect of the citizenship documentation requirement identified 18,000 individuals in the 7 months after implementation whose applications were denied or coverage terminated for inability to provide the necessary documentation, even though the state believed most of them to be eligible citizens.<sup>44</sup>

In Oregon, children denied Medicaid for inability to document citizenship were likely to be US citizens.<sup>45</sup> A study on the children in Oregon denied coverage for inability to provide documentation suggests that these children went on to have persistent loss of insurance coverage. In New Hampshire, the New Hampshire Healthy Kids (NHHK), processed child applications for the state's Children's Health Insurance Program (CHIP) and Medicaid. Prior to implementing the burdensome paper-based citizenship documentation requirement, 34 percent of applications received monthly by NHHK included all of the documents needed to verify eligibility. During the first six-months of implementing the new

burdensome citizenship documentation requirement, only 16 percent of applications received by NHHK had all documents needed to verify eligibility.<sup>46</sup>

It is important to note that this provision will burden housing agencies and eligibility workers. Based on the experience from implementing citizenship documentation in Medicaid, agencies will spend a significant amount of resources to implement this provision. The GAO found that states reported increased Medicaid administrative costs and needing to spend more time providing help to applicants and beneficiaries, increasing their time spent on applications and redeterminations of eligibility when they implemented the Medicaid citizenship documentation provisions.<sup>47</sup> What's more, Medicaid eligibility determinations were delayed, resulting in large backlogs of applications, either because it is taking time for applicants to obtain the required documents or because eligibility workers are overloaded with the new tasks and paperwork associated with administering the new requirement.<sup>48</sup>

The impact of this proposal on U.S. citizens is profound. Those who are unable to produce the required documents within the required time period under the proposed HUD rule will lose their housing assistance, and many will be evicted from their homes. A significant share could become homeless. The figures above suggest that hundreds of thousands of U.S. citizens could experience these harsh consequences under the proposed rule.

Adding more documentation requirements creates more barriers to housing for those who need it most, and could cause many people who have gained stability through rental assistance to return to homelessness. HUD has failed to take into account the added costs and burdens of these new documentation requirements and should complete an analysis of these costs before finalizing the proposed rule.

## **PROPOSAL IS INCONSISTENT WITH CONGRESSIONAL INTENT**

In the proposed rule, HUD claims to be revising its regulations “into greater alignment with the wording and purpose of Section 214,” namely by barring mixed-status families from receiving assistance. To support its claim, HUD insists that Section 214 prohibits the indefinite receipt of prorated assistance by mixed-status families, but it cannot point to any statutory language containing such an edict. In fact, Section 214 clearly conveys that Congress intended to ensure that individuals with eligible immigration status would receive assistance while keeping mixed status families together in the same home. The plain language of the statute conveys this intent. For example, 42 U.S.C. § 1436a(b)(2) states, “If the eligibility for financial assistance *of at least one member* of a family has been affirmatively established under this section, and *the ineligibility of one or more family members has not been affirmatively* established under this section, any financial assistance made available to that family by the applicable Secretary shall be prorated...” (emphasis added). The law explicitly permits housing authorities to choose not to affirmatively establish ineligibility.<sup>49</sup> Congress did not mince words. “Shall be prorated” does not mean “may be prorated for some period of time.” In mixed status families, HUD must provide prorated assistance.

The legislative history bolsters the straightforward reading of the statute. Section 214 was passed in 1980. In 1988, Congress included a provision by which mixed-status families who had been receiving full subsidy prior to the statute’s passage could avoid family breakup.<sup>50</sup> In its proposed rule, HUD twists that

provision, which provides for temporarily grandfathered assistance, to claim that Congress only intended for prorated assistance to be provided for a limited time. However, Congress added the proration provisions in 1996.<sup>51</sup> Congress has been consistent in attempting to guarantee that scarce federal subsidy would be provided for eligible immigrants and citizens while preserving the integrity of mixed-immigration status families. HUD's interpretation requires ignoring the plain language and the history of the statute. HUD should withdraw its rule because it is in direct conflict with the congressional mandate of Section 214 to provide prorated assistance to mixed status families.

## **PROPOSAL RUNS COUNTER TO ADDRESSING THE WAITLIST CRISIS AND HAS NO LEGITIMATE PURPOSE**

### **Proposal Would Reduce the Number of Families that Receive Federally Subsidized Assistance**

Secretary Carson stated that HUD has promulgated the proposed rule in an effort to address the waitlist crisis for subsidized housing faced by most Public Housing Authorities nationwide.<sup>52</sup> While it is true that there is a public housing and Section 8 waitlist crisis—there are currently 3 million individuals on voucher waitlists around the country, with an additional 6 million that would like to be on these waitlists<sup>53</sup>—the proposed rule would not alleviate and would, instead, worsen this crisis. By HUD's own assessment, the proposed rule will likely lead to a *decrease* in the number of assisted families. According to HUD, if the agency were to replace the 25,000 mixed status families currently receiving HUD assistance with households comprising of members who are all eligible, this transition would cost HUD from \$372 million to \$437 million annually.<sup>54</sup>

To pay for these new costs of the proposed rule,<sup>55</sup> HUD concludes that it would need to reduce the quantity of assisted housing.<sup>56</sup> Therefore, HUD's own economic analysis shows that the proposed rule will not only fail to achieve its stated goals of addressing the subsidized housing waitlist crisis, but will in fact exacerbate this very issue. The Regulatory Impact Analysis released by HUD makes it clear that the proposed rule will not further HUD's mission to "create strong, sustainable, inclusive communities and quality affordable homes for all."<sup>57</sup> In fact, the proposed rule will do the exact opposite, reducing the quantity of affordable homes on the market.

