Nos. 19-15072, 19-15118, and 19-15150

United States Court of Appeals for the Ninth Circuit

STATE OF CALIFORNIA, et al.,

Plaintiffs-Appellees

v.

U.S. DEPARTMENT OF HEALTH AND HUMAN SERVICES, et al.,

Defendants-Appellants

On Appeal from the United States District Court for the
Northern District of California

Case 4:17-cv-05783-HSG

BRIEF OF *AMICI CURIAE* THE NATIONAL WOMEN'S LAW CENTER, THE NATIONAL LATINA INSTITUTE FOR REPRODUCTIVE HEALTH, SISTERLOVE, INC., AND THE NATIONAL ASIAN PACIFIC AMERICAN WOMEN'S FORUM IN SUPPORT OF PLAINTIFFS-APPELLEES AND AFFIRMANCE

Fatima Goss Graves
Gretchen Borchelt
Michelle Banker
Sunu Chandy
NATIONAL WOMEN'S LAW CENTER
11 Dupont Circle NW, Suite 800
Washington, DC 20036

Jane Liu
NATIONAL ASIAN PACIFIC AMERICAN WOMEN'S FORUM
1730 Rhode Island Ave, NW
Suite 210
Washington, DC 20036

Sequoia Ayala
Jill Heaviside
SISTERLOVE, INC.
P.O. Box 10558
Atlanta, GA 30310-1731

Jeffrey Blumenfeld
LOWENSTEIN SANDLER LLP
2200 Pennsylvania Avenue, NW
Washington, DC 20037
Telephone: (202) 753-3810
Fax: (212) 262-7402
jblumenfeld@lowenstein.com

Naomi D. Barrowclough
LOWENSTEIN SANDLER LLP
One Lowenstein Drive
Roseland, NJ 07068
Telephone: (973) 422-6446
Fax: (973) 422-6447
nbarrowclough@lowenstein.com

(*Amici appreciate the assistance of Nina Serrianne at the National Latina Institute for Reproductive Health for her role in the preparation of this brief*)

CORPORATE DISCLOSURE STATEMENT
(Rule 26.1)

Pursuant to Federal Rules of Appellate Procedure 26.1(a) and 29(a)(4)(A), Amici Curiae make the following corporate disclosure statement:

The National Women's Law Center, the National Latina Institute for Reproductive Health, SisterLove, Inc., the National Asian Pacific American Women's Forum, and the 49 other Amici listed in the Appendix are non-profit public interest organizations and projects, none of which has corporate parents or stockholders.

TABLE OF CONTENTS

Page

TABLE OF AUTHORITIES iii

INTEREST AND IDENTITY OF AMICI CURIAE 1

INTRODUCTION AND SUMMARY OF ARGUMENT 1

STANDARD OF REVIEW 5, 6

ARGUMENT 6

I. THE DEPARTMENTS UNDERESTIMATE AND MINIMIZE THE HARM THE FINAL RULES WILL CAUSE. 6

A. The Departments Fail To Account For The Impact Of The Rules On Those With Limited Resources. 7

B. The Departments Significantly Underestimate The Number Of Women Who Will Be Harmed By The Final Rules. 11

II. THE RULES WILL HARM THOSE WHO LOSE COVERAGE BY REINSTATING PRE-ACA COST AND OTHER BARRIERS TO CONTRACEPTION. 14

A. The Rules Will Make Contraception Cost-Prohibitive for Many People. 14

B. The Rules Will Create Logistical, Administrative, and Informational Barriers to Contraception. 19

III. THE RULES WILL HARM THE HEALTH, AUTONOMY, AND ECONOMIC SECURITY OF THOSE WHO LOSE CONTRACEPTIVE COVERAGE...20

A. The Rules Will Harm The Health of Individuals And Families 20

1. The Rules Place More People At Risk For Unintended Pregnacy And Associated Health Risks..................................21

2. The Rules Will Undermine Health Benefits From Contraception. 24

B. The Rules Will Undermine Individuals' Autonomy And Control Over Their Reproductive And Personal Lives. 25

C. The Rules Undermine Individuals' Economic Security. 28

1. Access to Contraception Provides Life-Long Economic Benefits To Women, Families, And Society. 28

2. The Rules Will Exacerbate Economic And Social Disparities By Impeding Access to Contraception. 30

CONCLUSION 31

TABLE OF AUTHORITIES

CASES **PAGES**

Alfred L. Snapp & Son, Inc. v. Puerto Rico, ex rel., Barez,
458 U.S. 592 (1982)....................6

Buck v. Bell,
274 U.S. 200 (1927)....................26

Farris v. Seabrook,
677 F.3d 858 (9th Cir. 2012)....................5

Griswold v. Connecticut,
381 U.S. 479 (1965)....................25

Herb Reed Enters., LLC v. Fla. Entm't Mgmt., Inc.,
736 F.3d 1239 (9th Cir. 2013)....................5, 6

Pennsylvania v. Trump,
281 F. Supp. 3d 553 (E.D. Pa. 2017)....................12

Planned Parenthood of Se. Pa. v. Casey,
505 U.S. 833 (1992)....................25

STATUTES

8 U.S.C. § 1613(a)....................10

42 U.S.C. § 300a-4(c)(2)....................9

42 U.S.C. § 300gg-13(a)(4)....................2, 3

42 U.S.C. § 1396a(a)(10)(A)(i)(VIII)....................9

REGULATIONS

42 C.F.R. § 59.2....................9

42 C.F.R. § 59.5....................9

77 Fed. Reg. 8,725 (Feb. 15, 2012)....................3, 30

83 Fed. Reg. 57,536 (Nov. 15, 2018)....................passim

83 Fed. Reg. 57,592 (Nov. 15, 2018) ....passim

84 Fed. Reg. 7714 (Mar. 4, 2019)..10

OTHER AUTHORITIES

155 Cong. Rec. S12,021 (daily ed. Dec. 1, 2009) 3

155 Cong. Rec. S12,033 (daily ed. Dec. 1, 2009) 3

A. Law et al., *Are Women Benefiting from the Affordable Care Act? A Real-World Evaluation of the Impact of the Affordable Care Act on Out-of-Pocket Costs for Contraceptives*, 93 Contraception 392 (2016)..17

Adam Sonfield, *The Case for Insurance Coverage of Contraceptive Services and Supplies Without Cost-Sharing*, 14 Guttmacher Pol'y Rev. 7 (2011) 15, 24

Adam Sonfield et al., Guttmacher Inst., *Moving Forward: Family Planning in the Era of Health Reform* (2014) 24

Adam Sonfield et al., Guttmacher Inst., *The Social and Economic Benefits of Women's Ability to Determine Whether and When to Have Children* (2013) 28, 29

Am. Coll. of Obstetricians & Gynecologists, *Committee Opinion No. 554*, *Reproductive and Sexual Coercion* (2013)...................................27, 28

Am. Coll. of Obstetricians & Gynecologists, *Committee Opinion No. 649: Racial & Ethnic Disparities in Obstetrics & Gynecology* (2015)..20

Amy O. Tsui et al., *Family Planning and the Burden of Unintended Pregnancies*, 32 Epidemiologic Rev. 152 (2010)..22

Ana Nuevo Chiquero, *The Labor Force Effects of Unplanned Childbearing* (Boston Univ., Job Market Paper Nov. 2010).............................30

Ashley H. Snyder et al., *The Impact of the Affordable Care Act on Contraceptive Use and Costs among Privately Insured Women*, 28 Women's Health Issues 219 (2018)...4, 14, 17

Bearek et al., *Changes in Out-Of-Pocket Costs for Hormonal IUDs after Implementation of the Affordable Care Act: An Analysis of Insurance Benefit Inquiries*, 93 Contraception 139 (2016) 17

Black Mamas Matter Alliance, *Black Mamas Matter Toolkit Advancing the Right to Safe and Respectful Maternal Health Care* (2018)..22

Cassandra Logan et al., Nat'l Campaign to Prevent Teen & Unplanned Pregnancy, Child Trends, Inc., *The Consequences of Unintended Childbearing: A White Paper* (2007) 22

Carole Joffe & Willie J. Parker, *Race, Reproductive Politics and Reproductive Health Care in the Contemporary United States*, 86 Contraception 1 (2012) 26

Caroline Rosenzweig et al., Kaiser Family Found., *Women's Sexual and Reproductive Health Services: Key Findings from the 2017 Kaiser Women's Health Survey* (2018) 24

Catholic Benefits Ass'n, https://catholicbenefitsassociation.org/. 12

Catholics for Choice, *The Facts Tell the Story 2014-2015* (2014)..........................13

Christine Dehlendorf et al., *Disparities in Family Planning*, 202 Am. J. Obstet. Gynecol. 214 (2010) 18

Claudia Goldin & Lawrence F. Katz, *The Power of the Pill: Oral Contraceptives and Women's Career and Marriage Decisions*, 110 J. Pol. Econ. 730 (2002)..29

Debbie Postlethwaite et al., *A Comparison of Contraceptive Procurement Pre- and Post-Benefit Change*, 76 Contraception 360 (2007)..16

Deborah Gray White, *Ar'n't I a Woman?: Female Slaves in the Plantation South* (W.W. Norton & Co. ed., 1999) 26

Economic Policy Institute, *Family Budget Calculator, Monthly Costs* 8

Elena R. Gutiérrez, *Fertile Matters: the Politics of Mexican-Origin Women's Reproduction* (2008)..26

Elizabeth Miller et al., *Reproductive Coercion: Connecting the Dots Between Partner Violence and Unintended Pregnancy*, 81 Contraception 457 (2010) 28

Erin Armstrong et al., *Intrauterine Devices and Implants: A Guide to Reimbursement* (Regents of U.C. et al. 2d ed. 2015) 15

Express Scripts, *2015 Drug Trends Report* (2016) 17

Express Scripts, *2016 Drug Trends Report* (2017) 17

Fatima Saleem & Syed W. Rizvi, *Transgender Associations and Possible Etiology: A Literature Review*, 9 Cureus 1 (2017) 27

Guttmacher Inst., *A Real-Time Look at the Impact of the Recession on Women's Family Planning and Pregnancy Decisions* (2009) 16

Guttmacher Inst., *Insurance Coverage of Contraception* (Aug. 2018) 16

Guttmacher Inst., *Publicly Funded Family Planning Services in the United States* (2016) 22

Heinrich H. Hock, *The Pill and the College Attainment of American Women and Men* (Fla. St. Univ., Working Paper 2007)....................29

Inst. of Medicine, *Clinical Preventive Services for Women: Closing the Gaps* (2011) 16, 21, 22, 24

James Trussell et al., *Erratum to "Cost Effectiveness of Contraceptives in the United States" [Contraception 79 (2009) 5-14]*, 80 Contraception 229 (2009) 15

Jamila Taylor & Nikita Mhatre, *Contraceptive Coverage Under the Affordable Care Act*, Ctr. for Am. Progress (Oct. 6, 2017, 5:09 PM) 15

Jasmine Tucker & Kayla Patrick, Nat'l Women's Law Ctr., *Women in Low-Wage Jobs May Not Be Who You Expect* (2017) 7, 31

Jeffrey F. Peipert et al., *Preventing Unintended Pregnancies by Providing No-Cost Contraception*, 120 Obstetrics & Gynecology 1291 (2012)....................12

Jennifer J. Frost et al., Guttmacher Inst., *Contraceptive Needs and Services, 2014 Update* (2016) 10

Jennifer J. Frost & Jacqueline E. Darroch, *Factors Associated with Contraceptive Choice and Inconsistent Method Use, United States, 2004*, 40 Persps. on Sexual & Reprod. Health 94 (2008)..................................24

