Comments of Whitman-Walker Health on the Notice of Proposed Rulemaking

Whitman-Walker Clinic, Inc., dba Whitman-Walker Health (WWH or Whitman-Walker), submits these comments on the Proposed Rule published on January 26, 2018, 83 Fed. Reg. 3880. The Proposed Rule’s sweeping language ventures far beyond the actual scope of the federal laws that it purports to enforce. HHS appears to be endorsing discriminatory behavior by health care workers, motivated by their personal beliefs, that would be corrosive of fundamental professional standards and would threaten our patients’ welfare and Whitman-Walker’s ability to fulfill our mission. We urge that the Proposed Rule be withdrawn, or at a minimum, that it be modified to make clear that no endorsement is intended of discrimination in health care against lesbian, gay, bisexual, transgender and queer persons – or any discrimination based on the race, ethnicity, gender, disability status or religion of patients.

Interest of Whitman-Walker Health

Whitman-Walker is a Federally Qualified Health Center serving the greater Washington, DC metropolitan area, with a distinctive mission. As our Mission Statement declares:

Whitman-Walker Health offers affirming community-based health and wellness services to all with a special expertise in LGBTQ and HIV care. We empower all persons to live healthy, love openly, and achieve equality and inclusion.

Our patient population is quite diverse and reflects our commitment to be a health home for individuals and families that have experienced stigma and discrimination, and have otherwise encountered challenges in obtaining affordable, high-quality health care. In calendar year 2017, we provided health-related services to more than 20,000 unique individuals. Of our medical and
behavioral health patients, approximately 40% identified themselves as Black; approximately 40% identified themselves as White; and approximately 18% identified themselves as Hispanic. More than one-half identified their sexual orientation as gay, lesbian, bisexual or otherwise non-heterosexual. Approximately 8% identified themselves as transgender or gender-nonconforming. Our patients also are quite diverse economically; in 2017 approximately 35% of our medical and behavioral health patients reported annual income of less than the Federal Poverty Level, and another 12% reported income of 100 – 200% of the FPL.

Since the mid-1980s, Whitman-Walker’s Legal Services Department has provided a wide range of civil legal assistance to our patients and to others in the community living with HIV or identifying as sexual or gender minorities. Through their work, our attorneys have broad and deep experience with HIV, sexual orientation and gender identity discrimination in health care, employment, education, housing and public services. In 2017, approximately one-half of the more than 3,000 individuals who received legal assistance, or assistance with public benefit programs, identified as gay, lesbian, bisexual or otherwise non-heterosexual, and 18% identified as transgender or gender-nonconforming.

As would be expected given our very diverse community, Whitman-Walker’s patient population and legal clients also subscribe to a wide range of religious faiths.

Consistent with our commitment to welcoming and nondiscriminatory health care, our growing work force is very diverse. We currently have almost 270 employees at five sites in Washington, DC. More than 55% of our employees identify as people of color, and more than 55% are women. Although we of course do not require employees to identify their sexual orientation or gender identity, substantial numbers of our staff are sexual and gender minorities.
And while we do not collect data on employee religious beliefs or practices, our work force includes a wide range of religious beliefs and practices, as well as a wide range of non-religious beliefs and philosophies.

The diversity of our patient population, legal clients and work force all reflect our commitment to inclusive, welcoming and nondiscriminatory health care of the highest quality, with a special focus on persons who fear, or who have experienced, the lack of such care elsewhere. The Proposed Rule’s sweeping language and lack of specificity are of great concern; they appear to endorse discriminatory behavior, motivated by personal beliefs, that would be corrosive of fundamental professional standards and would threaten our patients’ health and welfare and Whitman-Walker’s mission.

**The Proposed Rule’s Sweeping, Overbroad Language Threatens Great Harm to Our National Health Care System, and Particularly to Mission-Driven Health Systems Such as Whitman-Walker, and to LGBTQ Individuals and Families and Others Particularly at Risk of Discrimination**