### **Proposal Would Lead to a Reduction in the Quality of Federally Assisted HUD Housing**

It is no secret that public housing conditions are deplorable in many parts of this country.<sup>58</sup> Some tenants are living in units that are riddled with mold, rodents, and are in general states of disrepair as a result of decades of underfunding. Rather than address the quality of housing, HUD has taken the opposite approach under the proposed rule. In the Regulatory Impact Analysis issued by HUD, the agency acknowledged that the proposed rule could create about \$200 million in new costs and hurt public housing by reducing the "maintenance of the units and possibly [leading to] deterioration of the units that could lead to vacancy."<sup>59</sup>

## **PROPOSAL APPEARS TO BE DRIVEN BY THE ADMINISTRATION'S RACIAL ANIMUS**

Given that the proposed rule is costly and does not further HUD's mission, it appears that the main purpose of this rule is simply to cause additional pain and harm to immigrant and mixed-status

households. Since the start of his Presidential bid, Donald Trump has made numerous and frequent statements that explicitly express hostility to immigrants from Latin America, Africa, and the Middle Eastern countries where the majority of people are not white and have low incomes, which are directly relevant to understanding the administration's motivations. Examples include:

- During his first campaign speech, Trump said: “When Mexico sends its people, they’re not sending their best. They’re sending people that have lots of problems. They’re bringing drugs. They’re bringing crime. They’re rapists.”<sup>60</sup>
- In a July 2015 Statement, Trump released a statement against Mexican immigrants, saying: “What can be simpler or more accurately stated? The Mexican Government is forcing their most unwanted people into the United States. They are, in many cases, criminals, drug dealers, rapists, etc.”<sup>61</sup>
- In December 2015, Trump called for a “a total and complete shutdown of Muslims entering the United States,” including refusing to readmit Muslim-American citizens who were outside of the country at the time.<sup>62</sup>
- On June 2, 2016, President Trump told the Wall Street Journal that a federal judge hearing a case about Trump University was biased because of the judge’s Mexican heritage.<sup>63</sup>
- On January 26, 2017, less than a week after taking office, President Trump issued the first of three executive orders banning people from predominantly Muslim countries from entering or reentering the United States. The ban currently affects millions of people, including hundreds of thousands of U.S citizens and permanent residents, who are prevented from reuniting with family members who live in the designated countries.
- In June 2017, Trump said 15,000 recent immigrants from Haiti “all have AIDS” and that 40,000 Nigerians, once seeing the United States, would never “go back to their huts” in Africa.<sup>64</sup>
- On July 26, 2017, President Trump expressed his support for the RAISE Act and promised “to create a new immigration system for America. Instead of today’s low-skill system, just a terrible system where anybody comes in.”<sup>65</sup> However, this bill only received support from three Senators, and was never even heard in committee.<sup>66</sup>
- On January 11, 2018 President Trump complained about “these people from shithole countries” coming to the United States and added that the United States should accept more immigrants from countries like Norway.<sup>67</sup>
- On May 16, 2018, President Trump commented that “[w]e have people coming into the country, or trying to come in. . . . You wouldn't believe how bad these people are. These aren't people, these are animals . . .”<sup>68</sup>
- On October 19, 2018, in response to a question on migrants fleeing violence and grinding poverty in Guatemala, El Salvador and Honduras, the president had these comments: “These are tough, tough people, and I don’t want them, and neither does our country.”<sup>69</sup>
- In a rally in Arizona on October 20, 2018 as well as at other campaign stops, President Trump repeated his claim that immigrants from Latin America are “bad hombres.”<sup>70</sup>

In addition to expressing hostility towards immigrants and people of color, President Trump has frequently displayed friendliness with proud racists and white nationalists. For example, he called some of those who marched alongside white supremacists in Charlottesville, Va., last August “very fine people.” After David Duke, the former leader of the Ku Klux Klan, endorsed him, Trump was reluctant to disavow Duke even when asked directly on television.<sup>71</sup> Trump endorsed and campaigned for Roy Moore, the Alabama Senate candidate who spoke positively about slavery.<sup>72</sup> Trump also pardoned – and praised – Joe Arpaio, the Arizona sheriff sanctioned for racially profiling Latinos and for keeping

immigrants in brutal prison conditions.<sup>73</sup>

It is clear that the proposed rule will have a disproportionate impact on people of color. The proposed rule would deny housing opportunities to thousands of immigrant families, using eligible immigration status as a pretext for discriminating against individuals based on their race and national origin. Overall, of the people in mixed-status families that could lose assistance, approximately 95 percent are people of color, including 85 percent who are Latino, 7 percent who are Black, and 1 percent who are Asian or Pacific Islander.<sup>74</sup> Of the U.S. citizens subject to the proposal's new citizenship documentation requirements, approximately 72 percent are people of color, including 47 percent who are Black, 20 percent who are Hispanic, and 3 percent who are Asian or Pacific Islander.<sup>75</sup>

