

## The Trump Administration’s Public Charge Proposal Could Impact 6.8 Million People in the Golden State

The Trump Administration is proposing radical changes to the “public charge” rule that would make it more difficult for immigrants to obtain a green card if they use any of a wide range of public benefits. If finalized, the proposed “public charge” rule would result in declines in immigrant families’ access to the basics we all need to survive. The proposal would make—and has already made—immigrant families afraid to seek programs that help them stay strong and productive and raise children who thrive.

By threatening immigration status when immigrants use programs to meet their family’s basic needs, the proposal would make immigrant families in California afraid to access programs—like health care and food assistance—that support essential needs. This fact sheet describes the potentially impacted population in the Golden State, including several counties facing the greatest impact.



### CALIFORNIA

Approximately **6.8 million people**, including **2.4 million children**, may be impacted.




### NATIONWIDE

Approximately **26 million people**, including **9.2 million children**, may be impacted.

### CALIFORNIA COUNTIES FACING THE GREATEST IMPACT

County	Total Population	Estimated Number of Potentially Impacted	Estimated Share of County Population
Los Angeles	10,057,000	2,369,000	24%
Orange	3,132,000	568,000	18%
San Diego	3,253,000	473,000	15%
Riverside	2,324,000	415,000	18%
San Bernardino	2,107,000	372,000	18%

Source: 2012-2016 5-Year American Community Survey Public Use Microdata Sample (ACS/PUMS); 2012-2016 5-Year American Community Survey (ACS) estimates accessed via American FactFinder. Custom Tabulations by Manatt Health, 9/30/2018., <https://www.manatt.com/Insights/Articles/2018/Public-Charge-Rule-Potentially-Chilled-Population>. Calculation of potentially chilled population based on families with at least one non-citizen and earned income under 250% of the federal poverty line.



**The public charge proposal will make communities sicker.**

**Families' fear to participate in Medicaid** could result in coverage losses throughout California, **decreased access to care, and worse health outcomes** for the entire family, including U.S. citizen children.

For financially vulnerable health care providers, Medicaid is an indispensable funding source for hospitals and clinics. **Losing Medicaid coverage would negatively impact the health outcomes of immigrant families.** It would also harm the financial security of hospitals and local economies.

---

## **The proposed public charge rule will increase hunger.**

**Decreased participation** among California immigrant families in food assistance could lead to higher levels of poverty and food insecurity.

For farmers and local economies, **reduced food assistance may reduce the well-documented positive economic impacts of programs** that help households purchase produce from businesses of all types and sizes.



---

## **California is fighting back.**

**If we want our communities to thrive, every family must be able to stay together and receive the care, services, and support they need to remain healthy and productive.** Federal law requires the Administration to consider public comments on the rule's impact, and leading California advocates and human services providers in our state joined thousands more nationwide to speak out. The public comment period ended on December 10, 2018 with more than **250,000 public comments submitted** - the vast majority in opposition.

After the Administration considers public comments received on the proposed rule, the Administration will likely issue a final public charge rule. Any changes cannot take effect until **at least 60 days** after the date the final rule is published. **In the meantime, and until a final rule is in effect, USCIS will continue to apply the current public charge policy.**

**To fight back, visit [ProtectingImmigrantFamilies.org](https://ProtectingImmigrantFamilies.org).** For more information, contact Renato Rocha ([rrocha@clasp.org](mailto:rrocha@clasp.org)) or David Kallick ([ddkallick@fiscalpolicy.org](mailto:ddkallick@fiscalpolicy.org)).