The Proposed Rule announces the intention of HHS’ Office for Civil Rights to vigorously enforce a number of federal statutes that protect conscience rights under limited circumstances. Most of these statutes delineate the rights of health care providers, in certain circumstances, to decline to perform specific procedures without retaliation: abortion; procedures intended to result in sterilization; and medical interventions intended to end a patient’s life. Several of the statutes pertain to the right of certain religious institutions to provide religiously-oriented, non-medical health care to their members. Other statutes delineate the right of certain health plans to participate in Medicaid or Medicare while declining to cover certain services, provided adequate notice is provided to their members. Other statutes address the right of patients (not providers) or the parents of minors to decline certain health-related screenings, vaccinations or treatments.
The Proposed Rule, however, contains broad language that appears to sweep far beyond these limited circumstances, and implies that persons working in a health care field have a general right to decline to provide care for any reason, moral or religious, or for no articulable reason at all. See, e.g., proposed Section 88.1 (Purpose) and Appendix A (mandatory notice to employees) to 45 C.F.R., 83 Fed. Reg. at 3931, declaring a broad, undefined right to accommodation for any religious or moral belief. See also 83 Fed. Reg. at 3881, 3887-89, 3903, which discusses at length the “problem” of health care workers being legally or professionally compelled to meet patient needs regardless of their personal beliefs. Moreover, HHS’ public pronouncements about the new Conscience and Religious Freedom Division within OCR, and encouraging health care workers to file complaints, send a message that health care workers’ personal beliefs prevail over their duties to patients. E.g.,


https://www.hhs.gov/conscience/conscience-protections/index.html (“Conscience Protections for Health Care Providers”) The statutes in question do not support these declarations of a general health care provider “right” to deny needed care.

The potentially harmful reach of the Proposed Rule is exacerbated by an overbroad, legally unsupported interpretation of what constitutes “assisting in the performance” of an objected-to medical procedure. The proposed definition – “to participate in any program or activity with an articulable connection to a procedure, health service, health program, or research activity …. [i]nclud[ing] but … not limited to counseling, referral, training, and other arrangements for the procedure, health service, health program, or research activity” (Section
88.2, 83 Fed. Reg. at 3923) – is so broad that it might authorize an individual in any health care-related job to decline to provide information or any assistance whatever to someone seeking care to which they may object. The problem is compounded by the broad definition of a protected refusal to provide a “referral” as “includ[ing] the provision of any information … by any method … pertaining to a health care service, activity, or procedure … that could provide any assistance in a person obtaining … a particular health care service ….” Section 88.2, 83 Fed. Reg. at 3924.

A sweeping interpretation of “conscience protection” rights for persons working in health care could have far-reaching consequences. Does HHS intend to countenance, for instance:

- Refusal to provide assistance to a same-sex couple with a sick child because of an objection to same-sex parenting?

- Refusal to even provide information to an individual questioning their gender identity on their possible options, or places where they might get the information or support they need?

- Refusal to provide help to a sick woman or man who is, or is thought to be Muslim because of a health care worker’s aversion to Islam?

- Refusal to provide assistance to an individual struggling with an opioid addiction because of a conviction that the addiction is the result of sin or the patient’s moral failings?

- Refusal to help an individual diagnosed with HIV or Hepatitis C because of moral or religious disapproval of the way that the individual acquired (or is assumed to have acquired) the infection – namely, sex or injection drug use?

The dangers to LGBTQ persons needing health care are particularly grave. Many studies and medical authorities have documented the persistence of biases – explicit or implicit – against LGBTQ persons among many health care workers at every level – from physicians, nurses and other licensed providers to front-desk staff. LGBTQ persons continue to encounter stigma and discrimination in virtually every health care setting, including hospitals, outpatient clinics,
private doctors’ offices, rehabilitation centers, and nursing homes. Transgender and gender-nonconforming persons are particularly at risk of substandard care or outright refusals of care. In this regard, it is particularly disturbing that the Proposed Rule offers, as an example of the “ills” it seeks to address, a lawsuit against a surgeon and hospital for refusing to perform a hysterectomy on a transgender man because of the patient’s transgender status. 83 Fed. Reg. at 3888 n.36, 3889, citing Minton v. Dignity Health, No. 17–558259 (Calif. Super. Ct. Apr. 19, 2017). Statutes that provide limited protection for health care providers who object to performing sterilization procedures on religious or moral grounds provide no justification for denying a medically indicated treatment of any kind – surgical, hormonal or other – to a transgender person. Suggesting otherwise is to encourage the gender identity discrimination that already is too prevalent.