Despite hard work and many contributions by communities of color to the economy, communities of color continue to face prejudice and discrimination throughout the United States, and many continue to struggle to meet basic needs, including finding a home they can afford. This is not surprising, as there is not a single part of the country where a minimum wage worker working full-time year-round can afford a two-bedroom rental home. When families have access to housing assistance, they have more resources to cover the cost of nutritious foods, health care, and other necessities.<sup>76</sup>

## CONCLUSION

In conclusion, we urge HUD to withdraw the proposed regulation in its entirety. As anti-poverty experts, we believe that the proposed changes will have profound and damaging consequences for the well-being and long-term success of immigrant families, and will also harm the millions of U.S. citizens currently receiving HUD assistance who at risk of homelessness if they are not able to meet new citizenship documentation requirements. We encourage HUD to dedicate its efforts to advancing policies that truly support economic security, self-sufficiency, and a stronger future for the United States by promoting – rather than undermining – the ability of people in low-income households to access one of the most basic human rights – a place to call home.

Further, the proposed rule does not provide the analytical information needed to justify the policy change and to evaluate the proposed rule's likely impacts. Because of the deficiencies in reasoning and analysis, the proposed rule fails to answer basic questions related to the impact of the change and the people whom the proposed rule would affect. All in all, the proposed rule does not contain the information and data necessary to fully evaluate the proposal or to comment on key aspects on the Department's justification for the rule.

Lastly, our comments include citations to supporting research and documents for the benefit of HUD in reviewing our comments. We direct HUD to each of the items cited and made available to the agency through active hyperlinks and as attachments, and we request that these, along with the full text of our comments, be considered part of the formal administrative record on this proposal.

Thank you for the opportunity to submit these comments. Contact Elizabeth Lower-Basch ([elowerbasch@clasp.org](mailto:elowerbasch@clasp.org)) and Renato Rocha ([rrocha@clasp.org](mailto:rrocha@clasp.org)) with any questions.

All sources accessed June 2019.

