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Introduction

“Justice is what love looks like in public” is an oft-quoted statement from Cornell West that has become a catchphrase for the transgender rights movement.² No truer words could be spoken in regards to the treatment of transgender individuals in the United States, particularly in the realm of health care access. Few groups have faced as many limitations and instances of injustice in access to health treatment and coverage. The transgender community is one of the most vulnerable and underserved

² See id. (explaining the transgender movement’s use of the Cornell West quote).
populations in the American Health Care system. Few groups confront as many barriers to health care as transgender patients. Transgender individuals are frequently denied access to health services because of their gender identity or expression, and many frequently report feeling harassed in medical offices and hospitals. Those who are able to locate transgender-favorable care often find they cannot access services due to lack of financial resources or insurance. Some transgender individuals face additional hurdles if they wish to undergo transition-related care, because most insurance policies exclude coverage for gender-confirming interventions and surgeries. Transition-related health care includes the use of psychotherapy, hormone therapy, and/or surgical procedures for treating the psychological diagnosis of gender dysphoria. An overwhelming majority of medical authority recognizes transition-related care as an effective and medically necessary treatment for gender dysphoria. Yet many providers and insurance companies refuse to treat or recognize the necessity of transition-related care. Further, the transgender population’s lack of access to care is even more striking when one considers the group’s


4. See JAMIE M. GRANT ET AL., NAT’L CTR. FOR TRANSGENDER EQUALITY & NAT’L GAY & LESBIAN TASK FORCE, INJUSTICE AT EVERY TURN: A REPORT OF THE NATIONAL TRANSGENDER DISCRIMINATION SURVEY, EXECUTIVE SUMMARY 73–74 (2011), available at http://www.endtransdiscrimination.org/PDFs/NTDS_Report.pdf (reporting that 19% of a national sample of transgender individuals had been refused care by a medical provider due to their transgender or gender-nonconforming status; 28% of respondents experienced verbal harassment in a medical setting; 2% were physically attacked in a doctor’s office).

5. Id.

6. See id. at 77 (noting that high costs render care inaccessible to most transgender people).


8. See id. at 5 (describing medical treatment options for gender dysphoria as medically necessary for many transgender individuals); see also Am. Med. House of Delegates, Res. No. 114, Removing Barriers to Care for Transgender Patients (June 16, 2008), available at http://www.tgender.net/taw/ama_resolutions.pdf (recognizing the World Professional Association for Transgender Health (WPATH) as the leading international, interdisciplinary professional organization devoted to the understanding and treatment of gender identity disorders).
JUSTICE IS WHAT LOVE LOOKS LIKE IN PUBLIC

In the past two years, LGBT Americans have witnessed improvements in their rights. The Patient Protection and Affordable Care Act (ACA)\(^9\) and the Supreme Court’s decision in United States v. Windsor\(^{11}\) have both significantly changed rights of access to health care and federal benefits for the LGBT community. The ACA is the most sweeping change in the United States Health Care system since the passage of the Medicaid and Medicare statutes in 1965.\(^{12}\) In restructuring the health care system, the ACA creates a platform to improve access to medical care for the LGBT community and importantly, transgender individuals. Specifically, the ACA creates a means to secure explicit protections for gender confirming care and gender-confirming procedures. The ACA also puts an end to years of discriminatory insurance practices that have isolated and harmed LGBT individuals. But the ACA falls short in two areas: coverage and access for same-sex partners and transgender discrimination. This is not to say that health care access for the LGBT community has not been improved, but the American health care system has a long way to go, particularly in regards to healthcare access for transgender individuals.

This Note examines the current landscape of transgender health care, the changes sparked by the implementation of the ACA and the effect of Windsor, as well as the shortcomings in the ACA’s treatment of transgender healthcare access. Part I provides a background on Transgender and LGB health care issues. It will examine the type of medical care needed by the transgender community as well as barriers to access. Part II will address how the ACA and the Supreme Court’s decision on DOMA in Windsor affected LGBT healthcare access and delivery. This section will examine the improvements as well as the issues that still remain. Finally, Part III will address proposals that have been made to improve health care access for

---
\(^9\) See Grant et al., supra note 4, at 80–83 (finding that 41% of transgender individuals have attempted suicide at one point in their life and that individuals experienced high rates of physical violence, sexual assault and HIV as well as above average rates of drug and alcohol abuse).
\(^{10}\) Patient Protection and Affordable Care Act, 42 U.S.C. § 18001 (2010).
\(^{11}\) United States v. Windsor, 133 S.Ct. 2675 (2013).
\(^{12}\) See David Leonhardt, In Health Bill, Obama Attacks Wealth Inequality, N.Y. Times, Mar. 24, 2010, available at http://www.nytimes.com/2010/03/24/business/24leonhardt.html?_r=0 (asserting that the bill is the federal government’s biggest attack on economic inequality since inequality began rising more than three decades ago).
transgender individuals. These proposals include ending employment discrimination, clarifying medical necessity review standards, and reforming state Medicaid programs. This section will focus on the Employment Non-Discrimination Act and different insurance and health care related non-discrimination directives passed by the states. The section will also examine recent state department of health and state department of insurance notices that effectively eliminate transition-related health care coverage discrimination. This Note concludes by arguing that, overall, the ACA gives judges and policymakers a rare opportunity to redirect the way transgender health care is treated. This Note advocates that policy-makers should address transgender health care disparities by issuing further guidance on the ACA’s nondiscrimination provisions, which will turn give advocates and judges the ability to enable and enforce positive changes to the health care system. How effective the ACA can be in expanding transgender-related health care access and addressing transgender specific health needs is dependent on the passage of further non-discrimination provisions.

I. Background on Transgender Health Care Issues

A. Definitions

“Transgender” is generally considered an umbrella term for people whose “gender identity, expression, or behavior is different from those typically associated with their assigned sex at birth.”13 The term includes but is not limited to transsexuals, cross-dressers, androgynous people, and gender non-conforming individuals.14 It is also important to distinguish transgender from the LGB community. Gender identity is one’s own, internal, personal sense of being a man or woman while sexual orientation describes a person’s enduring physical, romantic, and emotional attraction.


14. See NAT’L CTR. FOR TRANSGENDER EQUALITY, supra note 13 (defining terms transgender and transsexual).
to another person. Transgender people may be straight, lesbian, gay or bisexual.

“Transsexual” is a specific classification that falls under the “transgender” umbrella that is used to describe individuals who have an internal gender identity that does not “match the sex assigned at birth.” Some transsexuals seek to rectify this condition through psychological help and many use hormone therapy or sex reassignment surgery (SRS) to correct their biological sex. In the United States, transsexuals must be diagnosed with some type of gender identity disorder in order to pursue medical treatment. The period during which a person begins living as the gender with which they identify rather than the gender they were assigned at birth is generally known as “transition.” The transition period may or may not include medical and legal aspects such as taking hormones, having surgery, or changing identity documents. Not all transsexual individuals undergo transition-related surgery or other procedures; some transsexuals have no desire to do so and can successfully transition without it.

15. See Transgender 101, supra note 13 (stating that transgender is an identity not a sexual orientation).
16. Id.
17. Id.
18. See BURDA, supra note 13, at 156 (detailing a basic overview of transgender issues); see also NAT’L CTR. FOR TRANSGENDER EQUALITY, supra note 13 (defining the term “transgender” and explaining that transition may include medical and legal aspects such as changing one’s name on a driver’s license).
19. See Transgender Rights Toolkit: Transition-Related Health Care, LAMBDA LEGAL, http://www.lambdalegal.org/sites/default/files/publications/downloads/trt_transition-related-health-care_3.pdf (last visited Feb. 23, 2014) (detailing how individuals obtain transition-related care and that any form of hormone treatment or surgery requires a medical diagnosis; see also AM. PSYCHIATRIC ASS’N., Diagnostic and Statistical Manual of Mental Disorders (5th ed. 2013); see also AM. PSYCHIATRIC ASS’N., Gender Dysphoria Fact Sheet (2013), available at http://www.dsm5.org/Documents/Gender%20Dysphoria%20Fact%20Sheet.pdf [hereinafter DSM-V Fact Sheet] (stating that part of the motivation for changing the diagnostic term from gender identity disorder to gender dysphoria was to create a term that is less discriminatory while still providing a diagnostic term that is necessary for treatment and insurance coverage).
20. See NAT’L CTR. FOR TRANSGENDER EQUALITY, supra note 13 (defining “transition” as the time when a person begins living as the gender with which they identify rather than the gender they were assigned at birth, which often includes changing one’s first name and dressing and grooming differently).
21. Id.
Additionally, there are a variety of terms used to address transgender individuals post transition. According to the National Center for Transgender Equality, “transgender man,” is generally adopted a term for a transgender person who currently identifies as a man; while “transgender woman” describes a transgender person who currently identifies as women.

