



# Policy Brief 13

RETHINKING POLICY ON GENDER, SEXUALITY, AND WOMEN'S ISSUES

## UNIVERSAL ACCESS TO CONTRACEPTIVES UNDER COVERED CALIFORNIA WILL IMPROVE WOMEN'S REPRODUCTIVE HEALTH

BY KAREN LAI

*It is essential that the women's preventive coverage benefit, including contraception, be available to all women, regardless of what health plan they have or where they work—as Congress intended. Providing access to birth control just makes good sense.*

— Gwen Moore, U.S. Representative

BY KAREN LAI

# UNIVERSAL ACCESS TO CONTRACEPTIVES UNDER COVERED CALIFORNIA WILL IMPROVE WOMEN'S REPRODUCTIVE HEALTH

*The high percentage of unintended pregnancy in the United States<sup>1</sup> has been a catalyst for Healthy People 2020's goal to increase contraceptive-related insurance coverage.<sup>2</sup> In addition, 2010 Affordable Care Act (ACA) includes a mandate that state-based health insurance exchanges offer insurance coverage of FDA-approved contraceptives without extra costs to the enrollee. Nevertheless, the expansion of contraceptive coverage does not equate to full access, especially for low-income women. As the state with the greatest need for affordable access to contraceptives<sup>3</sup> and the leader in planning a health benefit exchange (Covered California), California has the unique opportunity to improve the reproductive health of low-income women nationwide.*

**T**O ENSURE EQUITABLE AND TIMELY ACCESS, the Covered California Board must re-align systems and policies and provide proactive guidance, monitoring, and responsiveness to the needs of this vulnerable population throughout the health exchange process. California currently faces a critical crossroads in setting Covered California policies. Because California has a long history of leading social welfare initiatives, Covered California represents an opportunity for California to prioritize and impact the reproductive health of women across the U.S. by setting the standard for care.

## CRITIQUE

Access to contraceptives is a significant public health problem. Compared to men, women suffer a greater financial burden. Not only do women disproportionately earn less money overall, they utilize more preventive, especially reproductive, services.<sup>4</sup> Unsurprisingly, 43% of U.S. women report cost as a barrier to receiving preventive services and filling prescriptions.<sup>5</sup> Irregular or delayed access to contraceptive services predisposes these women to

unintended pregnancies, which are associated with pregnancy complications, poorer maternal and infant health outcomes, and \$11 billion of taxpayer funds annually.<sup>6</sup>

The link between unintended pregnancies and poor health outcomes becomes particularly clear with low-income women. Their income status places them at higher risk of both unintended pregnancies and irregular and less health care.<sup>7</sup>

This translates into unmanaged chronic diseases and delayed prenatal care, which raise their risks of poor outcomes.<sup>8</sup> In California in 2006, almost 2.4 million women, an increase of



**Created under the Federal Patient Protection and Affordable Care Act, Covered California is the online marketplace where residents of California can view coverage options. "CoveredCA.com" is the website address.**



**Irregular or delayed access to contraceptive services predisposes women with lower or inconsistent incomes to unintended pregnancies, which are associated with pregnancy complications, poorer maternal and infant health outcomes, and \$11 billion of taxpayer funds annually.**

13% from 2000, were in need of publicly funded family planning services, but only 55% received them.<sup>9</sup> The need and health disparities associated with limited accessibility and affordability of contraceptives are therefore significant on a population scale.

California policy decisions critically affect contraceptive access: By 2014, this vulnerable population will theoretically receive greater coverage and access to contraceptive services through Covered California. Under Covered California, approximately one million newly insured Californian women will qualify for federal subsidies because of their income status (133%-400% of the Federal Poverty Level).<sup>10</sup>

However, insufficient knowledge, continuity of care and policies, and provider networks effectively impact access. In Massachusetts, under a similar system of mandated individual health insurance coverage combined with standardized health plans, women continued to report problems with receiving services, in particular contraceptives.<sup>11</sup> Their relatively inconsistent incomes<sup>12</sup> predisposed them to frequent changes in insurance eligibility and coverage without accompanying guidance on coverage policies, including maintaining coverage or keeping their provider.<sup>13</sup> Transitioning between insurance programs may affect women's access to their usual providers and/or providers who offer a comprehensive range of contraceptive services. Whether due to cost concerns, religious convictions, or funding sources, different

providers may offer different contraceptive services. Nationally, for instance, office-based providers offer significantly less comprehensive contraceptive options than publicly funded family planning clinics.<sup>14</sup> And in California, Catholic hospitals, which comprise approximately 16% of California hospitals,<sup>15</sup> likely offer even less. Taken together, these factors may lead to disproportionate coverage, access, and availability gaps in contraceptive services for low-income women in Covered California.

## RECOMMENDATIONS

Given these problems with knowledge, continuity of care, and provider variability, the Covered California Board should seize this opportunity to establish reproductive health access standards:

- Emphasize a clear, user-friendly web portal targeted towards previously uninsured enrollees and those transitioning between different programs, such as between Medi-Cal and Covered California.
- Strategically position *navigators* (enrollment helpers) to focus resources on the most unreached and/or high-risk communities.
- Train navigators, and recommend similar training for family planning centers (which 60% of women who use family planning consider their primary-care source<sup>16</sup>), in how to help women transition into coverage and receive appropriate care.
- Align coverage policies and provider networks between programs, like Medi-Cal and Covered California.
- Proactively monitor, measure, and act from outcomes of standards such as out-of-network provider standards.

Each of these recommendations will require proactive leadership from the Covered California Board and dedicated collaboration with other decision-makers. However, it is only by committing upfront to aligning universal access with coverage that Covered California can leverage its influence to shape the health of women across the state and the nation.