Jennifer J. Frost & Laura Duberstein Lindberg, *Reasons for Using Contraception: Perspectives of US Women Seeking Care at Specialized Family Planning Clinics*, 87 Contraception 465 (2013) 25

Jo Jones et al., Ctrs. For Disease Control & Prevention, *Nat'l Health Statistics Reps.: Current Contraceptive Use in the United States 2006-2010, and Changes in Patterns of Use Since 1995* (2012) 18

Juno Obedin-Maliver & Harvey J. Makadon, *Transgender Men and Pregnancy*, 9 Obstetric Med. 4 (2015) 26, 27

Kashif Syed, Advocates for Youth, *Ensuring Young People's Access to Preventive Services in the Affordable Care Act* (2014) 21

Kimberly Daniels et al., Ctrs. For Disease Control & Prevention, *62 Nat'l Health Stats. Reps.: Contraceptive Methods Women Have Ever Used: United States, 1982–2010* (2013)..13

Lawrence B. Finer & Mia R. Zolna, *Shifts in Intended and Unintended Pregnancies in the United States, 2001–2008*, 104 Am. J. Pub. Health S43 (2014)...21

Lisa L. Lindley & Katrina M. Walsemann, *Sexual Orientation and Risk of Pregnancy Among New York City High-School Students*, 105 Am. J. Pub. Health 1379 (2015) 21

Martha J. Bailey et al., *The Opt-in Revolution? Contraception and the Gender Gap in* Wages, 4 Am. Econ. J. Appl. Econ. 225 (2012) 29

Nat'l Latina Inst. for Reproductive Health, *Latina/o Voters' Views and Experiences Around Reproductive Health* (2018)...............................13, 18

Nat'l Women's Law Ctr., *Collateral Damage: Scheduling Challenges for Workers in Low-Wage Jobs and Their Consequences* (2017)................20, 31

Nat'l Women's Law Ctr., *Equal Pay for Asian and Pacific Islander Women* (2018)..31

Nat'l Women's Law Ctr., *FAQs About the Wage Gap* (2017)................................32

Nat'l Women's Law Ctr., *It Shouldn't Be a Heavy Lift: Fair Treatment for Pregnant Workers* (2016)..31

Nat'l Women's Law Ctr., *New Data Estimates 62.8 Million Women Have Coverage of Birth Control Without Out-of-Pocket Costs* (2018)..4

Nat'l Women's Law Ctr., *Sexual Harassment & Assault in Schools*, https://nwlc.org/issue/sexual-harassment-assault-in-schools/ (last visited Mar. 17, 2019)..27

Nat'l Women's Law Ctr., *The Stealth Attack on Women's Health: Medicaid Work Requirements Would Reduce Access To Care For Women Without Increasing Employment* (2017)..10

Nora V. Becker & Daniel Polsky, *Women Saw Large Decrease in Out-Of-Pocket Spending for Contraceptives After ACA Mandate Removed Cost Sharing*, 34 Health Affairs 1204 (2015)..............................14, 17

Paraprofessional Healthcare Inst., *U.S. Nursing Assistants Employed in Nursing Homes: Key Facts*, https://phinational.org/wp-content/uploads/legacy/phi-nursing-assistants-key-facts.pdf..............................8

Planned Parenthood, *IUD,* https://www.plannedparenthood.org/learn/birth-control/iud (last visited Mar. 17, 2019)..15

Power to Decide, *Publicly Funded Sites Offering All Birth Control Methods By County*, https://powertodecide.org/what-we-do/access/access-birth-control (last visited Mar. 17, 2019) 10

Proud Heritage: People, Issues, and Documents of the LGBT Experience, Vol. 2 (Chuck Stewart, ed. 2015) 26

Rachel K. Jones & Joerg Dreweke, Guttmacher Inst., *Countering Conventional Wisdom: New Evidence on Religion and Contraceptive Use* (2011)..13

Renee Montagne & Nina Martin, *Focus On Infants During Childbirth Leaves U.S. Moms In Danger*, Nat'l Pub. Radio (May 12, 2017, 5:00 AM)....................22

Sandy E. James et al., Nat'l Ctr. for Transgender Equality, *The Report of the 2015 U.S. Transgender Survey* (2015), https://www.transequality.org/sites/default/files/docs/USTS-Full-Report-FINAL.PDF. 20

SL Budge et al., *Anxiety and Depression in Transgender Individuals: The Roles of Transition Status, Loss, Social Support, and Coping*, 81 J. Consult Clin. Psych. 545 (2013) 27

Stacey McMorrow, Urban Inst., *Racial and Ethnic Disparities in Use of Prescription Contraception: The Role of Insurance Coverage* (June 26, 2017)....................18

U.S. Census Bureau, *2015 ACS 1-Year Estimates: Table S0201, Selected Population Profile in the United States,* https://factfinder.census.gov/bkmk/table/1.0/en/ACS/15_1YR/S0201//popgroup~031 (last visited Mar 17, 2019) 32

U.S. Dep't of Labor, Bureau of Labor Statistics, *Occupational Employment Statistics, May 2017 State Occupational Employment and Wage Estimates: California*, https://www.bls.gov/oes/current/oes_ca.htm#31-0000 (last updated Mar. 30, 2018)....................8

U.S. Dep't of Health and Human Servs., Asst. Sec'y for Planning and Education, Compilation of State Data on the Affordable Care Act, https://aspe.hhs.gov/compilation-state-data-affordable-care-act (last visited Dec. 28, 2018) 9

U.S. Dep't of Labor, Bureau of Labor Statistics, *Standard Occupational Classification Manual* (2018) 8

U.S. Health Res. & Servs. Admin., *Women's Preventive Services Guidelines*, https://www.hrsa.gov/womens-guidelines-2016/index.html (last visited Mar. 17, 2019) 2

U.S. Office of Disease Prevention & Health Promotion, *HealthyPeople 2020: Family Planning*, https://www.healthypeople.gov/2020/topics-objectives/topic/family-planning (last visited Mar. 17, 2019) 22

W. Canestaro et al., *Implications of Employer Coverage of Contraception: Cost-Effectiveness Analysis of Contraception Coverage Under an Employer Mandate*, 95 Contraception 77 (2017) 23

Zenen Jaimes et al., Generation Progress & Advocates for Youth, *Protecting Birth Control Coverage for Young People* (2015), http://www.advocatesforyouth.org/storage/advfy/documents/Factsheets/protecting%20birth%20control%20coverage%20factsheet-2-18-15.pdf. 16

INTEREST AND IDENTITY OF AMICI CURIAE

Amici the National Women's Law Center, the National Latina Institute for Reproductive Health, SisterLove, Inc., the National Asian Pacific American Women's Forum, and the 49 additional organizations listed in the Appendix, are national and regional organizations committed to obtaining racial justice, economic security, gender equity, civil rights, and reproductive justice for all, which includes ensuring that individuals who may become pregnant have access to full and equal health coverage, including contraceptive coverage without cost-sharing, as guaranteed by the Affordable Care Act ("ACA"). We submit this brief to demonstrate the irreparable harm that will result, particularly to those who face multiple and intersecting forms of discrimination, if the Administration's final rules regarding the ACA's contraceptive coverage requirement are permitted to go into effect.[1]

INTRODUCTION AND SUMMARY OF ARGUMENT

At stake in this litigation are the health and livelihoods of people in the Plaintiff States and across the United States who will suffer irreparable harm under the Administration's two final rules regarding the ACA's contraceptive coverage

[1] No counsel for a party authored this brief in whole or in part, and no person other than Amici Curiae and their counsel made a monetary contribution to fund the preparation or submission of this brief. All parties and signatories have consented to the filing of this brief.

requirement[2]—particularly Black, Latinx,[3] Asian American and Pacific Islander ("AAPI") women and other people of color, young people, people with limited resources, transgender men and gender non-conforming people, immigrants, people with limited English proficiency, survivors of sexual and interpersonal violence, and others who face multiple and intersecting forms of discrimination.

The ACA's contraceptive coverage requirement obligates employers to provide insurance coverage without cost-sharing for all FDA-approved methods of contraception for women, and related education, counseling, and services.[4,5] Congress intended the Women's Health Amendment of the ACA to reduce gender discrimination in health insurance by ensuring that it covers women's major health

---

[2] Religious Exemptions and Accommodations for Coverage of Certain Preventative Services Under the Affordable Care Act, 83 Fed. Reg. 57,536 (Nov. 15, 2018) (hereinafter "Religious Exemptions"); Moral Exemptions and Accommodations for Coverage of Certain Preventative Services Under the Affordable Care Act, 83 Fed. Reg. 57,592 (Nov. 15, 2018) (hereinafter "Moral Exemptions").

[3] "Latinx" is a term that represents a gender-neutral alternative to Latino and Latina and encompasses the identities of transgender and gender non-conforming individuals of Latin American descent.

[4] This brief uses the term "women" because the rules target women, and the ACA was intended to end discrimination against women. As we discuss, the denial of reproductive health care and related insurance coverage also affects some gender non-conforming people and transgender men.

[5] 42 U.S.C. § 300gg-13(a)(4); U.S. Health Res. & Servs. Admin., *Women's Preventive Services Guidelines*, https://www.hrsa.gov/womens-guidelines-2016/index.html (last visited Mar. 17, 2019).

needs and that women no longer pay more for health care than men, including by decreasing the cost of contraception.[6] The Departments of Health and Human Services, Treasury, and Labor (the "Departments") have acknowledged this intent, explaining that Congress added the ACA Women's Health Amendment because "women have unique health care needs and burdens . . . includ[ing] contraceptive services," and that the "Departments aim to reduce these disparities by providing women broad access to preventive services, including contraceptive services."[7]

The ACA contraceptive coverage requirement has furthered these aims by eliminating the out-of-pocket costs of contraception and ensuring coverage for the full range of FDA-approved contraceptives and related services for women. Today, an estimated 62.8 million women are eligible for coverage of the

---

[6] 42 U.S.C. § 300gg-13(a)(4); *see also* 155 Cong. Rec. S12,021, S12,026 (daily ed. Dec. 1, 2009) (statement of Sen. Mikulski) (Women's Health Amendment intended to alleviate "punitive practices of insurance companies that charge women more and give [them] less in a benefit"); 155 Cong. Rec. S12,033, S12,052 (daily ed. Dec. 1, 2009) (statement of Sen. Franken) (Women's Health Amendment intended to incorporate "affordable family planning services" to "enable women and families to make informed decisions about when and how they become parents").

[7] Group Health Plans and Health Insurance Issuers Relating to Coverage of Preventive Services Under the Patient Protection and Affordable Care Act, 77 Fed. Reg. 8,727, 8,728 (Feb. 15, 2012) [hereinafter "ACA Coverage"].

contraceptive method that works best for them, irrespective of cost.[8] As a result, use of contraception—especially highly-effective long-acting reversible contraceptives ("LARCs") such as intrauterine devices ("IUDs") and contraceptive implants—has increased.[9]

The final rules would reverse these gains by establishing a sweeping exemption permitted by neither the text nor the legislative history of the ACA, allowing virtually any employer or university to deny insurance coverage for contraception and related services to employees, students, and their dependents. These expansive exemptions would undermine gender equality by reintroducing the very inequities that Congress meant to remedy.

This brief first establishes that the Departments dramatically understate the harm the final rules will cause if allowed to take effect, both in terms of impact on people with limited means and the sheer number of people affected. Second, the brief provides data showing that the rules will make contraception cost-prohibitive, and will create other non-financial barriers to contraception, for many who will

---

[8] Nat'l Women's Law Ctr., *New Data Estimates 62.8 Million Women Have Coverage of Birth Control Without Out-of-Pocket Costs* (2018), https://nwlc-ciw49tixgw5lbab.stackpathdns.com/wp-content/uploads/2017/09/New-Preventive-Services-Estimates-4.pdf.