Messaging that health care workers are legally entitled to refuse or restrict care, based on their personal religious or moral beliefs, flies in the face of the standards and ethics of every health care profession, and would sow confusion and undermine the entire health care system. Health care is a fundamentally patient-oriented endeavor. With limited exceptions explicitly recognized in the statutes referenced in the Proposed Rule, the personal beliefs of health care workers are irrelevant to the performance of their jobs. A broad notion of a right to avoid “complicity” in medical procedures, lifestyles, or actions of other people with which one might personally disagree, which disregards the harm that might result to others, is legally, morally and politically unsupportable, particularly in a society like ours which encompasses, and encourages, a diversity of religious beliefs, cultures and philosophies. In health care, a sweeping right to “avoid complicity” is fundamentally corrosive. Encouraging employees of hospitals, health
systems, clinics, nursing homes and physician offices to express and act on their individual beliefs, in our religiously and morally diverse nation, would invite chaos, consume health care institutions with litigation, and result in denial of adequate care to uncounted numbers of people – particularly racial and ethnic minorities and LGBTQ people. No hospital, clinic or other health care entity or office could function in such an environment.

The impact of a broad, legally unsupported expansion of health care worker refusal rights on Whitman-Walker and our patients would be particularly drastic. Providing welcoming, high-quality care to the LGBTQ community and to persons affected by HIV is at the core of our mission. These are communities which are in particular need of affirming, culturally competent care because of the widespread stigma and discrimination they have experienced and continue to experience. We strive to message to all our staff that one’s personal religious and moral views are irrelevant to our mission and to patient needs. It would be very difficult if not impossible for us to accommodate individual health care staff who might object to, e.g., transgender care, or counseling and assisting pregnant clients with their pregnancy termination options, or harm-reduction care for substance abusers, or care for lesbian, gay or bisexual patients – without fundamentally compromising our mission and the quality of patient care. Many of our LGBTQ patients and patients with HIV have experienced substantial stigma and discrimination and are very sensitive to being welcomed or not welcomed in a health care setting. If they encounter discrimination at WWH from any staff person at any point, our reputation as a safe and welcoming place would be undermined. There are multiple “patient touches” in our system as in any health care system: from the staff person answering the phone or sitting at the front desk to
the physician to the pharmacy worker. Each of those touches can promote or undermine patient health – can convey respect and affirmation or disrespect and rejection.

Moreover, in our diverse workforce, encouraging individual employees to think that their personal beliefs can prevail over their duties to patients – and to their fellow employees – would introduce confusion and discord into our staff as well as pose barriers to patient care. The harm to our operations, finances and employee morale would be particularly complicated because we, like many health care entities, have a quasi-unionized workforce. Attempts to accommodate, for instance, one employee’s unwillingness to work with transgender patients, or patients perceived to be gay, or Muslim patients, or persons with opioid addiction, would impose burdens on other staff, and likely would result in grievances filed by other employees. We would incur substantial financial costs and drains on staff time that would substantially challenge our ability to care for a growing patient load. There would also be increased pressure to ascertain whether job applicants will be unwilling to perform essential job functions, which seems likely to undermine our philosophy, which is to foster a diverse workforce.

In addition, there is every reason to believe that the Proposed Rule, and HHS’ overly broad messaging of its legal authority, would result in increased discrimination against LGBTQ people and people with HIV at other health care centers and providers, outside Whitman-Walker. Biased attitudes towards LGBTQ people are still widespread but have tended to be more restrained or repressed due to changing social norms in some places. HHS messaging about the conscience rights of health care workers, particularly if not narrowly confined to specific procedures identified in the authorizing statutes, threatens to stimulate a sharp increase in those attitudes, which will have significant negative impacts on individual and public health. Fear of
discrimination among LGBTQ people would also increase. Whitman-Walker’s health care providers – particularly our counselors, psychiatrists and other behavioral health staff – have many patients who have experienced traumatic stigma and discrimination – based on sexual orientation, gender identity, HIV status, race/ethnicity, and/or other factors. The creation of the new OCR Conscience and Religious Freedom Division, and HHS messaging to date, is causing increased fear and anxiety among our patients and in the LGBTQ community generally.

Escalating health care discrimination, and escalating fear of such discrimination, would result in increased demand for Whitman-Walker’s services. Such increased demand would present considerable financial challenges. Many of our services to current patients lose money, due to third-party reimbursement rates and indirect cost reimbursement rates in contracts and grants which are substantially less than our cost of service. Substantially increased demand for our services, driven by increased discrimination and fear of discrimination outside Whitman-Walker, would exacerbate that pressure.
Conclusion

For the above reasons, Whitman-Walker Health requests that the Proposed Rule be withdrawn. At a minimum, HHS should substantially modify the Rule to make clear that it does not permit discrimination in health care against lesbian, gay, bisexual, transgender and queer persons – or any discrimination based on the race, ethnicity, gender, disability status or religion of any patient.
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