Gender Identity Disorder (GID) is the previous diagnostic term used for transsexuals seeking medical remedies to their discontent with their assigned sex. GID was defined in the American Psychiatric Diagnostic Manual of Mental Disorders IV (DSM-IV). The DSM-IV focused on two components that must present to make a GID diagnosis: there must be evidence of a strong and persistent cross-gender identification and there must be evidence of persistent discomfort about one’s assigned sex or a sense of inappropriateness in the gender role of that sex. The DSM-IV also lists specific diagnostic criteria for GID: (1) a strong and persistent cross-gender identification, (2) persistent discomfort with his or her sex, (3) the disturbance is not concurrent with a physical intersex condition, (4) the disturbance causes clinically significant distress or impairment in social, occupational, or other important areas of functioning.

The GID diagnosis was generally disliked by the transgender community because it made being transgender seem like a mental disorder, which included a stigma and represented a lack of understanding about the condition. Beginning in 2010, there was a move by transgender advocates

many people can successfully transition without surgery—some have no desire to pursue surgeries or medical intervention); see also LGBT Resources: Definition of Terms, UC BERKELEY GENDER EQUITY RESOURCE CTR., http://geneq.berkeley.edu/lgbt_resources_definition_of_terms/transman (last visited Feb. 23, 2014) (stating that not all individuals choose to transition).

23. See NAT’L CTR. FOR TRANSGENDER EQUALITY, supra note 13 (defining transgender man).


25. Id. at 576.

26. Id. at 576–77.

27. Id.

28. See Wynne Parry, Gender Dysphoria: DSM-5 Reflects Shift in Perspective On Gender Identity, HUFFINGTON POST (June 4, 2013), http://www.huffingtonpost.com/2013/06/04/gender-dysphoria-dsm-5_n_3385287.html (noting that transgender advocates have pointed out that distress is not an inherent part of
to change the definition in the DSM. Jack Drescher, a member of the American Psychological Association (APA) committee tasked with changing the definition of GID, told advocates that his subcommittee’s recommendation came from a desire to stop “pathologiz[ing] all expressions of gender variance just because they were not common or made someone uncomfortable.” Drescher also acknowledged that “all psychiatric diagnoses occur within a cultural context . . . [W]e know there is a whole community of people who are not seeking medical attention and live between the two binary categories.” In changing the diagnosis for transgender individuals the APA was taking a needed step for providing a means for treatment for transgender individuals who wish to undergo transition-related care, while also removing the stigma that often comes with calling something a disorder.

The new edition of the DSM released in 2013, the DSM-V, changed the diagnostic term for GID to “Gender Dysphoria.” Gender dysphoria (“GD”) is now used to describe a person whose gender at birth is contrary to the one they identify with. For a person to be diagnosed with gender dysphoria there must be a marked difference between the individual’s expressed or experienced gender and the gender others would assign him or her and it must continue for at least six-months. The DSM-V states that this condition/state can manifest in a variety of ways; including strong
desires to be treated as the other gender or to be rid of one’s sex characteristics, or a strong conviction that one has feelings and reactions typical of the other gender. The DSM-V also adds a post-transition “specifier” for people who are living full-time in their specified gender.

The new definition is crucial because, as emphasized by many advocates, transgender identity is not a mental illness. The change resembles the elimination of homosexuality from the DSM forty years ago, when the psychological community recognized that one can be homosexual and psychologically healthy or vice versa, homosexuality itself was not the diagnosed condition. The GID definition focused on the “identity” issue and the incongruity between someone’s birth gender and the gender with which he or she identifies. Though the incongruity element is still crucial to the definition of gender dysphoria, the DSM-V now emphasizes the importance of distress about the incongruity for diagnosis. Changing the definition was crucial for persons requiring diagnostic treatment of gender

35. See DSM-V Fact Sheet, supra note 19 (stating that gender dysphoria manifests in different ways and the diagnosis is fact based and patient specific).

36. “Specifier” is a medical term of art used in the DSM-V. The post-transition specifier has been added because after gender transition many people no longer meet criteria for gender dysphoria, but still remain in need of treatments to improve life in the desired gender and this specifier recognizes that need. AM. PSYCHIATRIC ASS’N, HIGHLIGHTS OF CHANGES FROM DSM-IV-TR TO DSM-5 (2013), available at http://www.dsm5.org/Documents/changes%20from%20ds
dm-iv-tr%20to%20ds
m-5.pdf.

37. See id. (stating that the specifier is meant to ensure treatment access for individuals to undergo hormone therapy, related surgery, and psychotherapy or counseling to support their gender transition).

38. See Parry, supra note 28 (emphasizing that gender dysphoria and being transgender is not a mental illness, but realizing that the need for some form of diagnosable condition is required for treatment and care); see also Lowder, supra note 28 (discussing how the transgender community felt that gender identity disorder created a stigma against transgender individuals).


40. See id. (explaining how the shift in diagnosis is crucial to understanding the difference between being transgender and having gender dysphoria). The new definition reflects recognition that the disagreement between birth gender and identity may not be pathological if it does not cause the individual distress. Id. Many transgender people are not distressed by their cross-gender identification and should not be diagnosed with gender dysphoria. Id. This new diagnosis is important because transgender people have often pointed out that distress in gender dysphoria is not an inherent part of being transgender—which is unique from many other disorder in the DSM because much of the distress that accompanies gender dysphoria arises as a result of a culture that stigmatizes people who do not conform to gender norms. Id.

41. Id., at 576–77.
dysphoria because it simplified the standards that must be met in order for an individual to receive medical treatment. These individuals needed a term that protects their access to care and that will not be used against them in social, occupational, or legal areas.

B. Transgender Health Care Needs

Transgender individuals have various health care needs that must be met. Transgender individuals require basic health care check-ups and screenings such as Pap smears and prostate cancer screenings, which are generally based on a person’s gender marker on their insurance contract. Apart from general health requirements such as check-ups and disease treatment, individuals with gender dysphoria require specific treatment for their diagnosis. Treatment for transsexual individuals diagnosed with gender dysphoria includes counseling, cross-sex hormones, gender reassignment surgery, and social and legal transition to the desired gender.

The DSM-V definition outlines the common treatments for gender dysphoria. Generally, gender dysphoria treatment involves a combination of “triadic” therapy, hormone therapy, sex reassignment surgery, and/or “real life experience.” Real life experience is an extended period of time during which a patient must live in his or her preferred gender role.

42. Id.; see also DSM-V Factsheet, supra note 19 (explaining how changing the diagnostic definition was crucial for acceptance and treatment of transgender individuals with gender dysphoria).


44. See Health Insurance Discrimination for Transgender People, HUMAN RIGHTS CAMPAIGN, http://www.hrc.org/resources/entry/health-insurance-discrimination-for-transgender-people (last visited Feb. 23, 2014) (describing how transgender individuals are discriminated against in the health care market, most health insurance contracts are written in a way that can deny transgender people coverage irrespective of whether those needs are related to transitioning).

45. See id. (stating that not all transgender people have the same medical needs—they may have already transitioned or choose not to transition at all).

46. See DSM-V Fact Sheet, supra note 19 (explaining treatment for gender dysphoria that is endorsed by the APA).

47. See id. (detailing triadic care system used to treat gender dysphoria).

48. See id.; see also RACHEL ANN HEATH, THE PRAEGER HANDBOOK OF TRANSSEXUALITY: CHANGING GENDER TO MATCH MINDSET 80 (Judy Kuriansky ed., 2006) (stating that the real-life experience is often for a minimum of twelve months but can be extended up to two years).

49. See RACHEL ANN HEATH, THE PRAEGER HANDBOOK OF TRANSSEXUALITY:
life experience is used to test whether there is further consolidation of gender identity in the patient. This practice is coupled with psychotherapy, which helps to further the goal of a stable lifestyle for the patient. The goal of combining the triadic therapies is to illuminate the patient’s history and his or her current expectations, ensure that the patient actually wants to undergo reassignment, and to ensure that the patient is psychologically prepared change genders.