[9] *See* Ashley H. Snyder et al., *The Impact of the Affordable Care Act on Contraceptive Use and Costs among Privately Insured Women*, 28 Women's Health Issues 219, 222 (2018).

lose coverage. Third, the brief discusses the multiple ways the rules will irreparably harm those who lose contraceptive coverage. The rules will: (1) jeopardize health by increasing unintended pregnancies and aggravating medical conditions managed by contraception; (2) undermine individuals' autonomy and control over their lives; and (3) threaten individuals' economic security. As highlighted throughout this brief, the rules will particularly harm people of color and others who already face systemic discrimination in the Plaintiff States and nationwide.

Because the final rules, if implemented, would result in nationwide, irreparable harm absent preliminary relief, Amici urge the Court to grant Plaintiffs' requested injunctive relief.

STANDARD OF REVIEW

"A plaintiff seeking a preliminary injunction must show that: (1) she is likely to succeed on the merits, (2) she is likely to suffer irreparable harm in the absence of preliminary relief, (3) the balance of equities tips in her favor, and (4) an injunction is in the public interest." *Farris v. Seabrook,* 677 F.3d 858, 864 (9th Cir. 2012) (citing *Winter v. Nat'l Res. Def. Council, Inc*., 555 U.S. 7, 20 (2008)). An appellate court reviews a district court's grant or denial of a preliminary injunction for abuse of discretion, a standard of review that is "limited and deferential." *Herb Reed Enters., LLC v. Fla. Entm't Mgmt., Inc*., 736 F.3d 1239,

1247 (9th Cir. 2013) (quoting *Johnson v. Couturier*, 572 F.3d 1067, 1078 (9th Cir. 2009)).

As the District Court correctly understood, a showing of the likelihood of irreparable harm both to the citizens of Plaintiff states, as well as to the States' fiscal interests, is relevant to the Court's analysis. *See Alfred L. Snapp & Son, Inc. v. Puerto Rico, ex rel., Barez*, 458 U.S. 592, 607 (1982) ("A State has a quasi-sovereign interest in the health and well-being—both physical and economic—of its residents in general," and therefore has standing to sue to protect those interests.). Therefore, this Court must weigh the irreparable harm to women that will result from the final rules absent preliminary injunctive relief. *Herb Reed Enters., LLC*, 736 F.3d at 1247.

ARGUMENT

I. THE DEPARTMENTS UNDERESTIMATE AND MINIMIZE THE HARM THE FINAL RULES WILL CAUSE.

The final rules assert that the exemptions do not burden third parties to a degree that counsels against providing the exemptions.[10] However, the Departments rely on faulty assumptions and misleading data, and fail to adequately weigh this burden.

[10] Religious Exemptions, 83 Fed. Reg. 57,536, 57,548-49; Moral Exemptions, 83 Fed. Reg. 57,592, 57,605-06.

A. The Departments Fail To Account For The Impact Of The Rules On Those With Limited Resources.

The Departments minimize the likely impact of the final rules on people with limited resources, who are disproportionately women of color and young people. These individuals have the fewest resources to pay out-of-pocket for medical expenses and are among those most likely to be irreparably harmed.

The Departments suggest that women with low incomes and women of color are less likely to be reliant upon employer-sponsored health plans, and thus the rules will have little effect on them.[11] To the contrary, many low-wage workers—who are disproportionately women of color[12]—and their dependents rely on employer-sponsored health insurance and stand to lose coverage under the rules.[13]

---

[11] Religious Exemptions, 83 Fed. Reg. at 57,551, 57,574, 57,576; Moral Exemptions, 83 Fed. Reg. at 57,608.

[12] Jasmine Tucker & Kayla Patrick, Nat'l Women's Law Ctr., *Women in Low-Wage Jobs May Not Be Who You Expect* 1 (2017), https://nwlc-ciw49tixgw5lbab.stackpathdns.com/wp-content/uploads/2017/08/Women-in-Low-Wage-Jobs-May-Not-Be-Who-You-Expect.pdf.

[13] Alanna Williamson et al., Kaiser Family Found., *ACA Coverage Expansions and Low-Income Workers* 4 (2016), http://files.kff.org/attachment/ACA-Coverage-Expansions-and-Low-Income-Workers (just under one-third of low-income workers had employer-sponsored coverage in 2014).

For example, over half of nursing assistants—making a median hourly wage of $14.84[14]—and their dependents rely on employer-sponsored coverage; the majority are women of color.[15] California's 98,500 full-time nursing assistants' median wage, about $2,572 monthly, is less than the amount needed to cover basic monthly expenses including housing, food, transportation, and health care.[16] Faced with out-of-pocket expenses for contraception, many female nursing assistants, particularly women of color, will be forced to forgo contraception or other necessities due to cost.

The same holds true for young people, who often have limited resources, large educational debt, and little ability to absorb extra costs. Many young people rely on student health plans governed by the ACA. Other young people are dependents in employer-sponsored plans, either from their own employment or because the ACA allows young adults to remain on their parent's or guardian's

---

[14] U.S. Dep't of Labor, Bureau of Labor Statistics, *Occupational Employment Statistics, May 2017 State Occupational Employment and Wage Estimates: California*, https://www.bls.gov/oes/current/oes_ca.htm#31-0000 (last updated Mar. 30, 2018); U.S. Dep't of Labor, Bureau of Labor Statistics, *Standard Occupational Classification Manual* 114 (2018).

[15] Paraprofessional Healthcare Inst., *U.S. Nursing Assistants Employed in Nursing Homes: Key Facts*, https://phinational.org/wp-content/uploads/legacy/phi-nursing-assistants-key-facts.pdf.

[16] Economic Policy Institute, *Family Budget Calculator, Monthly Costs*, https://www.epi.org/resources/budget/ (last visited Mar. 17, 2019).

health plan until age 26. From 2010-2013, 2.3 million dependent young adults gained or maintained coverage under this provision and stand to lose contraceptive coverage under the rules if their parents' employers object to it.[17]

The Departments also incorrectly assume that many who lose contraceptive coverage can access contraception through existing government-sponsored programs, such as Title X, Medicaid, and state-run programs.[18] While the rules will certainly force thousands more women to seek contraceptive care from these already-strained programs, causing the States fiscal harm, many who lose ACA coverage will not be able to access such care due to eligibility restrictions and capacity constraints. In addition to income- and category-based eligibility criteria for these programs,[19] anti-immigrant provisions in Medicaid restrict eligibility for most lawful permanent residents—many of whom are Latinx and AAPI—for five

---

[17] U.S. Dep't of Health and Human Servs., Asst. Sec'y for Planning and Education, Compilation of State Data on the Affordable Care Act, https://aspe.hhs.gov/compilation-state-data-affordable-care-act (last visited Mar. 17, 2019).

[18] Religious Exemptions, 83 Fed. Reg. at 57,548, 57,551; Moral Exemptions, 83 Fed. Reg. at 57,605.

[19] *See, e.g.*, 42 U.S.C. § 300a-4(c)(2); 42 C.F.R. §§ 59.2, 59.5(7), (8) (free care at Title X clinics limited to families at 100% federal poverty level [FPL]; subsidized care restricted to 250% FPL); *see also* 42 U.S.C. § 1396a(a)(10)(A)(i)(VIII) (limiting Medicaid eligibility for childless, non-pregnant adults to 133% FPL).

years.[20] For eligible women, Medicaid and Title X do not have the capacity to meet current needs, much less the demand from thousands who lose coverage due to the final rules.[21] Moreover, there are regions in the Plaintiff States, including San Benito, Tehama, and Yuba Counties in California, without reasonable access (one clinic per 1,000 women in need) to a publicly-funded clinic offering the full range of FDA-approved contraceptive methods.[22] The Administration's ongoing attempts to restructure Title X and Medicaid will further burden already-scarce resources.[23]

---

[20] 8 U.S.C. § 1613(a).

[21] Jennifer J. Frost et al., Guttmacher Inst., *Contraceptive Needs and Services, 2014 Update* 12, 30 (2016), https://www.guttmacher.org/sites/default/files/report_pdf/contraceptive-needs-and-services-2014_1.pdf (publicly-funded providers met only 39% of need for publicly-supported contraceptive services in 2014).

[22] Power to Decide, *Publicly Funded Sites Offering All Birth Control Methods By County*, https://powertodecide.org/what-we-do/access/access-birth-control (last visited Mar. 17, 2019).

[23] *See, e.g.*, Nat'l Women's Law Ctr., *The Stealth Attack on Women's Health: Medicaid Work Requirements Would Reduce Access To Care For Women Without Increasing Employment* (2017), https://nwlc.org/wp-content/uploads/2017/04/Medicaid-Work-Requirements-1.pdf; *see also* Compliance with Statutory Program Integrity Requirements, 84 Fed. Reg. 7714 (Mar. 4, 2019) (codified at 42 C.F.R. Part 59) (revising Title X regulations). The Title X final rule would redefine "low-income family" for Title X eligibility to include women who lose contraceptive coverage because of an employer's objection. This redefinition illegally defies the plain meaning and purpose of Title X, and in any event the final rule does nothing to ensure Title X providers actually have the capacity to meet the needs of these additional women.

B. The Departments Significantly Underestimate The Number Of Women Who Will Be Harmed By The Final Rules.

The Departments estimate that between 70,500 and 126,400 women will be affected by the final rules.[24] But the number of individuals at risk of losing coverage is almost certainly much greater given the Departments' faulty assumptions.

First, the Departments wrongly assume that only those entities that filed litigation or requested an accommodation, and a trivial number of similar entities, will take advantage of the expanded exemptions.[25] And the Departments presume no publicly-traded entities will take advantage of the rules.[26] On the contrary, by extending the religious exemption to all non-governmental universities and employers, including publicly-traded companies, the final rules greatly expand the number of eligible entities and it is improbable that none will claim the exemption, contrary to the Departments' assumption. Moreover, some of the original litigating

[24] Religious Exemptions, 83 Fed. Reg. at 57,578, 57,581.

[25] Religious Exemptions, 83 Fed. Reg. at 57,576–57,578, 57,581; Moral Exemptions, 83 Fed. Reg. at 57,625–27.

[26] Religious Exemptions, 83 Fed. Reg. at 57,579–81.

entities represent multiple, unidentified employers: for example, the Catholic Benefits Association alone represents more than 1,000 employers.[27]

Second, the Departments also underestimate the likely impact of the "moral" exemption, as the rule does nothing to circumscribe what types of convictions may be invoked to claim the exemption, nor does it require objectors to file a statement of the basis for their objection that could permit oversight.[28] As the district court in Pennsylvania correctly observed about the interim rules, which are identical to the final rules in this respect, "[w]ho determines whether the expressed moral reason is sincere or not or, for that matter, whether it falls within the bounds of morality or is merely a preference choice, is not found within the terms of the Moral Exemption Rule." *Pennsylvania v. Trump*, 281 F. Supp. 3d 553, 577 (E.D. Pa. 2017).

Third, it is also error to assume—as the Departments do—that employees of objecting entities share their employers' moral or religious objections to contraception.[29] Many women of faith and their dependents who rely on objecting entities for health insurance use contraception and will be impacted by loss of contraceptive coverage. More than 99% of sexually experienced women aged 15-

---

[27] Catholic Benefits Ass'n, https://catholicbenefitsassociation.org/ (last visited Mar. 17, 2019).