- <sup>1</sup> *Understanding Trump's Muslim Bans*, National Immigration Law Center (updated March 2019), <https://www.nilc.org/issues/immigration-enforcement/understanding-the-muslim-bans/>; Michael D. Shear and Emily Baumgaertner, "Trump Administration Aims to Sharply Restrict New Green Cards for Those on Public Aid," *The New York Times* (September 2018), <https://www.nytimes.com/2018/09/22/us/politics/immigrants-green-card-public-aid.html>; Dan Lamothe, "Pentagon Will Shift an Additional \$1.5 Billion to Help Fund Trump's Border Wall," *The Washington Post* (May 2019), [https://www.washingtonpost.com/national-security/2019/05/10/pentagon-will-shift-an-additional-billion-help-fund-trumps-border-wall/?utm\\_term=.37360e7cda10](https://www.washingtonpost.com/national-security/2019/05/10/pentagon-will-shift-an-additional-billion-help-fund-trumps-border-wall/?utm_term=.37360e7cda10); Yeganeh Torbati, "Exclusive: Trump Administration Proposal Would Make It Easier to Deport Immigrants Who Use Public Benefits," *Reuters* (May 2019), <https://www.reuters.com/article/us-usa-immigration-benefits-exclusive-idUSKCN1S91UR>.
- <sup>2</sup> HUD, Regulatory Impact Analysis, *Amendments to Further Implement Provisions of the Housing and Community Development Act of 1980*, Docket No. FR-6124-P-01 (Apr. 15, 2019).
- <sup>3</sup> *Chart Book: Economic Security and Health Insurance Programs Reduce Poverty and Provide Access to Needed Care*, Center on Budget and Policy Priorities (updated March 2018), <https://www.cbpp.org/research/poverty-and-inequality/chart-book-accomplishments-of-the-safety-net#part1>.
- <sup>4</sup> Jennifer Hiser, Ellen Morris, Hannah Payne, et al., *Just Cause Eviction: Rapid Health Impact Assessment*, Metropolitan Area Planning Council (n.d.), [http://www.mapc.org/wp-content/uploads/2017/11/HIA\\_Just\\_Cause\\_final.pdf](http://www.mapc.org/wp-content/uploads/2017/11/HIA_Just_Cause_final.pdf).
- <sup>5</sup> Raj Chetty, Nathaniel Hendren, and Lawrence F. Katz, *The Effects of Exposure to Better Neighborhoods on Children: New Evidence from the Moving to Opportunity Experiment*, Harvard University and NBER (August 2015), [http://scholar.harvard.edu/files/hendren/files/mto\\_paper.pdf](http://scholar.harvard.edu/files/hendren/files/mto_paper.pdf).
- <sup>6</sup> Kathryn Bailey, Elizabeth March, Stephanie Ettinger de Cuba, et al., *Overcrowding and Frequent Moves Undermine Children's Health*, Children's HealthWatch (November 2011), [www.issuelab.org/resources/13900/13900.pdf](http://www.issuelab.org/resources/13900/13900.pdf).
- <sup>7</sup> Michelle Wood, Jennifer Turnham, and Gregory Mills, "Housing Affordability and Family Well-Being: Results from the Housing Voucher Evaluation," *Housing Policy Debate* 19 (2008), <https://www.tandfonline.com/doi/abs/10.1080/10511482.2008.9521639>; Janet Currie and Aaron Yelowitz, "Are Public Housing Projects Good for Kids?" *Journal of Public Economics* 75 (2000), [www.yelowitz.com/CurrieYelowitzJPubE2000.pdf](http://www.yelowitz.com/CurrieYelowitzJPubE2000.pdf); Will Fischer, *Research Shows Housing Vouchers Reduce Hardship and Provide Platform for Long-term Gains Among Children*, Center on Budget and Policy Priorities (October 2015), [www.cbpp.org/sites/default/files/atoms/files/3-10-14hou.pdf](http://www.cbpp.org/sites/default/files/atoms/files/3-10-14hou.pdf).
- <sup>8</sup> Barbara Sard and Douglas Rice, *Realizing the Housing Voucher Program's Potential to Enable Families to Move to Better Neighborhoods*, Center on Budget and Policy Priorities (January 2016), <https://www.cbpp.org/research/housing/realizing-the-housing-voucher-programs-potential-to-enable-families-to-move-to>.
- <sup>9</sup> Aletha C. Huston, "U.S. Commentary: Effects of Housing Subsidies on the Well-Being of Children and Their Families in the Family Options Study," *Cityscape: A Journal of Policy Development and Research* 19 (2017), <https://www.huduser.gov/portal/periodicals/cityscape/vol19num3/ch15.pdf>.
- <sup>10</sup> Heather Sandstrom and Sandra Huerta, *The Negative Effects of Instability on Child Development: A Research Synthesis*, Urban Institute, 2013, <https://www.urban.org/sites/default/files/publication/32706/412899-The-Negative-Effects-ofInstability-on-Child-Development-A-Research-Synthesis.PDF>
- <sup>11</sup> Diana Becker Cutts, Alan F. Meyers, Maureen M. Black, et al., "US Housing Insecurity and the Health of Very Young Children," *Am J Public Health* 101 (2018), <https://www.ncbi.nlm.nih.gov/pmc/articles/PMC3134514/>.
- <sup>12</sup> Diana B. Cutts, Sharon Coleman, Maureen M. Black, et al., "Homelessness During Pregnancy: A Unique, Time-Dependent Risk Factor of Birth Outcomes," *Maternal and Child Health Journal* 19 (2015), <https://link.springer.com/article/10.1007%2Fs10995-014-1633-6>; Bianca V. Carrion, Valerie A. Earnshaw, Trace Kershaw, et al., "Housing Instability and Birth Weight among Young Urban Mothers," *J Urban Health* 92 (2015), <https://www.ncbi.nlm.nih.gov/pmc/articles/PMC4338127/>.
- <sup>13</sup> Kathleen M. Ziol-Guest, Claire C. McKenna, "Early Childhood Housing Instability and School Readiness," *Child Development* 85 (2014), <https://onlinelibrary.wiley.com/doi/abs/10.1111/cdev.12105>.
- <sup>14</sup> Megan Sandel, Richard Sheward, Stephanie Ettinger de Cuba, et al., "Unstable Housing and Caregiver and Child Health in Renter Families," *American Academy of Pediatrics* 141 (2018), [https://www.researchgate.net/profile/Mariana\\_Chilton/publication/322642849\\_Unstable\\_Housing\\_and\\_Caregiver\\_and\\_Child\\_Health\\_in\\_Renter\\_Families](https://www.researchgate.net/profile/Mariana_Chilton/publication/322642849_Unstable_Housing_and_Caregiver_and_Child_Health_in_Renter_Families).
- <sup>15</sup> Mai Abdul Rahman, "The Demographic Profile of Black Homeless High School Students Residing in the District of Columbia

Shelters and the Factors that Influence their Education” 55 (March 2014), <https://pqdtopen.proquest.com/doc/1620832476.html?FMT=ABS>.

<sup>16</sup> Lauren Taylor “Housing and Health: An Overview of the Literature” Health Affairs, June 2018 <https://www.healthaffairs.org/doi/10.1377/hpb20180313.396577/full/>.

<sup>17</sup> Joint Center for Housing Studies of Harvard University “The State of the Nation’s Housing” 2017 [http://www.jchs.harvard.edu/sites/default/files/harvard\\_jchs\\_state\\_of\\_the\\_nations\\_housing\\_2017.pdf](http://www.jchs.harvard.edu/sites/default/files/harvard_jchs_state_of_the_nations_housing_2017.pdf).