Each patient must be evaluated on a case-by-case basis with expert medical judgment required for both reaching a diagnosis and determining a course of treatment. After the patient has begun the real-life experience and undergone a period of psychotherapy, a physician may prescribe hormone treatment. Hormones are administered over a period of time before, during, and after sexual reassignment surgery. Hormone therapy, though a necessary part of treatment for gender dysphoria, poses numerous medical risks and should always be supervised by a physician. Estrogen can increase blood pressure, blood sugar, and cause blood clotting. Anti-androgens can lower blood pressure, disturb electrolytes, and dehydrate the body. Hormone therapy can also have adverse effects on

50. See WORLD PROF’L ASSOC. FOR TRANSGENDER HEALTH, supra note 7.
51. See id., at 12 (noting that the goal of treatment is not to cure GID but to provide a stable lifestyle with realistic chances for relationships and other gender identity expression).
52. See WORLD PROF’L ASSOC. FOR TRANSGENDER HEALTH, supra note 7, (outlining the process of psychotherapy and the goals of combining this treatment with real life experience).
53. See DSM-V Fact Sheet, supra note 19 (stating that diagnosis and treatment considerations and decisions are dependent on fact-specific issues concerning the patient in question such as physician health and psychological history).
54. See HEATH, supra note 48, at 113 (noting the different hormones available for men and women who wish to change sex).
55. See id. (outlining the SRS procedure and that hormone therapy is not only a crucial part but is an ongoing form of treatment).
56. See Key Transgender Health Concerns, LGBTI Health, VAND. U. MED. CTR., https://medschool.vanderbilt.edu/lgbti/health/transgender (last visited Dec. 5, 2014) (explaining the medical problems that can arise from hormone use and noting that persons who wish to use hormones should only do so under the supervision of a doctor who can prescribe appropriate doses and monitor its effects).
57. See id. (stating the possible negative side effects of transition-related hormone therapy).
58. See id. (detailing different effects of SRS).
liver functions and cause hyperprolactinemia—a disorder of the pituitary gland that results in an excess secretion of prolactin. If left untreated, many of the adverse side effects cause further medical problems for patients undergoing transition and require additional medications. Thus, the treating physician plays a crucial role for individuals who wish to undergo transition-related procedures. Physicians are necessary to monitor different treatments, to ensure that individuals remain healthy throughout treatment, and to make sure that adverse side effects of hormone treatment and surgery are well monitored.

In addition to hormone therapy, the final part of triadic therapy is sex reassignment surgery (SRS). SRS can include a number of different procedures. For transgender women, one possible procedure is a vaginoplasty, which involves the creation of a vagina using both penile skin and a urethral flap. For transgender men, phalloplasty is often performed—a procedure that is done to create a penis. Transsexual men can also receive a hysterectomy, vaginectomy, and mastectomy. Transsexual individuals can also receive treatment in the form of speech therapy, voice box surgery, and facial feminization therapy.

Like any extensive medical procedure, the entire transition process is costly. In 2001 the average cost for male to female SRS was over $10,000—with prices of well-known surgeons ranging from $4,500—
$26,000 for male to female surgeries.\textsuperscript{69} Conversely, female to male surgeries generally range from $4,000–$60,000 and averaged $18,000 in 2001.\textsuperscript{70} Recent statistics show that costs have not changed much. Hormones cost approximately $100 per month and therapy is about $100 per session.\textsuperscript{71} Surgeries typically cost between $7,000 and $50,000, and some phalloplasties can cost upward of $100,000.\textsuperscript{72} Most health insurance—both public and private—will cover basic health care needs, but generally do not cover transition procedures.\textsuperscript{73}

\textbf{C. Consequences of Inability to Obtain Health Care}

Inability to obtain proper treatment for gender dysphoria can have many negative consequences for transsexual individuals, but they are not the only ones who suffer from exclusions.\textsuperscript{74} Transgender individuals are also excluded from basic health care access because of lack of insurance or refusal of providers to render services.\textsuperscript{75} Instances of transgender discrimination in health care have ranged from degradation to outright to


\textsuperscript{70} See id. (explaining a survey sent to surgeons in order to estimate costs).

\textsuperscript{71} See Blake Ellis, \textit{Transgender and Struggling to Pay Medical Costs}, CNN \textit{Money} (Aug. 22, 2013), http://money.cnn.com/2013/08/22/pf/transgender-medical-costs/ (stating that transition procedures such as hormones and therapy are a continuous cost); see also Recommendations for Transgender Health Care, TRANSGENDER L. CTR., http://www.transgenderlaw.org/resources/tlchealth.htm (last visited Feb. 25, 2014) (stating that transition-related procedures are costs and as a result many transgender people cannot obtain medically necessary treatments because they cannot afford to pay them).

\textsuperscript{72} Id.

\textsuperscript{73} See Resources: Health Insurance Discrimination for Transgender People, HUMAN RIGHTS CAMPAIGN, http://www.hrc.org/resources/entry/health-insurance-discrimination-for-transgender-people (last visited Jan. 1, 2013) (stating that health care covers general needs like check-ups but will not cover procedures if they are designated for transition-related procedures).

\textsuperscript{74} See Am. Med. House of Delegates, \textit{supra} note 8, at 1 (explaining the effects of not providing access to procedures for transsexual individuals with GID).

\textsuperscript{75} See GRANT ET AL., \textit{supra} note 4, at 72–84 (detailing how health care providers discriminate against transgender individuals by refusing to treat them, whether or not they have undergone a transition).
refusals to provide care that results in poor health outcomes for transgender people. Rather than endure abuse and poor treatment, transgender people often go without health care. Similar to everyone else, transgender individuals need acute care when they are sick and preventative care to keep from getting sick, including gender-specific services such as Pap-smears and prostate exams. Transgender people may even need a mix of different preventative health screening procedures. For example, a transgender woman may require a mammogram and a prostate exam, depending on what stage of the transition process she is in. Access to basic health care such as physician services impacts overall physical, social, and mental health status, the prevention of diseases and disability, quality of life, preventable death, life expectancy, and the detection and treatment of health conditions. Thus, disparities in access to health services impact transgender individuals’ ability to reach their full potential while also affecting their quality of life. Further, many treatable medical conditions become emergency medical conditions, which strains the health care system when individuals are uninsured and require treatment they cannot afford.

Though there are no transgender specific diseases, there are numerous health disparities that directly affect the transgender and LGB population. Sexually transmitted infections, including HIV, are major concerns among

76. See id. at 6 (summarizing refusal or care rates and poor health outcomes).


79. Id.

80. See id. (examining different health disparities faced by transgender individuals).


82. See id. (elaborating on the effects that limited access to health care has on individuals in general while also noting that the LGBT community has some of the most limited access).

83. See LAMBDA LEGAL, supra note 77, at 2.
some LGBT groups, particularly male-to-female transgender persons.84 Data on HIV rates in transgender persons is sparse, but a recent systematic review estimated a HIV prevalence of 28% in male-to-female transgender persons.85 Transgender individuals are also susceptible to the same health disparities as other LGB individuals such as high rates of substance abuse and mental disorders.86 Members of the LGBT population are approximately twice as likely to smoke as the general population and more susceptible to drug abuse—though studies have been conflicting.87

Not only are there psychological ramifications that result from feeling as if one is the wrong gender, many transsexuals who are unable to undergo any form of transition therapy often turn to negative coping mechanisms.88 The American Medical Association (AMA), the American Psychiatric Association, and the World Health Organization have all recognized gender dysphoria as a serious medical condition.89 The AMA specifically states that GID—now gender dysphoria—if left untreated, “can result in clinically significant psychological distress, dysfunction, debilitating depression, and, for some people without access to appropriate medical care and treatment, suicidality and death.”90 The National Center for Transgender Equality and the National Gay and Lesbian Task Force conducted a survey in 2010 and found that participants used drugs and alcohol as a coping mechanism for dealing with discrimination and depression; while 41% of respondents said


86. Id. at 4.


88. NCTE, infra note 110, at 6.

89. See Baker & Cray, supra note 78, at 5 (referencing publications by the AMA, APA, and WHO which suggest the removal of barriers to transition-related health care and these organizations’ acceptance that gender identity disorder requires treatment).

they had attempted suicide. Thus, there is a significant need for improved transgender health care access.

D. Barriers to Care

Access and discrimination go hand-in-hand as discrimination has historically led to limited access and inadequate care for the LGB and Transgender community. The main barriers to care are employment discrimination against transgender individuals, lack of employment insurance coverage for transition-related care, insurance discrimination based on transgender status, and lack of insurance coverage for transition-related care. These barriers to care are found in both private and government provided health insurance programs.

1. Employment and Workplace Discrimination Limit Transgender Access to Care

Workplace and employment discrimination limits health care access for transgender individuals because most Americans who are insured are covered through employment based insurance. Twenty-nine states do not have sexual orientation nondiscrimination laws and thirty-four do not have gender nondiscrimination laws. Some state sexual orientation and gender nondiscrimination laws outlaw employment discrimination, but not public

91. See Grant et al., supra note 4, at 64–65 (detailing different and dangerous coping mechanisms used by transsexuals).

92. Id.

accommodation discrimination, leaving LGBT, particularly transgender, individuals vulnerable to discrimination.\textsuperscript{94}

Lack of employment opportunity not only impedes transgender and transsexual individuals’ ability to obtain care through insurance, but also inhibits individuals’ ability to pay for general health care and transition-related care.\textsuperscript{95} A 2011 national survey of transgender individuals conducted by the National Center for Transgender Equality and the National Gay and Lesbian Task Force found that respondents experienced unemployment at twice the rate of the general population and 47% said they had experienced an adverse job outcome such as being fired, not hired, or denied a promotion for being transgender or gender non-conforming.\textsuperscript{96} Further, many transgender individuals drop out of school before finishing high school due to lack of uniform anti-discrimination policies.\textsuperscript{97} The study also found that respondents who had lost a job due to bias also experienced ruinous consequences such as four times the rate of homelessness, 85% more incarceration, and more than double the HIV infection rate compared to those who did not lose a job due to bias.\textsuperscript{98} These statistics show not only continued transgender discrimination in the employment landscape but also that this discrimination has adverse effects on transgender health.