[28] *See* Moral Exemptions, 83 Fed. Reg. at 57,625–28.

44 have used at least one method of contraception at some point regardless of religious affiliation.[30] Among sexually experienced Catholic women, 98% have used a method of contraception other than natural family planning; that number is 95% for married Catholic Latinas.[31] Over 70% of Protestant women use a "highly effective contraceptive method" (including sterilization, IUDs, the pill, and other hormonal methods).[32] Of Latina and Latino voters, 86% consider contraception to be preventive health care and 82% do not view contraception through a religious lens.[33] Thus, contrary to the Departments' assertions, many individuals are likely to lose a vital health benefit under the rules.

(. . . continued)

[29] *See* Religious Exemptions, 83 Fed. Reg. at 57,563–64, 57,581; Moral Exemptions, 83 Fed. Reg. at 57,626.

[30] Kimberly Daniels et al., Ctrs. For Disease Control & Prevention, *62 Nat'l Health Stats. Reps.: Contraceptive Methods Women Have Ever Used: United States, 1982–2010* 8 (2013), https://www.cdc.gov/nchs/data/nhsr/nhsr062.pdf.

[31] Rachel K. Jones & Joerg Dreweke, Guttmacher Inst., *Countering Conventional Wisdom: New Evidence on Religion and Contraceptive Use* 4 (2011), https://www.guttmacher.org/sites/default/files/report_pdf/religion-and-contraceptive-use.pdf; Catholics for Choice, *The Facts Tell the Story 2014-2015* 5 (2014), http://www.catholicsforchoice.org/wp-content/uploads/2014/12/FactsTelltheStory2014.pdf.

[32] Jones & Dreweke, *supra* note 31, at 5.

[33] Nat'l Latina Inst. for Reproductive Health, *Latina/o Voters' Views and Experiences Around Reproductive Health* 2 (2018), http://latinainstitute.org/sites/default/files/NLIRH%20Survey%20Report_F_0.pdf

II. THE RULES WILL HARM THOSE WHO LOSE COVERAGE BY REINSTATING PRE-ACA COST AND OTHER BARRIERS TO CONTRACEPTION.

The ACA dramatically reduced out-of-pocket expenditures on contraception and related services, resulting in increased use.[34] The final rules threaten to reverse these gains. Without coverage, women will again face financial, logistical, informational, and administrative barriers that make it more difficult to use the most appropriate contraceptive method. These changes will particularly affect women of color, young people, transgender and gender non-conforming people, and others who face stark health disparities due to systemic barriers to contraceptive and other reproductive health care.

A. The Rules Will Make Contraception Cost-Prohibitive for Many People.

The Departments claim that contraception is "relatively low cost,"[35] but in fact, without insurance coverage, contraception is expensive. Prior to the ACA, women spent between 30% and 44% of their total out-of-pocket health costs just on contraception.[36] A 2009 study found that oral contraception (the pill) costs

---

[34] *See* Snyder, *supra* note 9, at 222.

[35] Religious Exemptions, 83 Fed. Reg. at 57,574.

[36] Nora V. Becker & Daniel Polsky, *Women Saw Large Decrease in Out-Of-Pocket Spending for Contraceptives After ACA Mandate Removed Cost Sharing*, 34 Health Affairs 1204, 1208 (2015), available at https://www.healthaffairs.org/doi/10.1377/hlthaff.2015.0127.

$2,630 over five years on average, and other very effective methods such as injectables, transdermal patches, and the vaginal ring, cost women between $2,300 and $2,800 over a five-year period.[37] Today, women without insurance can be expected to spend $850 annually—or $4,250 over five years assuming static costs—on oral contraception and attendant care.[38] LARCs—among the most effective contraceptives—carry the highest up-front costs: IUDs can cost up to $1,300 up front,[39] in addition to costs of ongoing care.[40]

Cost is a major determinant of whether people obtain needed health care, particularly for individuals with lower incomes.[41] Studies confirm that "[e]ven

---

[37] James Trussell et al., *Erratum to "Cost Effectiveness of Contraceptives in the United States" [Contraception 79 (2009) 5-14]*, 80 Contraception 229 (2009).

[38] Jamila Taylor & Nikita Mhatre, *Contraceptive Coverage Under the Affordable Care Act*, Ctr. for Am. Progress (Oct. 6, 2017, 5:09 PM), https://www.americanprogress.org/issues/women/news/2017/10/06/440492/contraceptive-coverage-affordable-care-act/.

[39] Erin Armstrong et al., *Intrauterine Devices and Implants: A Guide to Reimbursement* 5 (Regents of U.C. et al. 2d ed. 2015), https://www.nationalfamilyplanning.org/file/documents----reports/LARC_Report_2014_R5_forWeb.pdf; Planned Parenthood, *IUD*, https://www.plannedparenthood.org/learn/birth-control/iud (last visited Mar. 17, 2019).

[40] Such care may include removal or replacement of the IUD or help with complications should any occur.

[41] Adam Sonfield, *The Case for Insurance Coverage of Contraceptive Services and Supplies Without Cost-Sharing*, 14 Guttmacher Pol'y Rev. 7, 10 (2011).

small increments in cost sharing have been shown to reduce the use of preventive services."[42] When finances are strained, women cease using contraception, skip pills, delay filling prescriptions, or purchase fewer packs at once.[43] Cost is also a major determinant of contraceptive use by young people: before the ACA, 55% of young women reported experiencing a time when they could not afford contraception consistently.[44]

Cost also impacts the choice of contraceptive method. People often use methods that are medically inappropriate or less effective because they cannot afford more appropriate or effective methods with higher out-of-pocket costs.[45]

---

[42] *See* Inst. of Medicine, *Clinical Preventive Services for Women: Closing the Gaps* 109 (2011) [hereinafter "IOM Rep."].

[43] Guttmacher Inst., *A Real-Time Look at the Impact of the Recession on Women's Family Planning and Pregnancy Decisions* 5 (2009), https://www.guttmacher.org/sites/default/files/report_pdf/recessionfp_1.pdf.

[44] Zenen Jaimes et al., Generation Progress & Advocates for Youth, *Protecting Birth Control Coverage for Young People* 1 (2015), http://www.advocatesforyouth.org/storage/advfy/documents/Factsheets/protecting%20birth%20control%20coverage%20factsheet-2-18-15.pdf.

[45] Debbie Postlethwaite et al., *A Comparison of Contraceptive Procurement Pre- and Post-Benefit Change*, 76 Contraception 360, 360, 363 (2007) (finding decrease in out-of-pocket costs of contraception increased use of more effective methods); Guttmacher Inst., *Insurance Coverage of Contraception*, (Aug. 2018), https://www.guttmacher.org/evidence-you-can-use/insurance-coverage-contraception.

The ACA contraceptive coverage requirement has yielded enormous cost-savings.[46] The mean total out-of-pocket expenses for FDA-approved contraceptives decreased approximately 70% following the ACA,[47] and women saved $1.4 billion in 2013 on oral contraception alone.[48] This has corresponded with an increase in use,[49] particularly of the most effective forms of contraception. For example, at least one study found that "the removal of the cost barrier to IUDs and implants has increased their rate of adoption after the ACA."[50] The rules will reverse these critical gains.

---

[46] Snyder, *supra* note 9, at 222; *see also* Bearek et al., *Changes in Out-Of-Pocket Costs for Hormonal IUDs after Implementation of the Affordable Care Act: An Analysis of Insurance Benefit Inquiries*, 93 Contraception 139, 141 (2016) (cost of hormonal IUDs fell to $0 for most insured women following ACA).

[47] A. Law et al., *Are Women Benefiting from the Affordable Care Act? A Real-World Evaluation of the Impact of the Affordable Care Act on Out-of-Pocket Costs for Contraceptives*, 93 Contraception 392, 397 (2016).

[48] Becker & Polsky, *supra* note 36, at 1208.

[49] Express Scripts, *2015 Drug Trends Report* 118 (2016), http://lab.express-scripts.com/lab/drug-trend-report/~/media/e2c9d19240e94fcf893b706e13068750.ashx (reporting that contraceptive use increased 17.2% from 2014-15); Express Scripts, *2016 Drug Trends Report* 24 (2017), http://lab.express-scripts.com/lab/drug-trend-report/~/media/29f13dee4e7842d6881b7e034fc0916a.ashx (reporting 3.0% overall increase in contraceptive use from 2015-16, and 137.6% increase in specialty contraceptives, including LARCs).

[50] Snyder, *supra* note 9, at 222.

Notwithstanding the significant overall decrease in out-of-pocket costs of contraception under the ACA, racial and ethnic disparities in access to contraception persist, including access to the most effective methods. Black, Latina, and AAPI women are less likely to use prescription contraception than their white peers, due to structural barriers such as geographically inaccessible providers and inflexible work schedules.[51] In the past two years, four in ten Latina and Latino voters under age 45 (41%) have gone without the contraceptive method of their choice because of access issues.[52] Insurance coverage for contraception is an important factor in reducing these disparities in contraceptive use.[53] The rules will exacerbate existing disparities by inhibiting access to such coverage.

---

[51] Stacey McMorrow, Urban Inst., *Racial and Ethnic Disparities in Use of Prescription Contraception: The Role of Insurance Coverage* (forthcoming), https://academyhealth.confex.com/academyhealth/2017arm/meetingapp.cgi/Paper/17939 (June 26, 2017); Jo Jones et al., Ctrs. For Disease Control & Prevention, *Nat'l Health Statistics Reps.: Current Contraceptive Use in the United States 2006-2010, and Changes in Patterns of Use Since 1995* 5, 8 (2012), https://www.cdc.gov/nchs/data/nhsr/nhsr060.pdf; Christine Dehlendorf et al., *Disparities in Family Planning*, 202 Am. J. Obstet. Gynecol. 214, 216 (2010).

[52] Nat'l Latina Inst. for Reproductive Health, *supra* note 33, at 2.

[53] McMorrow, *supra* note 51; Dehlendorf, *supra* note 51, at 216.

B. The Rules Will Create Logistical, Administrative, and Informational Barriers to Contraception.

The rules will also impose other barriers to contraception, including logistical, informational, and administrative burdens in navigating the health care system without employer- or university-sponsored contraceptive coverage.

Navigating the health care system is complicated, requiring resources such as free time, regular and unlimited phone and internet access, privacy, transportation, language comprehension, and ability to read and respond to complex paperwork. It is, therefore, particularly difficult for individuals with limited English proficiency and for people in low-wage jobs—disproportionately women of color—who often work long, unpredictable hours without scheduling flexibility and who lack reliable access to transportation.[54]

Many who lose coverage will be forced by cost constraints to navigate switching away from providers they trust and who know their medical histories. This interruption in continuity of care poses particular challenges for people of color, people with limited English proficiency, and LGBTQ people, who already face multiple barriers to obtaining reproductive health services, including language barriers, a lack of cultural competency among providers, providers' limited

geographic availability, and implicit bias and discrimination.[55] Having to switch from a trusted provider is particularly consequential for transgender and gender non-conforming people, who report pervasive provider discrimination as well as refusals to provide care, cultural insensitivity, and ignorance of gender affirming care.[56]

III. THE RULES WILL HARM THE HEALTH, AUTONOMY, AND ECONOMIC SECURITY OF THOSE WHO LOSE CONTRACEPTIVE COVERAGE.

A. The Rules Will Harm The Health Of Individuals And Families.

By reinstating cost and other barriers to contraception, the rules will harm the health of individuals and families, particularly those already suffering negative health outcomes for which access to contraception is critical. Contraception is a

(. . . continued)

[54] Nat'l Women's Law Ctr., *Collateral Damage: Scheduling Challenges for Workers in Low-Wage Jobs and Their Consequences* 1-3 (2017), https://nwlc-ciw49tixgw5lbab.stackpathdns.com/wp-content/uploads/2017/04/Collateral-Damage.pdf.