<sup>18</sup> Enterprise and LISC “Affordable Housing for Families and Neighborhoods: The Value of Low-Income housing Tax Credits in New York City” 2010 <https://www.enterprisecommunity.org/download?fid=8099&nid=3831>.

<sup>19</sup> Laura C. N. Wood, *Impact of Punitive Immigration Policies, Parent-Child Separation and Child Detention on the Mental Health and Development of Children*, 2 *BMJ Paediatrics Open* (2018), <https://www.ncbi.nlm.nih.gov/pmc/articles/PMC6173255/>.

<sup>20</sup> HUD, Regulatory Impact Analysis, *Amendments to Further Implement Provisions of the Housing and Community Development Act of 1980*, Docket No. FR-6124-P-01, at 7 (Apr. 15, 2019).

<sup>21</sup> *Ibid.*, 8.

<sup>22</sup> *Confronting the Housing Squeeze: Challenges Facing Immigrant Tenants, and What New York Can Do*, Pratt Center for Community Development (2018), <https://prattcenter.net/research/confronting-housing-squeeze-challenges-facing-immigrant-tenants-and-what-new-york-can-do>.

<sup>23</sup> Megan Sandel, Richard Sheward, Stephanie Ettinger, et al., “Unstable Housing and Caregiver and Child Health in Renter Families,” 141 *Pediatrics* 1 (2018), <http://pediatrics.aappublications.org/content/141/2/e20172199>.

<sup>24</sup> Mike Nicholson “Proposed HUD Rule Would Bar Vulnerable Children from Subsidized Housing” Center for Migration Studies, June 2019 <https://cmsny.org/nicholson-62619/>.

<sup>25</sup> 42 U.S.C.A. § 1436a(a)(1)-(6) (West 2019), <https://www.law.cornell.edu/uscode/text/42/1436a>. (Noncitizens eligible for Section 214 housing programs: Lawful Permanent Residents, VAWA Self-Petitioners, Asylees and Refugees, Parolees, Persons Granted Withholding of Removal/Deportation, Qualified Victims of Trafficking, Persons granted admission for emergent or public interest reasons, Persons granted lawful temporary residence amnesty under the Immigration Reform and Control Act of 1986, Immigrants eligible for registry who entered the U.S. before June 30, 1948, Lawful U.S. residents and individuals who entered the U.S. under the Compacts of Free Association with the Marshall Islands, Micronesia, Palau and Guam Immigrants admitted for lawful temporary residence prior to January 1, 1982).

<sup>26</sup> See HUD, Regulatory Impact Analysis, *Amendments to Further Implement Provisions of the Housing and Community Development Act of 1980*, Docket No. FR-6124-P-01, at 6-8 (Apr. 15, 2019) (73% of eligible family members are children and there are a total of 76,141 eligible individuals in the covered programs, for a total of 55,582 eligible children; 70% of households are composed of eligible children with ineligible parents, for a total of 38,907 eligible children in households with ineligible parents).

<sup>27</sup> Center on Budget and Policy Priorities analysis of HUD administrative data found online: <https://www.nhlp.org/wp-content/uploads/KeepFamiliesTogether-Webinar-06052019.pdf>.

<sup>28</sup> Krista M. Pereira, Robert Crosnoe, Karina Fortuny, et al., *Barriers to Immigrants’ Access to Health and Human Services Programs*, U.S. Department of Health and Human Services (May 2012), <https://aspe.hhs.gov/system/files/pdf/76471/rb.pdf>.

<sup>29</sup> Neeraj Kaushal and Robert Kaestner, “Welfare Reform and Health Insurance of Immigrants,” *Health Services Research* 40 (2005), [https://www.ncbi.nlm.nih.gov/pmc/articles/PMC1361164/pdf/hesr\\_00381.pdf](https://www.ncbi.nlm.nih.gov/pmc/articles/PMC1361164/pdf/hesr_00381.pdf); Namratha R. Kandula, Colleen M. Grogan, Paul J. Rathouz, et al., *The Unintended Impact of Welfare Reform on the Medicaid Enrollment of Eligible Immigrants* (August 2004), <https://onlinelibrary.wiley.com/doi/abs/10.1111/j.1475-6773.2004.00301.x>; Rachel Benson Gold, “Immigrants and Medicaid After Welfare Reform,” *Guttmacher Report on Public Policy* 6.2 (2003), [https://www.guttmacher.org/sites/default/files/article\\_files/gr060206.pdf](https://www.guttmacher.org/sites/default/files/article_files/gr060206.pdf).

<sup>30</sup> Jennifer Laird, Neeraj Kaushal, Jane Waldfogel, et al., *Foregoing Food Assistance Out of Fear Changes to “Public Charge” Rule May Put 500,000 More U.S. Citizen Children at Risk of Moving into Poverty*, Columbia Population Research Center (April 2018), [https://static1.squarespace.com/static/5743308460b5e922a25a6dc7/t/5af1a2b28a922db742154bbe/1525785266892/Poverty+and+Social+Policy+Brief\\_2\\_2.pdf](https://static1.squarespace.com/static/5743308460b5e922a25a6dc7/t/5af1a2b28a922db742154bbe/1525785266892/Poverty+and+Social+Policy+Brief_2_2.pdf).