Prior to the ACA, transgender individuals could be denied coverage irrespective of whether their health needs were related to transitioning.\textsuperscript{99}

\begin{footnotes}
\item[94] See \textit{id}. (There is a general ban on discrimination on the basis of disability in the full and equal enjoyment of the goods, services, facilities, privileges, advantages, or accommodations of any place of public accommodation by any person who owns, leases, or operates a place of public. 42 U.S.C. § 12182 (1990). All persons are also entitled to equal enjoyment of goods, services, facilities, privileges, advantages, and accommodations of any place of public accommodation, without discrimination or segregation on the ground of race, color, religion, or national origin. 42 U.S.C. § 2000(a). Though there are prohibitions based on grounds of disability or race or religion, there is no accommodation law for LGBT status, which still allows for employer discrimination).
\item[95] See \textit{id} (detailing the effects of a lack of ability to obtain employment); \textit{see also} Jeffrey Young, \textit{Transgender Americans Struggle for Coverage as U.S. Lags ‘Far Behind’ Even Iran}, \textit{The Huffington Post}, (Aug. 22, 2012) http://www.huffingtonpost.com/2013/08/22/transgender-coverage_n_3797843.html.
\item[96] \textit{Grant et al.}, \textit{supra} note 4, at 2.
\item[98] \textit{Grant et al.}, \textit{supra} note 4, at 3.
\item[99] \textit{Resources: Health Insurance Discrimination for Transgender People}, \textit{supra} note
The ACA has now established non-discrimination provisions that HHS specified prohibits denial of coverage for transgender individuals based on their health status or preexisting conditions. Though this is a step in the right direction, discrimination against LGB and transgender individuals remains prominent in the health insurance industry. The vast majority of commercial health insurance plans in the U.S. exclude all or most coverage for treatment related to gender transition. This “transgender exclusion” denies coverage for treatments such as psychological counseling for initial diagnosis and ongoing transition assistance, hormone replacement therapy, and surgeries related to sex reassignment. The exclusion generally exists unless an employer, or the state in the case of public health programs, specifies that they will cover procedures used in transition-related care or specifically cover gender transition procedures.

Many employers do not want to cover transition-related care out of fear that doing so will raise the cost of insurance premiums. Recent data

73.
100. See U.S. DEPT. OF HEALTH & HUMAN SERVS., Section 1557 of the Patient Protection and Affordable Care Act, HHS.GOV, http://www.hhs.gov/ocr/civilrights/understanding/Section%201557/index.html (last visited Nov. 19, 2013) (explaining the non-discrimination provision of the ACA); see also An Overview of Section 1557, Nondiscrimination Standards, and the Affordable Care Act: A Tool for Stakeholders, NAT’L WOMEN’S LAW CTR. (2013), available at http://www.nwlc.org/sites/default/files/pdfs/final_nwlc_aca_nondiscrimination_guide.pdf [hereinafter An Overview of Section 1557]; see also 42 C.F.R. §155.120(c)(2014) (“In carrying out the requirements of this party, the State and the exchange must: (1) Comply with applicable non-discrimination statutes; and (2) Not discriminate based on race color, national origin, disability, age, sex, gender identity or sexual orientation.”).
101. See Resources: Health Insurance Discrimination for Transgender People, supra note 73 (explaining that a majority of health insurance plans exclude transition related treatment).
102. Id.; see also Shannon Minter, Representing Transsexual Clients: Selected Legal Issues, NAT’L CTR. FOR LESBIAN RIGHTS (2003), http://www.transgenderlaw.org/resources/translaw.htm#finref49&_utmref=149406063.1289414064.1380831485.1388605885.1388611341.11&_utmmb=149406063.0.10.1388612339&_utmcc=149406063.1388359941.9.8&utmcsr=google&utmccn=(organic)to&utmcmd=(organic)to&utmcrr=(not%20provided)&__utmz=&_utmn=191729222(last visited Oct. 22, 2014) (detailing the different treatment options for transgender individuals).
103. Minter, supra note 102.
has shown that this is not the case because gender dysphoria is rare.\textsuperscript{105} Data from San Francisco, which was the first U.S. city to provide insurance coverage for gender dysphoria related care for public employees in 2001, found that the change would not raise costs for municipal employees.\textsuperscript{106} Since San Francisco released its report, Portland and Multnomah County, Oregon, Seattle and Minneapolis have followed suit.\textsuperscript{107} Additionally, according to the Human Rights Campaign, a growing number of larger and Fortune 500 Companies have started offering transition-related care for transgender employees.\textsuperscript{108}

2. Discrimination by Private Insurance Companies

As a result of employment discrimination and/or an inability to obtain insurance through an employer, many transsexual individuals rely on individual or personal insurance\textsuperscript{109} in order to fund transition-related care.\textsuperscript{110} Though this is a feasible means to obtain coverage, many transgender individuals face the additional hurdle of an inability to access economic and educational opportunities due to discrimination, which limits

\textsuperscript{105} Id.

\textsuperscript{106} Id. see also FAQ on Access to Transition Related Care, \textsc{Lambda Legal}, http://www.lambdalegal.org/know-your-rights/transgender/transition-related-care-faq (last visited Jan 1. 2013) (explaining the survey and how the surcharge that employees had been paying to cover the policy change was reduced to zero; there was no need to take in the extra money, because the cost of covering these claims was so negligible); see also J. Denise Diskin, Taking it to the Bank: Actualizing Health Care Equality for San Francisco’s Transgender City and County Employees, \textsc{5 Hastings Race & Poverty L.J.} 129, 154 (2008).

\textsuperscript{107} Lambda Provider Discrimination, supra note 104.

\textsuperscript{108} See id. (identifying the Human Rights Campaign survey).

\textsuperscript{109} Private insurance is referring to insurance the individual purchases with their own funds. It is not provided through public health care programs or though employer based coverage. Private insurance is often more expensive and has more limited coverage than employer based plans.

\textsuperscript{110} See Jaime M. Grant et al., \textit{Nat’l Transgender Discrimination Survey Report on Health and Health Care}, \textsc{The Nat’l Ctr. for Transgender Equal. & The Nat’l Gay and Lesbian Task Force}, at 5 (Oct. 2010), available at http://transequality.org/PDFs/NTDSReportonHealth_final.pdf [hereinafter NCTE] (stating that 19% of the transgender population sampled reported being refused medical care due to their transgender or gender non-conforming status). It is important to note that here, private insurance is differentiated from employer-based care. Here, the term is meant to represent insurance that is purchased privately by individuals, not which is provided through one’s employment.
their inability to afford their health care needs. As a result, a large portion of the transgender community faces financial hardships that make affording private insurance nearly impossible. Even if an individual can afford private health insurance, or receives private health insurance through their employer, there are still additional obstacles of discrimination and exclusion procedures. Traditionally, insurers have relied on their ability to deny coverage for pre-existing conditions as a way to deny coverage of transition-related care. Provisions in the ACA, which bar insurance companies from denying coverage based on preexisting conditions, have generally eliminated this practice. The ACA does not prevent insurance companies from excluding certain types of medical procedures on the basis that they are not medically necessary or are cosmetic.