[55] *See* Am. Coll. of Obstetricians & Gynecologists, *Committee Opinion No. 649: Racial & Ethnic Disparities in Obstetrics & Gynecology* 3 (2015), https://www.acog.org/-/media/Committee-Opinions/Committee-on-Health-Care-for-Underserved-Women/co649.pdf?dmc=1&ts=20180521T1849308146; Sandy E. James et al., Nat'l Ctr. for Transgender Equality, *The Report of the 2015 U.S. Transgender Survey* 96-99 (2015), https://www.transequality.org/sites/default/files/docs/USTS-Full-Report-FINAL.PDF.

[56] James, *supra* note 55, at 96-99.

vital component of preventive health care: it combats unintended pregnancy and its attendant health consequences, avoids exacerbating medical conditions for which pregnancy is contraindicated, and offers standalone health benefits unrelated to pregnancy.

1. *The Rules Place More People At Risk For Unintended Pregnancy And Associated Health Risks.*

By limiting access to contraception, the rules will increase the risk of unintended pregnancy, which, due to systemic barriers, is already higher for women of color and young people (including LGBTQ youth).[57] Unintended pregnancy can have serious health consequences for individuals and their families. People with unplanned pregnancies are more likely to experience delayed access to prenatal care, leaving potential health complications unaddressed and increasing

---

[57] IOM Rep., *supra* note 42, at 103-04; Lawrence B. Finer & Mia R. Zolna, *Shifts in Intended and Unintended Pregnancies in the United States, 2001–2008*, 104 Am. J. Pub. Health S43, S47 (2014); Kashif Syed, Advocates for Youth, *Ensuring Young People's Access to Preventive Services in the Affordable Care Act* 2 (2014), http://www.advocatesforyouth.org/storage/advfy/documents/Preventive%20Services%20in%20the%20ACA-11-24-14.pdf; Lisa L. Lindley & Katrina M. Walsemann, *Sexual Orientation and Risk of Pregnancy Among New York City High-School Students*, 105 Am. J. Pub. Health 1379, 1383 (2015).

the risk of infant mortality, birth defects, low birth weight, and preterm birth.[58] Women with unintended pregnancies are also at higher risk for maternal morbidity and mortality, maternal depression, and physical violence during pregnancy.[59] The U.S. has a higher maternal mortality rate than any other high-income country, especially for Black women.[60] By creating additional barriers to contraception and preconception care, the rules threaten to increase rates of unintended pregnancy and related health risks.

---

[58] IOM Rep., *supra* note 42, at 103; *see also* Cassandra Logan et al., Nat'l Campaign to Prevent Teen & Unplanned Pregnancy, Child Trends, Inc., *The Consequences of Unintended Childbearing: A White Paper* 3-5 (2007), https://pdfs.semanticscholar.org/b353/b02ae6cad716a7f64ca48b3edae63544c03e.pdf.

[59] IOM Rep., *supra* note 42, at 103; Amy O. Tsui et al., *Family Planning and the Burden of Unintended Pregnancies*, 32 Epidemiologic Rev. 152, 165 (2010); U.S. Office of Disease Prevention & Health Promotion, *HealthyPeople 2020: Family Planning*, https://www.healthypeople.gov/2020/topics-objectives/topic/family-planning (last visited Mar. 17, 2019).

[60] Black Mamas Matter Alliance, *Black Mamas Matter Toolkit Advancing the Right to Safe and Respectful Maternal Health Care* 21 (2018), https://www.reproductiverights.org/sites/crr.civicactions.net/files/documents/USPA_BMMA_Toolkit_Booklet-Final-Update_Web-Pages.pdf; Renee Montagne & Nina Martin, *Focus On Infants During Childbirth Leaves U.S. Moms In Danger*, Nat'l Pub. Radio (May 12, 2017, 5:00 AM), https://www.npr.org/2017/05/12/527806002/focus-on-infants-during-childbirth-leaves-u-s-moms-in-danger; Guttmacher Inst., *Publicly Funded Family Planning Services in the United States* 1 (2016), https://www.guttmacher.org/sites/default/files/factsheet/fb_contraceptive_serv_0.pdf.

The Departments question whether the availability of contraceptive coverage without cost-sharing decreases the incidence of unintended pregnancy.[61] But as the post-ACA research corroborates, lowering the cost of contraception leads to increased use.[62] And increased access to contraception without cost-sharing results in fewer unintended pregnancies.[63] Denying contraceptive coverage was found to have resulted in 33 more pregnancies per 1000 women.[64]

The Departments also incorrectly assert that harm to women will be mitigated because some employers and universities with objections may voluntarily choose to cover some methods.[65] But allowing employers or universities to pick and choose covered methods—rather than allowing the users themselves to choose—undermines people's ability to consistently use the contraceptive that is most appropriate for them, increasing the risk of unintended pregnancy. Inconsistent or incorrect contraceptive use accounts for 41% of

---

[61] Religious Exemptions, 83 Fed. Reg. at 57,554–55; Moral Exemptions, 83 Fed. Reg. at 57,611.

[62] *See supra* notes 46 to 50 and accompanying text.

[63] Jeffrey F. Peipert et al., *Preventing Unintended Pregnancies by Providing No-Cost Contraception*, 120 Obstetrics & Gynecology 1291, 1291 (2012).

[64] W. Canestaro et al., *Implications of Employer Coverage of Contraception: Cost-Effectiveness Analysis of Contraception Coverage Under an Employer Mandate*, 95 Contraception 77, 83, 85 (2017).

[65] *See* Religious Exemptions, 83 Fed. Reg. at 57,574, 57,575, 57,581.

unintended pregnancies in the U.S.; non-use accounts for 54%.[66] Women are more likely to use contraception consistently and correctly when they can choose the method that suits their needs.[67]

2. *The Rules Will Undermine Health Benefits From Contraception.*

Contraception allows women to delay pregnancy when it is contraindicated and offers several standalone benefits unrelated to pregnancy. Although most women aged 18-44 who use contraception do so to prevent pregnancy (59%), 13% use it solely to manage a medical condition, and 22% use it for both purposes.[68]

Contraception is necessary to control medical conditions that are complicated by pregnancy, including diabetes, obesity, pulmonary hypertension, and cyanotic heart disease.[69] In addition, contraception treats menstrual disorders,

---

[66] Adam Sonfield et al., Guttmacher Inst., *Moving Forward: Family Planning in the Era of Health Reform* 8 (2014).

[67] Jennifer J. Frost & Jacqueline E. Darroch, *Factors Associated with Contraceptive Choice and Inconsistent Method Use, United States, 2004*, 40 Persps. on Sexual & Reprod. Health 94, 99, 101-03 (2008).

[68] Caroline Rosenzweig et al., Kaiser Family Found., *Women's Sexual and Reproductive Health Services: Key Findings from the 2017 Kaiser Women's Health Survey* (2018) at 3, http://files.kff.org/attachment/Issue-Brief-Womens-Sexual-and-Reproductive-Health-Services-Key-Findingsfrom-the-2017-Kaiser-Womens-Health-Survey.

[69] IOM Rep., *supra* note 42, at 103-04.

reduces menstrual pain, reduces the risks of certain cancers, such as endometrial and ovarian cancer, and helps protect against pelvic inflammatory disease.[70]

By reinstating cost barriers to some or all contraceptive methods, the rules will aggravate medical conditions and undermine necessary health benefits.

B. The Rules Will Undermine Individuals' Autonomy and Control Over Their Reproductive and Personal Lives.

The Supreme Court has recognized that "[t]he ability of women to participate equally in the economic and social life of the Nation has been facilitated by their ability to control their reproductive lives." *Planned Parenthood of Se. Pa. v. Casey*, 505 U.S. 833, 856 (1992); *see also Griswold v. Connecticut*, 381 U.S. 479, 485-86 (1965). Women also report that the ability to plan their lives is a main reason for their use of contraception.[71]

Contraception and the freedom it affords are particularly important for communities with histories of subjection to the control of others in their sexual and reproductive lives. During slavery, when Black women were the legal chattel of

---

[70] *Id.* at 107.

[71] Jennifer J. Frost & Laura Duberstein Lindberg, *Reasons for Using Contraception: Perspectives of US Women Seeking Care at Specialized Family Planning Clinics*, 87 Contraception 465, 467, 470 (2013).

their masters, they had no ability to resist unwanted sex or childbearing.[72] Slavery gave way to twentieth century policies and practices that encouraged and coerced women of color, individuals with disabilities, and so-called "sexual deviants," to refrain from reproduction; these policies culminated in forced sterilizations without informed consent.[73] Affordable access to the full range of contraceptive options empowers individuals to exercise control over their reproductive futures.

Contraception is also critical to the autonomy of transgender men and gender non-conforming individuals. Contraception permits individuals to align their gender identity with their physiology by enabling them to prevent pregnancy and control menstruation.[74] Social exclusion and bias in health care already contribute to transgender men experiencing higher incidence of depression, anxiety, and

---

[72] Deborah Gray White, *Ar'n't I a Woman?: Female Slaves in the Plantation South* 68 (W.W. Norton & Co. ed., 1999).

[73] Carole Joffe & Willie J. Parker, *Race, Reproductive Politics and Reproductive Health Care in the Contemporary United States*, 86 Contraception 1, 1 (2012); *see also* Proud Heritage: People, Issues, and Documents of the LGBT Experience, Vol. 2 205 (Chuck Stewart, ed. 2015); Elena R. Gutiérrez, *Fertile Matters: the Politics of Mexican-Origin Women's Reproduction* 35-54 (2008); *Buck v. Bell*, 274 U.S. 200, 205 (1927) (upholding law permitting coerced sterilization of "mentally defective" people).

[74] Juno Obedin-Maliver & Harvey J. Makadon, *Transgender Men and Pregnancy*, 9 Obstetric Med. 4, 6 (2015).

suicide,[75] and for some, pregnancy and menstruation can increase experiences of gender dysphoria—the distress resulting from one's physical body not aligning with one's sense of self.[76]

Finally, contraception is vital for survivors of rape and interpersonal violence.[77] Access to emergency contraception without cost-sharing empowers sexual assault survivors to prevent unwanted pregnancy, and is particularly critical for students given the high rate of sexual assault on college campuses.[78] The shot and LARCs enable women to prevent pregnancy with reduced risk of detection by or interference from partners.[79] Without these options, pregnancy can entrench a

---

[75] SL Budge et al., *Anxiety and Depression in Transgender Individuals: The Roles of Transition Status, Loss, Social Support, and Coping*, 81 J. Consult Clin. Psych. 545 (2013); Fatima Saleem & Syed W. Rizvi, *Transgender Associations and Possible Etiology: A Literature Review*, 9 Cureus 1, 2 (2017) ("Forty-one % of [transgender individuals in the U.S.] reported attempting suicide as compared to 1.6% of the general population.").

[76] Obedin-Maliver & Makadon, *supra* note 74, at 6; Saleem & Rizvi, *supra* note 75, at 1.

[77] Am. Coll. of Obstetricians & Gynecologists, *Committee Opinion No. 554, Reproductive and Sexual Coercion* 2-3 (2013), https://www.acog.org/-/media/Committee-Opinions/Committee-on-Health-Care-for-Underserved-Women/co554.pdf?dmc=1&ts=20180521T2206346190 [hereinafter "ACOG No. 554"].