<sup>31</sup> “Study: Following 10-year gains, SNAP Participation Among Immigrant Families dropped in 2018,” American Public Health Association (November 2018), <https://www.apha.org/news-and-media/news-releases/apha-news-releases/2018/annual-meeting-snap-participation>.

- <sup>32</sup> Hannah Matthews, Rebecca Ullrich, and Wendy Cervantes, *Immigration Policy's Harmful Impacts on Early Care and Education*, Center for Law and Social Policy (March 2018), [https://www.clasp.org/sites/default/files/publications/2018/03/2018\\_harmfulimpactsece.pdf](https://www.clasp.org/sites/default/files/publications/2018/03/2018_harmfulimpactsece.pdf).
- <sup>33</sup> Samantha Artiga and Petry Ubri, *Living in an Immigrant Family in America: How Fear and Toxic Stress are Affecting Daily Life, Well-Being, & Health*, Kaiser Family Foundation (December 2017), <https://www.kff.org/disparities-policy/issue-brief/living-in-an-immigrant-family-in-america-how-fear-and-toxic-stress-are-affecting-daily-life-well-being-health/>.
- <sup>34</sup> "California Children in Immigrant Families: The Health Provider Perspective," The Children's Partnership, <https://www.childrenspartnership.org/wp-content/uploads/2018/03/Provider-Survey-Infographic-.pdf>.
- <sup>35</sup> Hamutal Bernstein, Dulce Gonzalez, Michael Karpman, et al., *One in Seven Adults in Immigrant Families Reported Avoiding Public Benefit Programs in 2018*, Urban Institute (May 2019), <https://www.urban.org/research/publication/one-seven-adults-immigrant-families-reported-avoiding-public-benefit-programs-2018>.
- <sup>36</sup> Wendy Cervantes, Rebecca Ullrich, and Hannah Matthews, *Our Children's Fear: Immigration Policy's Effects on Young Children*, Center for Law and Social Policy (March 2018), <https://www.clasp.org/publications/report/brief/our-childrens-fear-immigration-policys-effects-young-children>.
- <sup>37</sup> Housing and Community Development Act of 1980: Verification of Eligible Status, 84 Fed. Reg. 20,589, 20,592 (proposed May 2019) (to be codified at 24 C.F.R. part 5), <https://www.federalregister.gov/documents/2019/05/10/2019-09566/housing-and-community-development-act-of-1980-verification-of-eligible-status>; Donna Cohen Ross, *New Medicaid Citizenship Documentation requirement is Taking a Toll: States Report Enrollment Is Down and Administrative Costs Are Up*, Center on Budget and Policy Priorities (March 2007), <https://www.cbpp.org/research/new-medicaid-citizenship-documentation-requirement-is-taking-a-toll-states-report>.
- <sup>38</sup> *Citizens Without Proof: A Survey of Americans' Possession of Documentary Proof of Citizenship and Photo Identification*, Brennan Center for Justice (November 2006), [http://www.brennancenter.org/sites/default/files/legacy/d/download\\_file\\_39242.pdf](http://www.brennancenter.org/sites/default/files/legacy/d/download_file_39242.pdf).
- <sup>39</sup> Ina Jafe, "For Older Voters, Getting the Right ID Can Be Especially Tough," National Public Radio: All Things Considered (September 2018), <https://www.npr.org/2018/09/07/644648955/for-older-voters-getting-the-right-id-can-be-especially-tough>.
- <sup>40</sup> "Citizenship Documentation Requirement," Kaiser Family Foundation (March 2007), <https://kff.org/wp-content/uploads/2013/01/7533-02.pdf>.
- <sup>41</sup> *Photo Identification Barriers Faced by Homeless Persons: The Impact of September 11*, National Law Center on Homelessness & Poverty (April 2004), [https://nlchp.org/wp-content/uploads/2018/10/ID\\_Barriers.pdf](https://nlchp.org/wp-content/uploads/2018/10/ID_Barriers.pdf).
- <sup>42</sup> *Ibid.*, 32.
- <sup>43</sup> *Medicaid: States Reported That Citizenship Documentation Requirement Resulted in Enrollment Declines for Eligible Citizens and Posed Administrative Burdens* (June 2007), <https://www.gao.gov/new.items/d07889.pdf>.
- <sup>44</sup> *Ibid.*
- <sup>45</sup> Brigit Hatch, Jennifer DeVoe, Jodi Lapidus, et al., *Citizenship Documentation Requirement for Medicaid Eligibility: Effects on Children*, Family Medicine (April, 2014), <https://www.ncbi.nlm.nih.gov/pubmed/24788422>.
- <sup>46</sup> Tricia Brooks, "Why is NH Proposing to Replace Proven Electronic Citizenship Verification with Burdensome Medicaid Paperwork Requirements?," *Georgetown University Health Policy Institute Center for Children and Families* (June 2018), <https://ccf.georgetown.edu/2018/06/28/why-is-nh-proposing-to-replace-proven-electronic-citizenship-verification-with-burdensome-medicaid-paperwork-requirements/>.
- <sup>47</sup> *Ibid.*, 38.
- <sup>48</sup> Donna Cohen Ross, *New Medicaid Citizenship Documentation requirement is Taking a Toll: States Report Enrollment Is Down and Administrative Costs Are Up*, Center on Budget and Policy Priorities (March 2007), <https://www.cbpp.org/research/new-medicaid-citizenship-documentation-requirement-is-taking-a-toll-states-report>.
- <sup>49</sup> 42 U.S.C. § 1436a(i)(2)(A), <https://www.law.cornell.edu/uscode/text/42/1436a>.
- <sup>50</sup> Housing and Community Development Act of 1987, Pub. L. No. 100-242, § 164, 101 Stat. 1815, <https://www.govinfo.gov/content/pkg/STATUTE-101/pdf/STATUTE-101-Pg1815.pdf>.
- <sup>51</sup> Use of Assisted Housing by Aliens Act of 1996, Pub. L. No. 104-208, § 572, 110 Stat. 3009, <https://www.govinfo.gov/content/pkg/PLAW-104publ208/pdf/PLAW-104publ208.pdf>.
- <sup>52</sup> Tracy Jan, "Trump Proposal Would Evict Undocumented Immigrants From Public Housing," Washington Post (April 2019), [https://www.washingtonpost.com/business/2019/04/18/trump-proposal-would-evict-undocumented-immigrants-public-housing/?utm\\_term=.f68fec836d53](https://www.washingtonpost.com/business/2019/04/18/trump-proposal-would-evict-undocumented-immigrants-public-housing/?utm_term=.f68fec836d53).