Appealing insurance company decisions is often difficult for transgender individuals because private insurance is governed by contract law. Thus it is up to the individual to ensure that the plan he or she purchases includes gender transition care. Most insurance companies

111. See COMPLIANCE IS GENDERED, supra note 97, at 218–19 (stating that much of the economic and educational discrimination against transgender individuals remains legal).
112. See id. at 219 (stating that harassment is widespread in schools and higher education and that transgender people face severe discrimination in the job market and are routinely fired for transitioning on the job of whether the genders identities come to their supervisor’s attention).
113. See Liza Khan, Transgender Health at the Crossroads: Legal Norms, Insurance Markets, and the Threat of Healthcare Reform, 11 YALE J. HEALTH POL’Y, L. & ETHICS 375, 398 (2011) (detailing the different forms of discrimination that occur in the private insurance setting such as denial of claims as experimental or denial of procedures based on preexisting conditions).
114. Id. at 398–400.
115. See ACLU KYR, infra note 116 (discussing in detail how insurance companies have discriminated against transgender individuals through pre-existing conditions and medically necessary classifications).
116. Part III of this note goes into more detail on these exclusions. Patient Protection and Affordable Care Act §§ 1557, 2704 [hereinafter PP&ACA] (prohibiting exclusion of preexisting conditions and preventing discrimination in coverage); see also AM. CIVIL LIBERTIES UNION, Know Your Rights-Transgender People and the Law, ACLU (Nov. 19, 2009), http://www.aclu.org/hiv-aids_lgbt-rights/know-your-rights-transgender-people-and-law [hereinafter ACLU KYR] (stating that coverage depends upon the individual contract with the individual insurance company).
117. See ACLU KYR, supra note 116 (detailing how contract law governs private individual insurance because such programs are based on a contracted agreement between the insurance company and the insured).
118. See id. (explaining how coverage is dependent on the insurance contract and how
will exclude many transition procedures, transition-related care, procedures related to transition specifically, or are unclear about whether those services are covered. Generally, insurance companies deny coverage for SRS by declaring it a cosmetic procedure, which allows them to get around the “medically necessary standard.” The “medical necessity standard” is a common health coverage term that defines health care services that a physician exercising prudent clinical judgment would provide to a patient for the purpose of preventing, evaluating, diagnosing or treating an illness, injury, disease, or its symptoms. For example, in Davidson v. Aetna Life & Cas. Co., Victoria Davidson had an insurance policy through his employer stating that cosmetic surgeries would be covered if the surgery is necessary for the repair a non-occupational injury. Aetna argued that SRS is not necessary to repair an injury and is purely cosmetic and denied coverage of the procedure. The district court found for Davidson after determining that SRS is performed in order to correct a psychological defect, not solely improve muscle tone or physical appearance—a general trait of cosmetic procedures. Thus, the court determined that classifying the procedure as more than cosmetic is appropriate. Davidson, though a victory for transgender individuals, illustrates that outcomes in other similar

119. See id. (describing how insurance companies generally exclude transition related care).
120. See id. (noting that classifying something as cosmetic gets around any claim of medical necessity); see also Section II(B)(3) for an explanation of the “medical necessity” standard.
123. See id. at 451 (finding that SRS is not merely cosmetic surgery).
124. See id. at 453 (stating Aetna’s Medical Director maintained that there is nothing physically wrong with a transsexual’s body; the director went further to say that the surgery was attempting to change the body to fit the transsexual’s mind).
125. See id. at 453 (explaining the court’s determination that the SRS procedure was more than a cosmetic because of the psychological benefits gained by the patient with GID and that it more than improving a physical aspect of their body).
126. See id. at 453 (stating that court is deferring the professional judgment of medical experts and does not want to interfere).
cases are heavily dependent on the court’s opinion and whether or not they want to view transition-related care as medically necessary or cosmetic.\textsuperscript{127}

3. Discrimination with Public Health Programs

The same discriminatory insurance practices that occur in private health insurance are also present in public insurance programs—namely state Medicaid programs. Medicaid statutes vary by state and though the federal Medicaid statute does not exclude reimbursement of treatments related to SRS, states can choose whether or not to reimburse certain medical procedures under their programs.\textsuperscript{128} Federal regulations constrain some state Medicaid choices—for example, a state may not deny services to an otherwise eligible individual solely because of a diagnosis, illness, or condition.\textsuperscript{129} But states are still given broad power to choose procedures to cover under state Medicaid, leading to a marked disparity in transgender care for those who qualify for Medicaid.\textsuperscript{130}

Case law is also inconsistent in regards to transgender health care access under Medicaid.\textsuperscript{131} Some regulations and case law establish that a state cannot categorically deny compensation for SRS under Medicaid but other cases uphold a state’s denial of reimbursement for SRS procedures.\textsuperscript{132} In \textit{Pinneke v. Preisser}\textsuperscript{133} the United States Court of Appeals for the Eighth

\textsuperscript{127} See \textit{id.} at 450–53 (analyzing the current understanding of transsexualism as a medical diagnosis and noting that the decision to require coverage under an insurance plan depends on each individual’s case).

\textsuperscript{128} See \textit{BURDA, supra} note 13, at 174–175 (providing examples of states that do not provide for SRS under their Medicaid programs).

\textsuperscript{129} See 42 C.F.R. § 440.230(c) (2011) (“The Medicaid agency may not arbitrarily deny or reduce the amount, duration, or scope of a required service under §§ 440.210 and 440.220 to an otherwise eligible recipient solely because of the diagnosis, type of illness, or condition.”).

\textsuperscript{130} See \textit{BURDA, supra} note 13, at 174 (providing examples of states that exclude SRS).

\textsuperscript{131} See \textit{id.} (showing how Medicaid statutes vary between states); see also 42 U.S.C. § 1396(a)(10) (2010) (providing a list of care and services that must be provided in order for medical assistance); see also 42 C.F.R. § 440.230(c) (2011) (“The Medicaid agency may not arbitrarily deny or reduce the amount, duration, or scope of a required service under §§ 440.210 and 440.220 to an otherwise eligible recipient solely because of the diagnosis, type of illness, or condition.”).

\textsuperscript{132} See Pinneke v. Preisser, 623 F.2d 546, 549 (8th Cir. 1980) (stating that there
Circuit held states cannot absolutely exclude the only known available medical treatment for a gender identity disorder because that would be considered an arbitrary denial of benefits based exclusively on a diagnosis or type of illness.\(^{134}\) In *Pinneke* the court stated that the Iowa Department of Social Services could not create an irrebuttable presumption that SRS can never be medically necessary\(^{135}\) and that it must take into account the applicant’s diagnosed condition, the prescribed treatment, and the knowledge of the medical community.\(^{136}\) In *Doe v. State*\(^{137}\) the Supreme Court of Minnesota addressed an adult male transsexual’s appeal from a decision of the State Welfare Department denying him medical benefits to fund his sex-transition surgery.\(^{138}\) In rendering its decision that the Welfare Department’s determination to deny medical assistance benefits to Doe was arbitrary and unreasonable, the court also ruled that the determination of whether SRS is medically necessary must be decided on a case-by-case basis and based on an unbiased evaluation.\(^{139}\)

Conversely, other courts have denied coverage for SRS under various rationales. In *Casillas v. Daines*\(^{140}\) a Federal District Court ruled in favor of the New York State Department of Health’s denial of Terri Casillas claim for Medicaid coverage for surgeries and services to treat her GID.\(^{141}\) The

\(^{134}\) See *id.* at 547–49 (noting that Pinneke was eligible for Medicaid, diagnosed with a transsexual personality and denied funding for SRS surgery; the court found that SRS was the only treatment available to relieve her condition and the state plan was an arbitrary denial of benefits because it excluded the only known treatment).

\(^{135}\) See *id.*

\(^{136}\) See *id.* at 549–50 (emphasizing that the decision of whether a certain treatment is “medically necessary” rests with the individual’s physician and not with government officials).

\(^{137}\) Doe v. State, 257 N.W.2d 816 (Minn. 1977).

\(^{138}\) See *id.* at 817 (providing background on Doe’s case and going into detail into Doe’s transition surgery request and denial).

\(^{139}\) See *id.* at 821 (determining that the Minnesota Welfare Department’s denial of medical assistance benefits to an adult male transsexual was arbitrary and unreasonable).

\(^{140}\) See Casillas v. Daines, 580 F. Supp. 2d 235, 247 (S.D.N.Y. 2008) (finding that the state agency’s rationale “provided a more than sufficient rational basis” related to the government interest of protecting the health of its citizens and the conservation of limited medical sources).

\(^{141}\) This case was decided in 2008, when GID was still the term used to diagnosed transgender individuals requesting transition-related care under the DSM-IV. See *id.* at 238, 247 (noting that the state agency cited serious complications from the surgeries and the administration of estrogen as evidence that providing for these procedures under Medicaid went against the state’s interest in protecting the health of its citizens and the conservation of
New York State Health Department had adopted a regulation that prohibits state Medicaid reimbursement for services related to gender reassignment. Casillas challenged the ban with the support of her current psychologist and her prior treating psychiatrist, and argued that the treatments were medically necessary. The court disagreed with Casillas’s claim that she had been denied equal protection on the basis of her diagnosis. Instead, the court agreed with the state agency’s explanation—that it was protecting the health of state citizens and conserving limited medical resources—and the policy survived rational basis review.