[78] Nat'l Women's Law Ctr., *Sexual Harassment & Assault in Schools*, https://nwlc.org/issue/sexual-harassment-assault-in-schools/ (last visited Mar. 17, 2019).

[79] ACOG No. 554, *supra* note 77, at 2-3.

woman in an abusive relationship, endangering the woman, her pregnancy, and her children. Abusive partners often engage in "reproductive coercion" behaviors to promote unwanted pregnancy, including interfering with contraception or abortion.[80] By impeding their access to contraceptive methods less susceptible to interference, the rules harm women's ability to resist such coercion.[81]

C. The Rules Undermine Individuals' Economic Security.

The rules will thwart people's ability to plan, delay, space, and limit pregnancies as is best for them, thereby undermining their financial stability, as well as their ability to participate equally in society and further their educational and career goals.

1. ***Access To Contraception Provides Life-Long Economic Benefits To Women, Families, And Society.***

Access to contraception has life-long economic benefits: it enables women to complete high school and attain higher levels of education, improves their earnings and labor force participation, and secures their economic independence.[82]

---

[80] *Id.* at 1-2; Elizabeth Miller et al., *Reproductive Coercion: Connecting the Dots Between Partner Violence and Unintended Pregnancy*, 81 Contraception 457, 457–58 (2010).

[81] ACOG No. 554, *supra* note 77, at 2-3.

[82] Adam Sonfield et al., Guttmacher Inst., *The Social and Economic Benefits of Women's Ability to Determine Whether and When to Have Children* 7-8 (2013), https://www.guttmacher.org/sites/default/files/report_pdf/social-economic-benefits.pdf.

The availability of the oral contraceptive pill alone is associated with roughly one-third of the total wage gains for women born from the mid-1940s to early 1950s.[83] Access to oral contraceptives has improved women's educational attainment,[84] which in turn has caused large increases in women's participation in law, medicine, and other professions.[85] While wage disparities persist, contraception has helped advance gender equality by reducing the gap.[86]

The Departments are well aware of these significant benefits. In previously-issued rules, they explained that before the ACA, disparities in health coverage "place[d] women in the workforce at a disadvantage compared to their male co-workers," that "[r]esearchers have shown that access to contraception improves the social and economic status of women," and that the ACA's contraceptive coverage

---

[83] Martha J. Bailey et al., *The Opt-in Revolution? Contraception and the Gender Gap in* Wages, 4 Am. Econ. J. Appl. Econ. 225, 241 (2012), https://www.ncbi.nlm.nih.gov/pmc/articles/PMC3684076/.

[84] Heinrich H. Hock, *The Pill and the College Attainment of American Women and Men* 19 (Fla. St. Univ., Working Paper 2007).

[85] Claudia Goldin & Lawrence F. Katz, *The Power of the Pill: Oral Contraceptives and Women's Career and Marriage Decisions*, 110 J. Pol. Econ. 730, 749 (2002).

[86] Sonfield, *supra* note 82, at 14.

requirement "furthers the goal of eliminating this disparity by allowing women to achieve equal status as healthy and productive members of the job force."[87]

By inhibiting access to contraception, the rules will threaten the economic security and advancement of individuals, families, and society.

2. ***The Rules Will Exacerbate Economic And Social Disparities By Impeding Access To Contraception.***

The rules will most jeopardize the economic security of those facing systemic barriers to economic advancement, forcing women with limited means into an impossible situation: they will have less ability to absorb the cost of an unintended pregnancy, but will be more at risk for it due to greater difficulty affording contraception.

Unplanned pregnancy can entrench economic hardship. Unplanned births reduce labor force participation by as much as 25%.[88] The ability to avoid unplanned pregnancy is especially important for women in low-wage jobs, who are less likely to have parental leave or predictable and flexible work schedules.[89] Many women in low-wage jobs who become pregnant are denied pregnancy

---

[87] ACA Coverage, 77 Fed. Reg. at 8,725, 8,728.

[88] Ana Nuevo Chiquero, *The Labor Force Effects of Unplanned Childbearing*, (Boston Univ., Job Market Paper Nov. 2010), http://www.unavarra.es/digitalAssets/141/141311_100000Paper_Ana_Nuevo_Chiquero.pdf.

accommodations and face workplace discrimination; some are forced to quit, are fired, or are pushed into unpaid leave.[90] Nearly 70% of those holding jobs that pay less than $10 per hour are women, and a disproportionate number of women in low-wage jobs are women of color.[91] Women of color also experience greater wage disparities than white women: among full-time workers, Latina women make only 54¢ for every dollar paid to white men; that number is 57¢ for Native American women, 63¢ for Black women, and as low as 51¢ and 56¢ for AAPI women in some ethnic subgroups.[92]

CONCLUSION

The final rules will cause substantial and irreparable harm to individuals in the Plaintiff States and nationwide, and particularly to those facing multiple and

(. . . continued)

[89] Nat'l Women's Law Ctr., *supra* note 54, at 1, 4.

[90] Nat'l Women's Law Ctr., *It Shouldn't Be a Heavy Lift: Fair Treatment for Pregnant Workers* 1 (2016), https://nwlc-ciw49tixgw5lbab.stackpathdns.com/wp-content/uploads/2015/08/pregnant_workers.pdf; Nat'l Women's Law Ctr., *Equal Pay for Asian and Pacific Islander Women* (2018), https://nwlc-ciw49tixgw5lbab.stackpathdns.com/wp-content/uploads/2018/02/Asian-Women-Equal-Pay-Feb-2018.pdf.

[91] Tucker & Patrick, *supra* note 12, at 1.

intersecting forms of discrimination, for the same reasons as the interim final rules. Accordingly, the Court should affirm the preliminary injunction issued by the court below.

Respectfully Submitted,

Date: April 22, 2019

s/ Naomi D. Barrowclough
Naomi D. Barrowclough, Esq.
LOWENSTEIN SANDLER LLP
One Lowenstein Drive
Roseland, New Jersey 07068
Telephone: (973) 422-6446
Fax: (973) 422-6447
nbarrowclough@lowenstein.com

Jeffrey Blumenfeld, Esq.
LOWENSTEIN SANDLER LLP
2200 Pennsylvania Avenue, NW
Washington, DC 20037
Telephone: (202) 753-3810
Fax: (212) 262-7402
jblumenfeld@lowenstein.com

(. . . continued)

[92] Nat'l Women's Law Ctr., *FAQs About the Wage Gap* (2017), https://nwlc-ciw49tixgw5lbab.stackpathdns.com/wp-content/uploads/2017/09/FAQ-About-the-Wage-Gap-2017.pdf; NAPAWF calculations from U.S. Census Bureau, *2015 ACS 1-Year Estimates: Table S0201, Selected Population Profile in the United States,* https://factfinder.census.gov/bkmk/table/1.0/en/ACS/15_1YR/S0201//popgroup~031 (last visited Mar. 17, 2019).

Of Counsel

Fatima Goss Graves
Gretchen Borchelt
Sunu Chandy
Michelle Banker
NATIONAL WOMEN'S LAW CENTER
11 Dupont Circle NW, Suite 800
Washington, DC 20036

Jane Liu
NATIONAL ASIAN PACIFIC AMERICAN WOMEN'S FORUM
1730 Rhode Island Ave, NW
Suite 210
Washington, DC 20036

Sequoia Ayala
Jill Heaviside
SISTERLOVE, INC.
P.O. Box 10558
Atlanta, GA 30310-1731

(*Amici appreciate the assistance of Nina Serrianne at the National Latina Institute for Reproductive Health for her role in the preparation of this brief*)

CERTIFICATE OF COMPLIANCE

I, Naomi D. Barrowclough, certify that pursuant to Federal Rules of Appellate Procedure 29(a)(4)(G), 29(a)(5), 32(a)(7)(C), and 32(g)(1), and Ninth Circuit Rule 32-1, the forgoing Brief of *Amici Curiae* in Support of Plaintiffs-Appellees and in Support of Affirmance is 6,461 words, excluding the portions exempted by Fed. R. App. P. 32(f), if applicable. The brief's type size and type face comply with Fed. R. App. P. 32(a)(5) and (6) in that it is proportionately spaced and has a typeface of 14 points.

Date: April 22, 2019　　　　By: /s/ Naomi D. Barrowclough

CERTIFICATE OF SERVICE

I hereby certify that on April 22, 2019, I electronically filed the foregoing: with the Clerk of the Court for the United States Court of Appeals for the Ninth Circuit by using the appellate CM/ECF system.

I certify that all participants in the case who are registered CM/ECF users will be served by the appellate CM/ECF system.

Date: April 22, 2019 By: /s/ Naomi D. Barrowclough

APPENDIX A:

STATEMENTS OF INTEREST OF AMICI CURIAE

Advocates for Youth partners with youth leaders, adult allies, and youth serving organizations to advocate for policies and champion programs that recognize young people's rights to honest sexual health services; and the resources and opportunities necessary to create sexual health equity for all youth. Young people have the right to lead healthy lives, which includes access to the resources and tools necessary to make healthy decisions about their lives. The Affordable Care Act increased access to contraception for young people and Advocates for Youth seeks to ensure that young people continue to have access to the wide range of reproductive and sexual health care services they need.

The Afiya Center is a non-profit organization dedicated to serving Black women of color. We believe that Black women should have access to everything they need to respond appropriately to their reproductive health choices. As a Reproductive Justice organization, we believe all women should have the right to have a child, not have a child, and raise the children they have in safe environments free from state sanctioned violence. The IFRs are state sanctioned violence that would force women to endure hardships that do not support the right to the families of their choice. We must say no to this kind of interference.

Since 1914 **American Sexual Health Association** has worked to prevent

the adverse outcomes of poor sexual health in the United States. We believe strongly that women should have access to health care coverage that includes contraceptive care. This guarantee, under the ACA is essential to ensure that people have control over their reproductive health. Sexual and reproductive health are part of overall health and well-being, and inextricably linked to a broad range of other economic and social factors. We seek to ensure that women have access to essential reproductive services.

Black Women Birthing Justice is a collective of African-American, African, Caribbean and multiracial women who are committed to transforming birthing experiences for Black women and transfolks. Our vision is that that every pregnant person should have an empowering birthing experience, free of unnecessary medical interventions. We aim to enhance Black women's faith in their strength and resilience, and empower them to make healthy choices and to stand up for the pregnancy and birth experience they envision. We believe that access to contraception is vital to reproductive justice. Part of our mission is to advocate for the right of low-income women and women on welfare to make healthy and non-coerced decisions about when and whether to get pregnant. We are signing on to this amicus brief because we believe that all women deserve accessible, no cost contraceptive coverage as outlined in the Affordable Care Act.

The Black Women's Health Imperative (BWHI) is a national

organization dedicated solely to improving the health and wellness of our nation's 21 million Black women and girls - physically, emotionally and financially. For 35 years, BWHI has advanced and promoted Black women's health through evidence based programs and initiatives, policy and advocacy, and research translation. Our policy and advocacy team evaluates and develops national and state policies to address issues most critical to Black women's health, especially regarding breast and cervical cancers, diabetes, HIV/AIDS, intimate partner violence, sexual assault, maternal health and reproductive justice. BWHI works to ensure that Black women have access to quality, affordable health care, which includes access to all forms of contraceptives. Access to the full range of contraceptive methods, some of which alleviate gynecological conditions, is critical to the health and well being of Black women, and BWHI participates as amicus in cases that may impact Black women's reproductive health.