- <sup>53</sup> Alicia Mazzara, "Housing Vouchers Work: Huge Demand, Insufficient Funding for Housing Vouchers Means Long Waits," *Center on Budget and Policy Priorities* (April 2017), <https://www.cbpp.org/blog/housing-vouchers-work-huge-demand-insufficient-funding-for-housing-vouchers-means-long-waits>.
- <sup>54</sup> HUD, Regulatory Impact Analysis, *Amendments to Further Implement Provisions of the Housing and Community Development Act of 1980*, Docket No. FR-6124-P-01, at 11 (Apr. 15, 2019).
- <sup>55</sup> Braktkon Booker, *White House Budget Calls for Deep Cuts to HUD*, National Public Radio (February 2018), <https://www.npr.org/2018/02/13/585255697/white-house-budget-calls-for-deep-cuts-to-hud>.
- <sup>56</sup> HUD, Regulatory Impact Analysis, *Amendments to Further Implement Provisions of the Housing and Community Development Act of 1980*, Docket No. FR-6124-P-01, at 3 (Apr. 15, 2019) (emphasis added).
- <sup>57</sup> "Mission," U.S. Department of Housing and Urban Development (n.d.), <https://www.hud.gov/about/mission>.
- <sup>58</sup> Luis Ferre-Sadurni, "New York City's Public Housing Is in Crisis. Will Washington Take Control?," *The New York Times*, (December 2018), <https://www.nytimes.com/2018/12/25/nyregion/nycha-hud-deblasio-carson.html>; Jill Ripenhoff and Lee Zurik, *Failure to Fix: Mold. Mice. Messes.*, Investigate TV (2018), <http://www.investigatetv.com/failure-to-fix-mold-mice-messes/>; Holbrook Mohr and Jeff Donn, "Health and Safety Conditions Worsen in U.S. Subsidized Housing," *Seattle Times* (April 2019), <https://www.seattletimes.com/business/inspections-show-deterioration-of-us-funded-housing-for-poor/>.
- <sup>59</sup> HUD, Regulatory Impact Analysis, *Amendments to Further Implement Provisions of the Housing and Community Development Act of 1980*, Docket No. FR-6124-P-01, at 3 (Apr. 15, 2019).
- <sup>60</sup> Washington Post Staff, "Full text: Donald Trump announces a presidential bid," *The Washington Post*, (June 16, 2015.), [https://www.washingtonpost.com/news/post-politics/wp/2015/06/16/full-text-donald-trump-announces-a-presidential-bid/?utm\\_term=.c35512e917ef](https://www.washingtonpost.com/news/post-politics/wp/2015/06/16/full-text-donald-trump-announces-a-presidential-bid/?utm_term=.c35512e917ef).
- <sup>61</sup> Hunter Walker, "Donald Trump just released an epic statement raging against Mexican immigrants and 'disease,'" *Business Insider*, (July 6, 2015.), <https://www.businessinsider.com/donald-trumps-epic-statement-on-mexico-2015-7#ixzz3fF897EIH>.
- <sup>62</sup> Tessa Berenson, "Donald Trump Calls For 'Complete Shutdown' of Muslim Entry to U.S.," *Time Magazine*, (December 7, 2015.), <http://time.com/4139476/donald-trump-shutdown-muslim-immigration/>.
- <sup>63</sup> Brent Kendall, "Trump Says Judge's Mexican Heritage Presents 'Absolute Conflict,'" *The Wall Street Journal*, (June 3, 2016.), <https://www.wsj.com/articles/donald-trump-keeps-up-attacks-on-judge-gonzalo-curiel-1464911442>.
- <sup>64</sup> Michael D. Shear & Julie Hirschfeld Davis, "Stoking Fears, Trump Defied Bureaucracy to Advance Immigration Agenda," *The New York Times*, (December 23, 2017.), <https://www.nytimes.com/2017/12/23/us/politics/trump-immigration.html>.
- <sup>65</sup> *President Donald J. Trump Backs RAISE Act*, The White House, (August 2, 2017, <https://www.whitehouse.gov/briefings-statements/president-donald-j-trump-backs-raise-act/>), <https://www.whitehouse.gov/briefings-statements/president-donald-j-trump-backs-raise-act/>.