Some courts have denied reimbursement for transition-related care on the grounds that SRS is “experimental” and that there is disagreement with regards to the efficacy of such procedures. For example, in Rush v. Parham the United States Court of Appeals for the Fifth Circuit found that Georgia could reasonably exclude reimbursement of experimental treatments and remanded to the district court to determine if the specific procedures in question in the case could be classified as experimental. Similarly, in Smith v. Rasmussen, the Eighth Circuit upheld an Iowa law that prohibited funding of SRS. Unlike the Fifth Circuit, the Smith court did not find that procedures were experimental; instead the court relied on the Department of Health’s research that demonstrated different opinions of

142. See id. at 237 (citing 18 N.Y.C.R.R. § 505.2(1)(2011)).
143. See id. at 238 (stating that the “plaintiff was examined by a medical doctor who is Professor and Chairman of Plastic and Reconstructive Surgery at Philadelphia College of Osteopathic Medicine who has opined that hormones, orchiectomy and vaginoplasty are medically necessary to treat plaintiffs [sic] GID.”).
144. See id. at 247 (reviewing the agency’s rationale for denying reimbursement of SRS and associated treatments).
145. See id. (stating that the agency’s rationale “provided a more than sufficient rational basis which was related to legitimate government interests – the health of its citizens”).
146. See Rush v. Parham, 625 F.2d 1150, 1156 (5th Cir. 1980) (finding that Georgia could exclude SRS procedures from Medicaid reimbursement because it is an experimental treatment).
147. See id. at 1156–57 (remanding the case to a lower court for determination of whether or not the procedures could reasonably be considered experimental).
148. See Smith v. Rasmussen, 249 F.3d 755, 762 (8th Cir. 2001) (determining that the regulation was the reasonable result of rulemaking processes that overcame the presumption in favor of the treating physician).
149. See id. at 760–61 (describing the regulation and the process the state used to reach its decision).
the effectiveness and value of SRS. The different cases and variety of rulings are evidence of the ongoing disagreement in the United States courts and among the medical community over the efficacy and value of SRS and other transgender transition-related treatments. Also, the cases show that states continue to have great control over whether or not to include certain transition procedures.

Medicare is equally discriminatory towards transgender individuals, particularly regarding transition-related care for those with gender dysphoria. Like Medicaid, Medicare has banned even the consideration of coverage for sex reassignment surgery and related care because of a fear of “serious complication[s]” resulting from “experimental surgery” since 1981. The Medicare ban also uses the same “medical necessity” provision and requirements as Medicaid and has used that standard to ban any sort of coverage for transition-related care. The ban created a threshold barrier to coverage for medical care for transgender people under Medicare, which prohibited all forms of gender reassignment surgeries

150. See id. at 761 (describing that the value of the surgery has been questioned).

151. Though the AMA has come out in favor of transition related care as a necessary treatment for gender dysphoria, not all physicians and practitioners agree with this assessment. See Am. Med. House of Delegates, supra note 8.

152. See Burda supra note 13, at 174 (explaining how different states have varying Medicaid provisions on SRS and transgender care); see generally Doe v. State, 257 N.W.2d 816 (Minn. 1977); see generally Rush v. Parham, 625 F.2d 1150, 1156 (5th Cir. 1980); see generally Casillas v. Daines, 580 F. Supp. 2d 235, 247 (S.D.N.Y. 2008).


154. See 1 SEXUAL ORIENTATION AND THE LAW §10:22 (2013) (stating that Medicare, Tricare, and the Veterans Health Administration do not pay for sex reassignment surgeries)

155. See Medicare Can Pay for Transgender Recipient’s Gender Confirmation Surgeries: Feds, HUFFINGTON POST (May 30, 2014, 1:06 PM), http://www.huffingtonpost.com/2014/05/30/medicare-transgender-gender-surgery_n_5418899.html (explaining a recent Health and Human Services Departmental Appeals Board decision that ruled that a three-decade-old rule excluding transition related surgeries from the procedures covered by the national health program for the elderly and disabled was unjustified); see also Evan McMorris-Santoro, Obama Administration Opens the Door to Medicare-Funded Sex Reassignment Surgery, BUZZFEED (May 30, 2014, 12:02 PM), http://www.buzzfeed.com/evanmcsan/obama-administration-opens-the-door-to-taxpayer-funded-sex-r (stating that language banning the coverage of sex reassignment surgery was issued in 1981).

156. See Social Security Act, 42 U.S.C. §1395y(a)(1)(A) (2013) (stating Medicare payment for items or services “not reasonable and necessary for the diagnosis or treatment of illness or injury” are barred from coverage).
regardless of the individual patient’s diagnosis or serious medical needs.\textsuperscript{157} This ban was recently questioned by LGBT rights activists and was lifted by a Department of Health and Human Services Department Appeals Board Ruling on May 30, 2014.\textsuperscript{158}

\textit{II. What the ACA and United States v. Windsor Mean for LGBT Health}

The ACA and \textit{U.S. v. Windsor} have been heralded as victories for the LGBT community.\textsuperscript{159} As the largest-ever health insurance expansion takes place in the United States, the promise of finally getting health care will be a “boon for much of the LGBT community.”\textsuperscript{160} \textit{Windsor} represented a needed victory for the LGBT community as a whole in securing their federal rights.\textsuperscript{161} Though both can be considered “wins” for the LGBT community and should be considered a step in the right direction towards more acceptance and health care access, there are still problems and limitations that have yet to be addressed. Generally, representatives have found that the ACA and \textit{Windsor} stand to benefit the LGBT community while continuing to fail to provide any real improvements for transgender
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individuals.\textsuperscript{162} Part II of this note will first examine the improvements in LGBT—particularly transgender—health care that stem from the ACA and \textit{Windsor}. Second it will address some crucial issues that still remain and hinder transgender health care access.

\textit{A. Improvements in Transgender Health Care Access}

\textbf{1. ACA Improvements to Access and Nondiscrimination}

The Patient Protection and Affordable Care Act (ACA) was meant to increase the quality and affordability of health insurance, lower the uninsured rate by expanding public and private coverage, and reduce the costs of health care through various state and federal mechanisms.\textsuperscript{163} The ACA seeks to achieve these goals through the optional state expansion of Medicaid, the creation of insurance exchanges, and a ban on discrimination by health insurers.\textsuperscript{164} LGBT individuals, like all other Americans, will benefit from more affordable insurance coverage plans that cover pre-existing conditions, access to preventative care, and small business tax credits.\textsuperscript{165} More specifically, LGBT and particularly transgender individuals stand to benefit most from the nondiscrimination provisions of the ACA.\textsuperscript{166} The ban on discrimination represents a progressive move by the Obama administration towards further acceptance of the LGBT community.\textsuperscript{167} The ban has also created a new tool to combat LGBT health care discrimination.

\textsuperscript{162} See id. (noting that although the transgender community has more access through the non-discrimination provisions of the ACA and the exchanges, many are still wary of seeking care); see also Mitch Kellaway, \textit{Transgender Health Insurance (Part 2) Why Coverage is Only the Beginning}, \textsc{Huffington Post} (Sept. 6, 2013 5:47 PM), http://www.huffingtonpost.com/mitch-kellaway/transgender-health-insurance_b_3850332.html (explaining the author’s own experience with transition-related care and the limitations faced by others, particularly the inability to find insurance coverage and/or physicians to perform transition-related procedures).

\textsuperscript{163} Patient Protection and Affordable Care Act, 42 U.S.C. § 18001 (2010).


\textsuperscript{165} See \textit{The Affordable Care Act Helps LGBT Americans}, \textsc{Whitehouse.gov} (last visited Nov. 19, 2013), http://www.whitehouse.gov/sites/default/files/docs/the_aca_helps_lgbt_americans.pdf (explaining that one of the administration’s main goals under the ACA is to improve LGBT health care access).

\textsuperscript{166} Id.

\textsuperscript{167} See id. (explaining how the administration seeks to improve LGBT health care
Discrimination in the health care industry generally refers to the ways in which insurers differentiate among individuals in designing and implementing health insurance coverage. Discrimination can occur at the point of enrollment, the way coverage is designed, and the decisions that insurers make when administering benefits and services. The nondiscrimination provision of the ACA protects individuals from discrimination based on race, color, national origin, sex, age, or disability under any health program or activity that is receiving federal financial assistance. The nondiscrimination provision is outlined in Section 1557 of the ACA. Section 1557 applies to public and private entities such as state health departments, hospitals, clinics, or insurance companies that receive federal funds; Medicare and Medicaid, including the health insurance marketplaces. As a result, any health program or activity that receives federal financial assistance, such as hospitals, clinics, employers, or insurance companies that receive federal money must abide by the rules of section 1557. The provision further applies to visiting nurse programs.

168. See Kevin Lucia et al., New Report on State Approaches to Nondiscrimination under the Affordable Care Act, CTR. ON HEALTH INS. REFORMS GEO. U. HEALTH POL’Y INST. (July 29, 2013), http://chirblog.org/new-report-on-state-approaches-to-nondiscrimination-under-the-aca/ (explaining the Center’s study that found that discriminatory practices have not been deterred by the ACA or HHS regulations); see also Sara Rosenbaum, Insurance Discrimination on the Basis of Health Status: An Overview of Discrimination Practices, Federal Law, and Reform Opinions, GEO. L. O’NEILL INST. FOR NAT’L AND GLOBAL HEALTH L., at 6 (2009), available at http://scholarship.law.georgetown.edu/cgi/viewcontent.cgi?article=1023&context=ois_papers.

