

Intel Corporation
Human Resources
Mail Stop RNB4-126
2200 Mission College Blvd.
Santa Clara, CA 95054
408-765-4756
408-765-6284 - fax



VIA EMAIL ONLY (oir_submission@omb.eop.gov)

United States Citizenship and Immigration Services
Office of Policy and Strategy
Regulatory Coordination Division
20 Massachusetts Avenue, N.W.
Washington, DC 20529-2140

Re: OMB Control Number 1615-0023. Agency Information Collection Activities: Application To Register Permanent Residence or Adjust Status, Form I- 485 Supplement A, and Instruction Booklet for Filing Form I- 485 and Supplement A, Form I- 485; Revision of a Currently Approved Collection, published at 80 Fed. Reg. 36829-36830 (June 26, 2015)

Dear Sir or Madam:

Thank you for the opportunity to submit comments regarding USCIS's suggested changes to Form I-485 and accompanying instructions. Intel appreciates the deep thought and planning that went into these extensive documents and applauds the Agency's commitment to continuous improvement in its forms, processes and communications.

While Intel will not comment on the numerous specific changes to the form, the Company has some overarching observations regarding this work. It is clear that the Agency sought to meticulously outline every possible scenario that might present itself in an adjustment of status application. While this level of detail would be appropriate for an adjudicator's field manual on adjustment of status, it is overwhelming to the applicant who must complete it, even with the detailed and well-thought out instructions.

First, increasing the length of the form fourfold is excessive, unnecessary for the adjudicator to properly assess the application, and overly burdensome to applicants. For example, several additional questions regarding the spouse, former spouses and children were added. These questions, which appear to be designed for family-based applicants or to detect marriage fraud, are not relevant to all adjustment of status applicants and therefore are excessive. One category of applicants for whom these questions are irrelevant are employment based applicants who are applying without derivative beneficiaries. Even in the context of family-based applicants, since copies of the marriage and divorce certificates are already presented as part of the application, it is unclear how adding these questions adds any value to the current process.

Another example is that the inadmissibility questions grew from one to four pages. Numerous added questions probe very deeply into specific grounds of excludability which do not apply to the majority of

An Equal Opportunity Employer

applicants. For example, it is unnecessary to ask several questions around the same criminal excludability ground. When a criminal "hit" occurs, adjudicating officers can more effectively target detailed and specific follow-up questions to the applicant through a Request for Evidence and at an interview.

Second, some questions call for a legal conclusion as opposed to merely gathering facts. It is the proper role of the adjudicating officer to review the facts and determine how those facts bear on eligibility to adjust status. It is inappropriate to ask an applicant for a legal conclusion which they are not competent to provide. Immigration law is complex and constantly evolving. Even the existing question which asks whether the applicant has violated the terms and conditions of his nonimmigrant status is ambiguous and best answered after consulting with an immigration attorney. There is a risk that applicants will answer these questions incorrectly, even with the aid of the instructions. It is more appropriate for the adjudicating officer to rely on questions that elicit specific facts that are properly within the applicants scope of knowledge (*e.g.*, "Have you EVER worked in the United States without authorization?") and to review the evidence presented (*e.g.*, compare work history provided against the status documents), rather than ask the applicant to make a legal conclusion about their activities.

Finally, some questions elicit information which is irrelevant to the merits of the application. For example, biographic information is not relevant to an applicant's eligibility for permanent residency. While numerous ethnicities exist, the form merely inquires whether the applicant is of Hispanic or Latino ethnicity or not. Photos required by the current application already reveal the applicant's eye and hair color, so it is redundant to request that again. While height and weight are not required fields, it is unclear how this is relevant to eligibility. If somehow relevant, this information might be more appropriately recorded by a USCIS designated physician on the medical examination form.

In conclusion, Intel sincerely applauds USCIS's initiative to improve its forms, and encourages the Agency to continue in this valuable endeavor. We only hope that the focus will turn to eliminating redundancies in information requested and finding ways to elicit information that does not require the applicant to state a legal conclusion. We would like to challenge USCIS to improve the form in a way that simultaneously decreases the size and burden of the application. We believe that is possible and that there are highly talented and experienced USCIS officers who are capable of achieving this.

Thank you for the opportunity to provide comments.

Sincerely yours,

A handwritten signature in black ink that reads "Margie Jones". The signature is written in a cursive, flowing style.

Margie Jones
U.S. Immigration Operations Manager