- <sup>66</sup> S.1720 - RAISE Act, U.S. United States Congress, (August 2, 2017, ), <https://www.congress.gov/bill/115th-congress/senate-bill/1720>; <https://www.congress.gov/bill/115th-congress/senate-bill/1720>.
- <sup>67</sup> Josh Dawsey, "Trump derides protections for immigrants from 'shithole' countries," January 12, 2018, *The Washington Post*, (January 2018), [https://www.washingtonpost.com/politics/trump-attacks-protections-for-immigrants-from-shithole-countries-in-oval-office-meeting/2018/01/11/bfc0725c-f711-11e7-91af-31ac729add94\\_story.html?utm\\_term=.7fc895490993](https://www.washingtonpost.com/politics/trump-attacks-protections-for-immigrants-from-shithole-countries-in-oval-office-meeting/2018/01/11/bfc0725c-f711-11e7-91af-31ac729add94_story.html?utm_term=.7fc895490993).
- <sup>68</sup> "Remarks by President Trump at a California Sanctuary State Roundtable,," *The White House*, (May 16, 2018, ), <https://www.whitehouse.gov/briefings-statements/remarks-president-trump-california-sanctuary-state-roundtable/>.
- <sup>69</sup> Emily Cochrane, "Playing Up Support Among Hispanic Voters, Trump Takes Aim at Immigration Laws,," *The New York Times* (October 20, 2018), <https://www.nytimes.com/2018/10/20/us/politics/trump-arizona-rally-immigration.html>.
- <sup>70</sup> Emily Cochrane, "Playing Up Support Among Hispanic Voters, Trump Takes Aim at Immigration Laws," *New York Times* (October 20, 2018), <https://www.nytimes.com/2018/10/20/us/politics/trump-arizona-rally-immigration.html>. Ibid.
- <sup>71</sup> Glenn Kessler, "Donald Trump and David Duke: For the record," *The Washington Post*, (March 1, 2016, [https://www.washingtonpost.com/news/fact-checker/wp/2016/03/01/donald-trump-and-david-duke-for-the-record/?utm\\_term=.7126e49478f7](https://www.washingtonpost.com/news/fact-checker/wp/2016/03/01/donald-trump-and-david-duke-for-the-record/?utm_term=.7126e49478f7)), [https://www.washingtonpost.com/news/fact-checker/wp/2016/03/01/donald-trump-and-david-duke-for-the-record/?utm\\_term=.7126e49478f7](https://www.washingtonpost.com/news/fact-checker/wp/2016/03/01/donald-trump-and-david-duke-for-the-record/?utm_term=.7126e49478f7).
- <sup>72</sup> German Lopez, "Roy Moore was once again caught making remarks that can be interpreted as okay with slavery," *Vox*, (December 11, 2017, ), <https://www.vox.com/identities/2017/12/11/16761348/roy-moore-racism-sexism>.
- <sup>73</sup> Kevin Liptak, Daniella Diaz, and Sophie Tatum, "Trump pardons former Sheriff Joe Arpaio," *CNN*, (August 27, 2017, ), <https://www.cnn.com/2017/08/25/politics/sheriff-joe-arpaiio-donald-trump-pardon/index.html>.

<sup>74</sup> Alicia Mazzara “Demographic Data Highlight Potential Harm of New Trump Proposal to Restrict Housing Assistance” Center on Budget and Policy Priorities, July 2019 <https://www.cbpp.org/research/housing/demographic-data-highlight-potential-harm-of-new-trump-proposal-to-restrict-housing>.

<sup>75</sup> Ibid.

<sup>76</sup> Nabihah Maqbool, Janet Viveiros, and Mindy Ault, *The Impacts of Affordable Housing on Health: A Research Summary*, Center for Housing Policy, 2015, [http://www.housingpartners.com/assets/creating\\_change/http\\_\\_\\_app.brnto.pdf](http://www.housingpartners.com/assets/creating_change/http___app.brnto.pdf).