169. See Rosenbaum supra note 168 at 6–7 (outlining enrollment based discrimination tools).

170. See Section 1557 of the Patient Protection and Affordable Care Act, U.S. DEPT’T OF HEALTH & HUMAN SERVS. http://www.hhs.gov/ocr/civilrights/understanding/section1557/ (last visited Nov. 19, 2013) (stating that the nondiscrimination provision applies under any program or activity that is administered by an Executive agency or any entity established under Title I of the ACA – meaning that this provision virtually applies to all aspects of the health care system); see An Overview of Section 1557, supra note 100.

171. Section 1557 of the Patient Protection and Affordable Care Act, supra note 170.

172. See id.; see also 42 C.F.R. §155.120(c) (2014) (“In carrying out the requirements of this part, the State and the exchange must: (i) Comply with applicable non-discrimination statutes; and (ii) Not discriminate based on race color, national origin, disability, age, sex, gender identity or sexual orientation.”).

173. See An Overview of Section 1557, supra note 100 (detailing the filings the Center
community health education interventions, and similar programs that receive federal dollars. \(^{174}\) Section 1557 specifically extends the discrimination prohibition to entities that receive federal assistance in the form of contracts of insurance, credits, or subsidies. \(^{175}\) The prohibition also applies to any program or activity administered by an executive agency, or any program created under Title I of the ACA, including new state health insurance exchanges. \(^{176}\)

All public and some private insurance plans must abide by the Section 1557 discrimination prohibition. \(^{177}\) It is not clear how Section 1557 applies to some employer and individual insurance plans. Most private insurance plans—through partnerships with public programs like Medicaid—receive federal funding or assistance, \(^{178}\) which could subject them to the Section 1557 discrimination prohibition. \(^{179}\) However, it is unclear whether a private insurance carrier partnering with a federal agency is considered to be receiving federal assistance to an extent that would subject the carrier to Section 1557. In January 2014, the National Women’s Law Center (“NWLC”) used this reasoning to launch complaints against Genworth Financial, John Hancock, Transamerica, and Mutual of Omaha to the HHS Office of Civil Rights. \(^{180}\) The complaints are in response to the insurance

---

174. Id.
175. Id.
176. Id.
177. See id (noting which insurance plans are must follow the ACA provision); see also Section 1557 of the Patient Protection and Affordable Care Act, supra note 170.
179. See Affordable Care Act, Pub. L. No. 111-148 § 1557 (2010) (stating that the provision applies to any program or activity that is administered by an Executive agency or any entity established under Title I of the ACA, or that receives federal funding for programs).
companies’ announced practice of “gender-rating” long-term care insurance policies, or charging women more than men for the same coverage simply because they are women.\footnote{181} In the complaints, the NWLC asserts that the insurer’s gender-based premiums for long-term care insurance violate Section 1557.\footnote{182} The complaints state that because insurers offer long-term care policies through Medicaid partnership programs in some states, they received federal assistance, rendering them subject to the provisions of section 1557.\footnote{183} For example, in the complaint filed against Transamerica, the NWLC states that CMS assists Transamerica through the Washington State’s Partnership Program,\footnote{184} a state program that links private long-term care insurance policies with “special Access to Medicaid.”\footnote{185} Through the Partnership Program, CMS, the Washington DSHS, and the Washington HCA incentivize the purchase of Transamerica’s long-term care insurance policies.\footnote{186} The program provides incentives for individuals to purchase Transamerica’s Partnership Program-approved long-term care insurance policies by providing special access to Medicaid if individuals buy and use benefits under a Partnership approved policy.\footnote{187} NWLC asserts that because the Medicaid Partnership Program with Transamerica is a joint federal-state program that provides health care coverage for low-income people and is administered by CMS and the Washington Health Care Authority, Transamerica must follow the provisions of Section 1557.\footnote{188} The other complaints follow a similar framework in attributing a relationship between

private insurers and state Medicare or Medicaid Programs. HHS has yet to issue a ruling based on whether these arguments prove that private insurance companies can be bound to the provisions of Section 1557 because they receive federal assistance for some of their programs.

The nondiscrimination provision of the ACA also applies to marketing, public education, and consumer assistance programs as well as benefit design and the ten “essential health benefits” required in all plans individual and small employer plans. Essential health benefits must include items and services within at least ten categories: ambulatory patient services; emergency services; hospitalization; maternity and newborn care; mental health and substance abuse disorder services, including behavior health treatment; prescription drugs; rehabilitative and habilitative services and devices; laboratory services; preventive and wellness services and chronic disease management; and pediatric services, including oral and vision. Section 1557 creates a mechanism for consistent federal and state


190. 45 C.F.R. § 147.104(e) (2014); see also An Overview of Section 1557, supra note 100.

191. See An Overview of Section 1557, supra note 100 (noting that the non-discrimination provision applies to more than just insurance plans).

enforcement of the nondiscrimination standards.\textsuperscript{193} The provision is meant to end the pre-ACA discriminatory practices of insurers and providers.\textsuperscript{194} Federally, 1557 is enforceable through the filing of an administrative complaint or by lawsuit.\textsuperscript{195} The Office for Civil Rights (OCR) at the Department of Health and Human Services has been tasked with enforcing Section 1557 and will receive any administrative complaints—though other federal agencies will have responsibilities enforcing 1557.\textsuperscript{196} The Department of Justice is required to include 1557 in its enforcement of civil rights laws.\textsuperscript{197} States are required to engage in oversight and enforcement by enforcing existing state laws that apply to ACA-related entities.\textsuperscript{198} States can accomplish this through consumer protection laws and rules regarding deceptive practices that can be used to reinforce federal nondiscrimination regulations regarding market practices.\textsuperscript{199} States can also enforce these regulations through public accommodation laws that protect individuals against discrimination by or in public or private entities that are used by the public.\textsuperscript{200}

In order to provide more clarification on nondiscrimination policies, the HHS Office of Civil Rights (OCR) issued a letter to LGBT advocacy groups in July 2012.\textsuperscript{201} The OCR stated that Section 1557’s sex

\begin{itemize}
\item \textsuperscript{193} An Overview of Section 1557, supra note 100, at 12.
\item \textsuperscript{194} Id.
\item \textsuperscript{195} Id.; see also Patient Protection and Affordable Care Act § 1557, codified at 42 U.S.C. § 18116 (2012).
\item \textsuperscript{196} An Overview of Section 1557, supra note 100, at 12.
\item \textsuperscript{197} Id.
\item \textsuperscript{198} Id.
\item \textsuperscript{199} See id. at 13 (noting that public accommodation laws protect individuals against discrimination and can be leveraged to support federal nondiscrimination provisions). Seventeen states and the District of Columbia (Minnesota, Rhode Island, New Mexico, California, Illinois, Maine, Hawaii, New Jersey, Washington, Iowa, Oregon, Vermont, Colorado, Connecticut, Nevada, Massachusetts, and Delaware) have laws banning discrimination based on sexual orientation and gender identity/expression while four states (Wisconsin, New Hampshire, Maryland, and New York) have laws banning discrimination based on sexual orientation. See also State Nondiscrimination Laws in the U.S. THE TASK FORCE (June 2, 2013), http://www.thetaskforce.org/downloads/reports/issue_maps/non_discrimination_6_13_color.pdf.
\item \textsuperscript{200} An Overview of Section 1557, supra note 100.
\item \textsuperscript{201} Letter from Leon Rodriguez, HHS Office of Civil Rights, to Maya Rupert, Federal Policy Director, National Center for Lesbian Rights [hereinafter Letter from Leon Rodriguez to Maya Rupert], available at http://www.scribd.com/doc/102169872/HHS-Response-1557-7-12-12; see also M. Dru Levasseur, Affordable Care Act and Nondiscrimination, LAMBDALEGAL.ORG,
discrimination prohibition, “extends to claims of discrimination based on gender identity or failure to conform to stereotypical notions of masculinity or femininity [and] also prohibits sexual harassment and discrimination regardless of actual or perceived sexual orientation or gender identity of the individuals involved.” HHS confirmed what many LGBT advocates felt the ACA’s anti-discrimination provisions create an important new tool to combat anti-LGBT and especially anti-transgender discrimination in health care. The letter and clarification it provides is a significant development that builds on a series of recent rulings that have extended sex discrimination prohibitions to include discrimination based on gender identity expression. The importance of this change in federal policy cannot be overstated. The guidance is crucial and is considered by advocates to be the beginning of further reforms sought to benefit the LGBT community.

2. ACA Increases Access to Mental Health and Substance Abuse Disorder Services

In mandating essential health benefits coverage, the ACA expands mental health and substance abuse disorder coverage. Beginning in 2014, small group and individual market health plans will be required to cover mental health and substance abuse disorder services with coverage that is comparable to that for general medical and surgical care. This means that about 3.9 million people covered in the individual market will gain either mental health or substance abuse disorder coverage or both; it is also

http://www.lambdalegal.org/blog/aca-and-nondiscrimination (Aug. 7, 2012), (stating that the letter is a significant development in transgender rights and that is it hard to overstate the significance of the guidance).