The **Black Women's Roundtable (BWR)** is an intergenerational civic engagement network of the National Coalition on Black Civic Participation. BWR comprises a diverse group of Black women civic leaders of international, national, regional and state-based organizations and institutions. Together, BWR's members represent the issues and concerns of millions of Americans and families who live across the United States and around the world. At the forefront of championing just and equitable public policy on behalf of Black women, BWR promotes their

health and wellness, economic security, education and global empowerment as key elements for success. These issues are interconnected and BWR supports health policies that deliver quality health care for all, strengthen the safety net for our most vulnerable communities, and address disparities in access to care. Our HealthCARE is a Human Right #NotAPrivilege Campaign seeks to protect and expand Medicaid, Medicare and the Affordable Care Act (ACA) along with ensuring access to contraceptives as set forth in the ACA.

California Black Women's Health Project, a 24-year-old statewide nonprofit organization, is the only 501(c)(3) non-profit organization solely dedicated to improving the health of California's Black women and girls through advocacy, education, policy, and outreach. We are committed to advocating for policies and practices that promote and improve physical, spiritual, mental and emotional wellbeing of the 1.2 million Black women and girls in California. We believe a healthier future is possible when women are empowered to make choices in an environment where equal access and health justice are community priorities.

The **Center on Reproductive Rights and Justice at UC Berkeley** seeks to realize reproductive rights and advance reproductive justice by bolstering law and policy advocacy efforts, furthering scholarship, and influencing academic and public discourse. Our work is guided by the belief that all people deserve the social, economic, political, and legal conditions necessary to make genuine

decisions about reproduction.

Latinas continue to face disparities in access to contraception and other critical reproductive healthcare. The **Colorado Organization for Latina Opportunity and Reproductive Rights (COLOR)** believes that we need to do more to close the gaps and ensure that people have the services they need to manage their health and plan their families.

The **Desiree Alliance** positions ourselves in the belief that reproductive access and care must be made available to all those who seek such services. Far too long government has regulated reproductive rights/health/justice over those who seek preventative care of their bodies. Religious freedom under the guise of applicable law should never be deterrent in providing services that renders choice over legal regulation. Third party gateways should never interfere with healthcare options, and must not be allowed to withhold any healthcare choices decided by consenting and informed persons regardless of religious belief, gender, race, identity, and citizenship status.

Founded in 1974, **Equal Rights Advocates (ERA)** is a national non-profit legal advocacy organization dedicated to protecting and expanding economic and educational access and opportunities for women and girls. In concert with our commitment to securing gender equity in the workplace and in schools, ERA seeks to preserve women's right to reproductive choice and protect women's access

to health care, including safe, legal contraception and abortion. In addition to litigating cases on behalf of workers and students and providing free legal advice and counseling to hundreds of women each year, ERA has participated in numerous amicus briefs in cases affecting the rights of women and girls, such as this right, and the long-term economic impacts of limited and inequitable access to opportunity and care for intersectional populations.

EverThrive Illinois (EverThrive IL) works to improve the health of women, children, and families over the lifespan by centering the values of health equity, diverse voices, and strong partnerships. EverThrive IL focuses on health issues of key importance to women, children, and their families including child and adolescent health, immunizations, maternal and infant mortality, and health reform. Because access to safe and voluntary contraception is a human right as declared by the United Nations, can improve the quality of life for people and their families, and is central to alleviating gender-based violence, EverThrive IL is committed to upholding and advocating for the ACA contraceptive-coverage requirement.

Gender Justice is a nonprofit legal and policy advocacy organization based in the Midwest that is committed to the eradication of gender barriers through impact litigation, policy advocacy, and education. As part of its litigation program, Gender Justice represents individuals and provides legal advocacy as amicus

curiae in cases involving issues of gender discrimination. Gender Justice has an interest in ensuring that all individuals capable of getting pregnant have access to birth control through their employers' insurance plans. This is central to eliminating gender discrimination and ensuring the full participation of all women in society.

Ibis Reproductive Health is a global research and advocacy organization driving change through bold, rigorous research and principled partnerships that advance sexual and reproductive autonomy, choices, and health worldwide. We believe that research can catalyze change when the entire research process is viewed as an opportunity to shift power, is undertaken in partnership with the communities most affected, and includes a focus on how data can be most effectively used to make change. We focus on increasing access to quality abortion care, transforming access to abortion and contraception through technology and service innovations, and expanding comprehensive sexual and reproductive health information and services.

In Our Own Voice: National Black Women's Reproductive Justice Agenda is a national-state partnership with eight Black women's Reproductive Justice organizations: The Afiya Center, Black Women for Wellness, Black Women's Health Imperative, New Voices for Reproductive Justice, SisterLove, Inc., SisterReach, SPARK Reproductive Justice NOW, and Women with a Vision.

In Our Own Voice is a national Reproductive Justice organization focused on lifting up the voices of Black women leaders on national, regional, and state policies that impact the lives of Black women and girls. Access to contraception is critical to ensuring that all people have the human right to control our bodies, our sexuality, our gender, and our reproduction. In Our Own Voice is committed to engaging in advocacy that helps secure full access to contraceptive coverage as intended by the Affordable Care Act.

Jobs With Justice is dedicated to expanding the ability for men and women to come together to improve their workplaces, their communities and their lives. By leading strategic campaigns, changing the conversation, and mobilizing labor, community, student, and faith voices at the national and local levels with our network of coalitions, we create innovative solutions to the challenges faced by working people today. We sign on to this brief as the government should not further limit the economic and healthcare needs of women.

Lift Louisiana is a non-profit organization that works to improve the health and wellbeing of women, their families, and their communities. Through advocacy and direct representation of providers and women seeking access to healthcare, including abortion care and care for incarcerated women, Lift Louisiana has firsthand experience with challenges women face when seeking such care. Lift Louisiana and its staff also have experience commenting on proposed regulations

that target healthcare for women, and it has brought legal challenges to such regulations on grounds that the state agency failed to comply with administrative procedure act requirements. Because this litigation raises many of the same issues that are core to Lift Louisiana's mission and experience, Lift Louisiana has an interest in serving as an amicus in this case.

The **Maine Women's Lobby** advocates for the well-being of Maine women and girls, with a focus on freedom from violence, freedom from discrimination, access to health care, including reproductive health care, and economic security. The ability to control her reproduction is essential to a woman's well-being.

NARAL Pro-Choice America is a national advocacy organization, dedicated since 1969 to supporting and protecting, as a fundamental right and value, a woman's freedom to make personal decisions regarding the full range of reproductive choices through education, organizing, and influencing public policy. NARAL Pro-Choice America works to guarantee every woman the right to make personal decisions regarding the full range of reproductive choices. Ensuring that people can get affordable birth control and have the ability to decide whether, when, and with whom to start or expand their family is crucial to that mission.

NARAL Pro-Choice Oregon is the leading grassroots pro-choice advocacy organization in Oregon. NARAL Pro-Choice Oregon develops and sustains a constituency that uses the political process to guarantee every person who can

become pregnant the right to make personal decisions regarding the full range of reproductive choices, including preventing unintended pregnancy, bearing healthy children, and choosing legal abortion. Because access to contraception is integral to reproductive healthcare and the ability of individuals to decide whether and when to become a parent, NARAL Pro-Choice Oregon seeks to ensure that women receive full benefits of no-cost contraceptive coverage as intended by the Affordable Care Act.

The National Advocates for Pregnant Women (NAPW) is a non-profit organization working to defend and advance the human and civil rights, health and welfare of pregnant and parenting women and people with the capacity for pregnancy. NAPW defends women through legal representation and support in cases throughout the United States, and advocates for policies that protect the health and welfare of pregnant and parenting people and their families.

The **National Asian Pacific American Women's Forum (NAPAWF)** is the only national, multi-issue Asian American and Pacific Islander ("AAPI") women's organization in the country. NAPAWF's mission is to build a movement to advance social justice and human rights for AAPI women, girls, and transgender and gender non-conforming people. NAPAWF approaches all of its work through a reproductive justice framework that seeks for all members of the AAPI community to have the economic, social, and political power to make their own

decisions regarding their bodies, families, and communities. Its work includes advocating for the reproductive health care needs of AAPI women and ensuring AAPI women's access to reproductive health care services. Legal and institutional barriers to reproductive health care disproportionately impact women of color, low-income women, and other marginalized groups. Without legal protection to ensure meaningful, affordable access to basic reproductive health care, including contraception, many AAPI women are left without the crucial health and family planning services that they need to be able to make their own decisions regarding their bodies, families, and communities. Consequently, NAPAWF has a significant interest in ensuring that all people, regardless of their economic circumstances, immigration status, race, gender, sexual orientation, or other social factors, have affordable access to safe and effective contraception.

The National Black Justice Coalition (NBJC) is a civil rights organization dedicated to the empowerment of Black lesbian, gay, bisexual, transgender, queer and same gender loving people, including people living with HIV/AIDS. Because access to contraception is of tremendous significance to all women's health, equality, and economic security, NBJC seeks to ensure that women receive the full benefits of seamless access to no-cost contraceptive coverage as intended by the Affordable Care Act, and has participated as amicus in numerous cases that affect this right.

The National Center for Law and Economic Justice advances the cause of economic justice for low-income families, individuals, and communities. We have worked with low income communities fighting the systemic causes of poverty for more than 50 years. In our work, we often combat injustice and fundamental unfairness in government programs, including those that provide access to health care.

The **National Center for Transgender Equality** is a national social justice organization working for life-saving change for the over 1.5 million transgender Americans and their families. NCTE has seen the harmful impact that discrimination in health care settings has on transgender people and their loved ones, including discrimination based on religious or moral disapproval of who transgender people are, how they live their lives, and their reproductive choices. Discrimination against transgender people in health care—whether it is being turned away from a doctor's office, being denied access to or coverage of basic care, or being mistreated and degraded simply because of one's transgender status—is widespread and creates significant barriers to care, including contraceptive care. NCTE works to ensure that transgender people and other vulnerable communities are protected from discrimination in health care and other settings and have autonomy over their bodies and health care needs.

Founded in 1899, the **National Consumers League (NCL)** is America's

pioneering non-profit consumer advocacy organization. For nearly 120 years, NCL has worked to ensure consumers' access to quality, affordable healthcare. As part of our mission, NCL advocated for passage of the Women's Preventive Services provisions of the Affordable Care Act, including coverage of contraception with no cost-sharing. NCL is committed to ensuring that access to no-cost contraceptive coverage – a necessary component of basic health care for women – is protected.

The National Institute for Reproductive Health (NIRH) is a non-profit advocacy organization working to build a society in which everyone has the freedom and ability to control their reproductive and sexual lives. NIRH promotes its mission by galvanizing public support for access to reproductive health care, including abortion and contraception, and supporting public policy that ensures that women have timely, affordable access to the full range of reproductive health care in their communities.

The National Latina Institute for Reproductive Health (NLIRH) is the only national reproductive justice organization dedicated to advance health, dignity, and justice for 28 million Latinas, their families, and communities in the United States. Through leadership development, community mobilization, policy advocacy, and strategic communications, NLIRH works to ensure that all Latinas are informed about the full range of options for safe and effective forms of contraception and family planning. NLIRH believes that affordable access to

quality contraception and family planning is essential to ensuring that all people, regardless of age or gender identity, can shape their lives and futures.

Since 1973, the **National LGBTQ Task Force** has worked to build power, take action, and create change to achieve freedom and justice for lesbian, gay, bisexual, transgender, and queer ("LGBTQ") people and our families. As a progressive social justice organization, the Task Force works toward a society that values and respects the diversity of human expression and identity and achieves equity for all.