*Karen Lai is an M.P.H. candidate in the Department of Health Policy and Management in the Fielding School of Public Health at UCLA. She is also pursuing a M.D. and hopes to work in the area of child and adolescent mental health. She is interested in learning about and changing the course of the development of mental disorders not only from a pathophysiological standpoint but also from a public health, systems-based perspective. Through her courses at UCLA, she has become more cognizant of and passionate*

about influencing, through research and policy, the various social conditions that shape the well-being of children and families. Opportunities to develop hands-on public health experiences, such as field work in integrating mental and physical health systems in public schools, as well as those to sharpen her policy writing and analysis skills, both reflect and shape her career interests in advocacy, research, and clinical work for children and families.

PHOTO CREDITS: page 1: sandoclr, iStockphoto.com; page 3: Dmitry Kalinovsky, Shutterstock.com

## NOTES

1. Disparities in rates of unintended pregnancy in the United States, 1994 and 2001. Finer, L.B., Henshaw, S.K. *Perspectives on Sexual and Reproductive Health*, volume 38, issue 2, pages 90-96, 2006.
2. *Healthy People 2020: Topics & Objectives*. U.S. Department of Health and Human Services. 2011. <http://www.healthypeople.gov/2020/default.aspx>. Accessed August 13, 2013.
3. *Contraceptive Needs and Services*. Frost, JJ, Zolna, MR and Frohwirth, L. Guttmacher Institute, July, 2010. <http://www.guttmacher.org/pubs/win/contraceptive-needs-2010.pdf>. Accessed August 13, 2013.
4. Gender Differences in the Utilization of Health Care Services. Bertakis, KD et al., *Journal of Family Practice*, volume 49, issue 2, pages 147-152. 2000; The cost of being a woman—a national study of health care utilization and expenditures for female-specific conditions. Kjerulff, K.H., et al., *Womens Health Issues*, volume 17, issue 1, pages 13-21. 2007; *Women's Health Research: Progress, Pitfalls, and Promise*. Committee on Women's Health Research; Institute of Medicine. National Academies Press. 2010. Who is at greatest risk for receiving poor-quality health care? Asch, S.M., et al., *New England Journal of Medicine* volume 354, issue, 11, pages 1147-1156; utilization of ambulatory medical care by women: United States, 1997-98, *Vital and Health Statistics*, 2001. U.S. Department of Health and Human Services,
5. Increased ambulatory care copayments and hospitalizations among the elderly, Trivedi, A.N., et al., *New England Journal of Medicine* volume 362, issue 4, pages 320-328; *Oceans Apart: The Higher Health Costs of Women in the U.S. Compared to Other Nations, and How Reform Is Helping*, Robertson, R., et al., The Commonwealth Fund, July 2012.
6. Preconception and interconception health status of women who recently gave birth to live-born infant—Pregnancy Risk Assessment Monitoring System (PRAMS), United States, 26 Reporting Areas, 2004, D'Angelo, D, et al., *Morbidity and Mortality Weekly Report Surveillance Summaries*, December 14, 2007, pages 4 and 17; The public costs of births resulting from unintended pregnancies: national and state-level estimates, perspectives on sexual and

- reproductive health, Sonfield, A., et al., Guttmacher Institute volume 43, issue 2, pages 94-102, June, 2011.
7. Disparities in rates of unintended pregnancy in the United States, 1994 and 2001, Finer, L.B., Henshaw, S.K., *Perspectives on Sexual and Reproductive Health* volume 38, issue 2, pages 90-96, 2006.
  8. Maternal mortality in the United States: a human rights failure, Bingham, D., et al., *Contraception* volume 83, pages 189-193, 2011.
  9. *Contraceptive Needs and Services*, Guttmacher Institute, 2006, 2009.
  - 10 *Impact of Health Reform on Women's Access to Coverage and Care*, Kaiser Family Foundation, April, 2012.
  11. Access to contraception after health care reform in massachusetts: a mixed-methods study investigating benefits and barriers, Dennis, A., et al., *Contraception* volume 85, 166-172, 2012.
  12. Massachusetts Health Reform: Impact on Women's Health, Hyams, T., and Cohen, L., Connors Center for Women's Health and Gender Biology, June 2010; *Women and Health Reform in Massachusetts Issue Brief*, Sered, S., Suffolk University, 2008.
  13. *Low-Income Women's Access to Contraception after Massachusetts Health Care Reform*, Ibis Reproductive Health and Massachusetts Department of Public Health Family Planning Program, September 2009.
  14. Contraceptive methods available to patients of office-based physicians and Title X clinics –United States, 2009-2010, Centers for Disease Control and Prevention, *Morbidity and Mortality Weekly Report*, January 14, page 1, 2011.
  15. *California Catholic Health Care: Snapshot Pamphlet*, Alliance of Catholic Health Care, <http://www.thealliance.net/docs/Alliance%20Snapshot%20Pamphlet.pdf> URL accessed August 28, 2013.
  16. *Protect Access to Family Planning for the Poor and Low-Income: Defeat Attempts to Cut Title X Funding*, National Family Planning & Reproductive Health Association, June, 2011.

For more information on CSW Policy Briefs, visit <http://www.csw.ucla.edu/publications/policy-briefs>. CSW Policy Briefs are also available at the California Digital Library: <http://escholarship.org/uc/csw>

UCLA CENTER FOR THE STUDY OF WOMEN  
Box 957222/Public Policy Bldg 1500  
Los Angeles, CA 90095-7222  
310 825 0590 • [cswpubs@csw.ucla.edu](mailto:cswpubs@csw.ucla.edu)

DIRECTOR: Kathleen McHugh