The **National Network to End Domestic Violence (NNEDV)** is a not-for profit organization incorporated in the District of Columbia in 1994 (www.nnedv.org) to end domestic violence. As a network of the 56 state and territorial domestic violence and dual domestic violence sexual assault Coalitions and their over 2,000 member programs, NNEDV serves as the national voice of millions women, children and men victimized by domestic violence. NNEDV is committed to the wide availability of reproductive health care, including low-cost and confidential access to birth control. This is a critical need for survivors of domestic violence to protect their health and safety.

The **National Organization for Women (NOW) Foundation** is a 501 (c)(3) entity affiliated with the National Organization for Women, the largest grassroots feminist activist organization in the United States with chapters in every

state and the District of Columbia. Since its inception, NOW Foundation's goals have included advocating for improved access to the full range of reproductive health services for all women, no matter where they work or what their income level may be. NOW Foundation is opposed to any policy or regulatory provision that reduce women's access to reproductive health care services.

The National Partnership for Women & Families (National Partnership), formerly the Women's Legal Defense Fund, is a national advocacy organization that develops and promotes policies to help women achieve equal opportunity, quality health care, and economic security for themselves and their families. Since its founding in 1971, the National Partnership has worked to advance women's health, reproductive rights, and equal employment opportunities through several means, including by challenging discriminatory policies in the courts.

The National Women's Health Network (NWHN) improves the health of all women by influencing public policy and providing health information to support decision-making by individual consumers. Founded in 1975 to give women a greater voice within the health care system, NWHN aspires to create systems guided by social justice that reflect the needs of women in all their diversities. NWHN is committed to ensuring that women have self-determination in all aspects of their reproductive and sexual health and establishing universal

access to health care. NWHN is a membership-based organization supported by thousands of individuals and organizations nationwide.

The **National Women's Law Center** is a non-profit legal advocacy organization dedicated to the advancement and protection of women's legal rights and opportunities since its founding in 1972. The Center focuses on issues of key importance to women and their families, including economic security, employment, education, health, and reproductive rights, with special attention to the needs of low-income women and those who face multiple and intersecting forms of discrimination. Because access to contraception is of tremendous significance to women's health, equality, and economic security, the Center seeks to ensure that women receive the full benefits of seamless access to contraceptive coverage without cost-sharing as intended by the Affordable Care Act and has participated as amicus in numerous cases that affect this right.

New Voices for Reproductive Justice is a Human Rights and Reproductive Justice advocacy organization with a mission to build a social change movement dedicated to the full health and well-being of Black women, femmes, and girls in Pennsylvania and Ohio. New Voices defines Reproductive Justice as the human right of all people to have full agency over their bodies, gender identity and expression, sexuality, work, reproduction and the ability to form families. Since 2004, the organization has served over 75,000 women of color and LGBTQIA+

people of color through community organizing, grassroots activism, civic engagement, youth mentorship, leadership development, culture change, public policy advocacy, and political education. In November of 2017, New Voices was instrumental in the passage of a Will of Council in the City of Pittsburgh calling on state and federal officials to ensure equitable access to a full range of reproductive health services, including contraception. This call to action exemplifies crucial recognition of the fact that unhindered access to comprehensive reproductive healthcare is fundamental to the health and well being of our families and communities. New Voices stands in staunch opposition to discriminatory laws, policies, rules, and actions that deny people access to contraception. These barriers disproportionately harm women of color, gender nonconforming people and low-income women. All people should have access to a full range of reproductive health care, including contraceptive coverage through health insurance, free from outside interference.

Nurses for Sexual and Reproductive Health provides students, nurses and midwives with education and resources to become skilled care providers and social change agents in sexual and reproductive health and justice. As providers, we know healthcare coverage is essential to our patients' ability to access safe and compassionate care. We also know that contraception is a part of sexual and reproductive care, which we assert is vital to the health and well-being of our

patients.

The **Oklahoma Call for Reproductive Justice**, founded as a 501(c)4 in 2010, is a statewide grassroots coalition of organizations and individuals focusing on the advancement of reproductive health, rights and justice in Oklahoma. OCRJ peruses its mission through legislative advocacy, community outreach and education, and litigation. We believe that reproductive justice includes the right to have or not to have a child and respect for families in all their forms. It supports access to sexual education, contraception, abortion care and pregnancy care as well as to the resources needed to raise children in safe and healthy circumstances, with good schools and healthcare and other elements necessary for bright futures regardless of immigration status. It encompasses respect for all individuals, their partners and families, and for sexuality and for gender differences.

Population Connection is a grassroots non-profit organization committed to ensuring that every woman and family has access to the full range of contraceptive methods as a preventive service as intended by the Affordable Care Act.

Raising Women's Voices for the Health Care We Need (RWV) is a national initiative working to ensure that the health care needs of women and families are addressed as the Affordable Care Act is implemented. It has a diverse network of thirty grassroots health advocacy organizations in twenty-nine states.

RWV has a special mission of engaging women who are not often invited into health policy discussions: women of color, low-income women, immigrant women, young women, and members of the lesbian, gay, bisexual, transgender, and queer community.

The **Reproductive Health Access Project** is a national nonprofit organization dedicated to training and supporting clinicians to make reproductive health care accessible to everyone, everywhere in the United States. We focus on three key areas: abortion, contraception, and management of early pregnancy loss. Our work focuses on integrating full-spectrum reproductive health care in primary care settings and we are guided by the belief that everyone should be able to access basic health care, including contraceptive care, from their primary care clinician.

The **Sargent Shriver National Center on Poverty Law** has a vision of a nation free from poverty with justice, equity and opportunity for all. The Shriver Center provides national leadership to promote justice and improve the lives and opportunities of people with low income, by advancing laws and policies, through litigation and policy advocacy, to achieve justice for our clients. The Shriver Center is committed to the health and economic security and advancement of women and recognizes the importance of access to contraception to achieve those ends. The Shriver Center seeks to ensure that women receive the full benefits of

seamless access to no-cost contraceptive coverage as intended by the Affordable Care Act.

The **Sexuality Information and Education Council of the United States (SIECUS)** has served as the national voice for sex education, sexual health, and sexual rights for over 50 years. SIECUS asserts that sexuality is a fundamental part of being human, one worthy of dignity and respect. We advocate for the rights of all people to accurate information, comprehensive sexuality education, and the full spectrum of sexual and reproductive health services. SIECUS works to create a world that ensures social justice inclusive of sexual and reproductive rights, and we view comprehensive sexuality education as a vehicle for social change. SIECUS envisions an equitable nation where all people receive comprehensive sexuality education and quality sexual and reproductive health services affirming their identities, thereby ensuring their lifelong health and well-being. Specifically, access to contraceptive care is vital to SIECUS's mission, and SIECUS has participated in several amicus briefs impacting the right to contraceptive coverage.

Founded in July 1989, **SisterLove, Inc.** is an HIV/AIDS and reproductive justice nonprofit service organization focusing on women, particularly women of African descent. SisterLove's mission is to eradicate the adverse impact of HIV/AIDS and other sexual and reproductive oppressions upon all women, their families, and their communities in the United States and worldwide through

education, prevention, support, and human rights advocacy. To realize this mission, SisterLove engages in advocacy, reproductive health education, and prevention. SisterLove seeks to educate and empower youth and women of color to influence the laws and policies that disparately impact them.

SisterReach, founded October 2011, is a non-profit reproductive justice organization that advocates for the human rights of women and teens of color, poor and rural women, LGBT+ people and their families in Tennessee. Reproductive Justice is a human rights framework coined by black women, centering the reproductive health and wellness of women, girls and individuals. Our mission is to empower our base to lead healthy lives, raise healthy families and live in healthy and sustainable communities. We do our work from a 3-pronged strategy of education, policy & advocacy, and culture change work.

Women of color do not need additional obstacles to obtaining the care we need to take care of ourselves and our families. We trust Black women to make our own decisions. **SisterSong: National Women of Color Reproductive Justice Collective** will speak out about any attempts to push important services out of reach.

SPARK Reproductive Justice Now! believes that access to birth control is essential to the economic security of all families and it is an important part of comprehensive reproductive healthcare.

UltraViolet is a powerful and rapidly growing community of people mobilized to fight sexism and create a more inclusive world that accurately represents all women, from politics and government to media and pop culture. We work on a range of issues—reproductive rights, healthcare, economic security, violence, and racial justice—and we center the voices of all women, especially women of color, immigrants, and LGBTQ women. UltraViolet exists to create a cost for sexism and to achieve full equity for all women through culture and policy change. We fight attacks against women and work toward a proactive vision of what equality looks like for women. We demand accountability from individuals, the media, and institutions that perpetuate sexist narratives or seek to limit the rights, safety, and economic security of women.

URGE: Unite for Reproductive & Gender Equity (URGE) is a non-profit grassroots advocacy organization that works to mobilize young people through a reproductive justice framework. URGE builds infrastructure through campus chapters and city activist networks, where we invite individuals to discover their own power and transform it into action. URGE members educate their communities and advocate for local, state, and national policies around issues of reproductive justice and sexual health.

The **Women's Institute for Freedom of the Press** is a non-profit media democracy organization dedicated to the advancement and protection of women's

rights and voices since its founding in 1972. WIFP focuses on issues of importance to women and all those who do not have full rights. Without control over their health and well-being, women cannot fully participate in democracy. Women need access to no-cost contraceptive coverage as intended by the Affordable Care Act and therefore WIFP supports this amicus brief.

The **Women's Media Center** is an inclusive and feminist organization that works to make women and girls visible and powerful. To challenge sexism, shape public and government discourse and policies affecting women, and provide gender-specific analysis and solutions, women need to be involved in all sectors of society and have equal opportunities. We oppose policies that limit women's ability to participate equally in all sectors and that impose economic, racial, health, and civil rights costs on women that are on the basis of sex.

The **Women's Rights and Empowerment Network** (WREN) is a nonpartisan nonprofit organization whose mission is to build a movement to advance the health, economic well-being, and rights of South Carolina's women, girls and their families. WREN recognizes that the health and education of women and children is crucial in order to ensure statewide prosperity. We advocate for policies that address the barriers that families, predominantly women and mothers, face when accessing the rights and resources needed to make healthy and well informed decisions. Access to contraception is of tremendous significance to

women's health, equality, and economic security. WREN seeks to ensure that women receive the full benefits of seamless access to no-cost contraceptive coverage as intended by the Affordable Care Act, and has advocated for this at the state and national level.

Women With A Vision, Inc. (WWAV) is a community-based non-profit, founded in 1989 by a grassroots collective of African-American women in response to the spread of HIV/AIDS in communities of color. Created by and for women of color, WWAV is a social justice non-profit that addresses issues faced by women within our community and region. Major areas of focus include Sex Worker Rights, Drug Policy Reform, HIV Positive Women's Advocacy, and Reproductive Justice outreach. We envision an environment in which there is no war against women's bodies, in which women have spaces to come together and share their stories, in which women are empowered to make decisions concerning their own bodies and lives, and in which women have the necessary support to realize their hopes, dreams, and full potential. As such, we know that when women do not have bodily autonomy, including access to safe birth control methods, they face many barriers and obstacles to reaching their full potential. We believe that their bodies are their own and should be supported by policy, healthy communities, and social services that support bettering their lived experiences.

WV FREE is a non-profit health, rights, and justice organization dedicated

to the elevation of all West Virginians through the promotion of dignity and autonomy of women and families since its founding in 1989. WV FREE focuses on issues of key importance to women and their families, including economic security, employment, education, health, and reproductive rights, with special attention to the needs of rural women, women of color, and low-income women. Because access to contraception is of tremendous significance to women's health, equality, and economic security, WV FREE seeks to ensure that women receive the full benefits of seamless access to no-cost contraceptive coverage as intended by the Affordable Care Act.