203. Id. at 2.
204. See Levasseur, supra note 201 (noting EEOC and HUD rulings and guidance clarifying that discrimination against LGBT persons is sex discrimination).
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estimated that 1.2 million individuals currently in small group plans will receive mental health and substance abuse disorder benefits under the ACA.\(^{207}\) The ACA also builds on the Mental Health Parity and Addiction Equity Act of 2008 (MHPAEA)\(^{208}\) to extend the federal parity protections to 62 million Americans.\(^{209}\)

The MHPAEA is a federal law that generally prevents group health plans and health insurance issuers that provide mental health or substance abuse disorder (“MH/SUD”) benefits from imposing less favorable benefit limitations on those benefits than medical/surgical benefits.\(^{210}\) The MHPAEA is an extension of the Mental Health Parity Act of 1996 (MHPA) which provided that large group health plans cannot impose lifetime dollar limits on mental health benefits that are less favorable than any such limits imposed on medical and surgical benefits.\(^{211}\) The MHPAEA preserved the MHPA and added new protections, such as extending the parity requirements to substance abuse disorders.\(^{212}\) The MHPAEA originally applied to group health plans and group health insurance coverage, but was amended by the ACA.\(^{213}\)

Under the ACA amendments, the MHPAEA now applies to individual health insurance coverage.\(^{214}\) HHS has jurisdiction over public sector group health plans—referred to as “non-Federal governmental plans”—while the

\(^{207}\) Id. at 2.


\(^{209}\) See Beronio, et. al, ASPE Issue Brief, supra note 205 (explaining how the ACA expands mental health care coverage).


\(^{211}\) Id.

\(^{212}\) See id. The key changes were that: (1) if a group health plan or health insurance coverage included medical/surgical benefits and MH/SUD benefits, the financial requirements and treatment limitations that apply the MH/SUD benefits must be no more restrictive than the limitations that apply to substantially all medical/surgical benefits; (2) MH/SUD benefits may not be subject to any separate cost-sharing requirements or treatment limitations that only apply to such benefits; (3) if a group health plan or health insurance coverage includes medical/surgical benefits and MH/SUD benefits, and the plan or coverage provides for out-of-network medical/surgical benefits it must provide the same for MH/SUD benefits; and (4) standards for medical necessity determinations and reasons for any denial of benefits relating to MH/SUD must be disclosed upon request.

\(^{213}\) Id.

\(^{214}\) Id.
Department of Labor and the Treasury have jurisdiction over private group health plans. Employment-related group health plans may be either “insured” (purchasing insurance from an issuer in the group market) or “self-funded.” The insurance that is purchased, whether by an insured group health plan or in the individual market, is regulated by the State’s insurance department. Private employment-based group health plans are regulated by the Department of Labor. The final regulation that puts the ACA’s changed into effect has been effective since January 13, 2014. The regulation applies to non-Federal governmental plans with more than 100 employees and to group health plans of private employers with more than 50 employees.

The regulation also applies to health insurance coverage in the individual health insurance market but does not apply to group health plans for small employers, except as is covered by the essential health benefits requirements of the ACA. The regulations do not require group health plans to provide MH/SUD benefits, but if plans do provide such benefits, the financial requirements and treatment limitations that apply to MH/SUD cannot be more restrictive than the limitations and requirements that apply to substantially all of the medical surgical benefits. This does not apply to all plans, but does provide an expansion of protections of mental health and substance abuse disorders treatment and program assistance for many individuals. Under the new parity rules, 7.1 million Americans currently covered in the individual market will be able to count on mental health and
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223. Id; see also 78 C.F.R. §§ 68,240, 68,248 (Nov. 13, 2013). The MHPAEA does not apply to non-federal governmental plans that have 100 or fewer employees; small private employers that have 50 or fewer employees; group health and plans that are exempt from the MJPAEA based on their increased cost; and large, self-funded non-Federal government employers that opt-out of requirements of the MHPAEA.
substance abuse disorder coverage that is comparable to their general medical and surgical coverage.  

Increased access to mental health and substance abuse disorder services will greatly help the transgender community. Mental health services are an essential and costly part of transgender health care, particularly for individuals who wish to undergo hormone therapy or SRS procedures. Gender dysphoria must be diagnosed before an individual can begin to undergo various treatments. If left undiagnosed transgender persons with gender dysphoria can suffer dangerous mental ramifications. The American Medical Association, American Psychiatric Association and the World Health Organization have all recognized gender dysphoria as a serious medical condition that if left untreated “can result in in clinically significant physiological distress, dysfunction, debilitating depression and, for some people without access to appropriate medical care and treatment, suicidality and death.” Thus, the ACA’s requirements for coverage of mental health services are a step in the right direction and will provide for necessary treatment for transgender individuals.

3. Windsor Improvements

In U.S. v. Windsor, the Court overturned part of the Defense of Marriage Act of 1996 (DOMA) that denied federal benefits to same sex couples. Justice Kennedy, writing for the Court, closed his majority

224. See Beronio, supra note 205 (explaining how though limited, the changed rules provide more coverage and protections for mental health treatments and needs than did before).

225. See CTR. FOR CONSUMER INFO. & INS. OVERSIGHT, supra note 210 (stating that mental health and substance abuse disorder treatments must be covered by insurance plans).

226. See WORLD PROF’L ASSOC. FOR TRANSGENDER HEALTH, supra note 7, at 165–232 (providing flexible standards of care for Gender Identity Disorders) (on file with the Washington and Lee Journal of Civil Rights and Social Justice) (emphasizing that in order to pursue gender conforming care, transgender individuals will have to undergo a psychiatric evaluation in order to receive a diagnosis to have the procedures covered by insurance companies).

227. DSM-V Fact Sheet, supra note 19.

228. See AM. MED. HOUSE OF DELEGATES, supra note 8 (noting the different problems associated with Gender Identity Disorder).

229. Id. at 1.


opinion by stating that DOMA must fail because it denies same-sex couples the dignity that states that have passed same-sex marriage statutes intended them to have.232 Importantly, Kennedy stated that DOMA sets same-sex couples apart in a way that violates the due process and equal protection principles guaranteed under the Constitution.233 The decision does not guarantee a right to same-sex marriage, but allows individuals who live in states that allow same-sex marriage to receive the same federal benefits as heterosexual couples legally married in these states.234

Windsor and the end to discrimination against same-sex couples on the federal level are important to transgender individuals in two ways. First, Windsor demonstrates openness on the part of the Court to non-traditional sexual orientation. The Court’s opinion is crucial for other transgender friendly policies and laws to be developed and enforced. It also hopefully marks the beginning of more pro-LGBT rulings and legislation regarding health care access. Second, Windsor has a direct effect on transgender individuals’ right to marry and the benefits that accompany a recognized marriage, an important means for transgender individuals to access health care.235 Transgender people face unique legal issues with marriage, which in turn affects benefits and health care access for couples.236 Transgender individuals are often able to enter into a heterosexual marriage after undergoing sex-reassignment procedures and legal gender documentation changes, but they may also be married to a person of the same sex.237 Though being transgender and being gay are different,238 some same-sex
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233. Id. at 2696.
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236. See FAQ About Transgender People and Marriage Law, supra note 235.
237. See id. (noting that transgender individuals can transition during a marriage and if the couple stays together the result is a legal marriage in which both spouses are male or female.)
238. See Transgender 101, supra note 13 (stating that being gay is considered a sexual identity and orientation while transgender is a gender identity or expression).
marriage bans still affect transgender individuals’ ability to marry. If transgender individuals live in a state where same-sex couples cannot have a legally recognized marriage, their marriage may not be valid. If a transgender couple is different sex—for example, a transgender man who is married to a non-transgender woman—the validity of the marriage under state law depends on whether the government respects the gender identity of the transgender spouse. Basically, if a transgender man marries a woman in a state that does not recognize his transition and also has a ban on same-sex marriage, the marriage is deemed a same-sex and is not recognized. The Court’s ruling on DOMA helps rectify this disparity at the federal level. By recognizing valid same-sex marriages, the Court allows transgender couples that may be denied benefits by states that do not recognize transition or same-sex marriage, access to federal benefits if they get married in a state that does allow same-sex marriage. The ruling has also been affecting state policies by sparking rulings and legislation overturning same-sex marriage bans.

Spousal coverage is an important pathway to insurance for millions of people, thus the DOMA ruling and subsequent policy interpretations have resulted in expanded access for some LGBT families to a range of benefits including dependent health coverage. Benefit access and marriage recognition is an important means for health care access for many transgender couples. If one spouse is employed, the other generally has a greater likelihood of health care access through an employment-based plan.
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239. See FAQ About Transgender People and Marriage Law, supra note 235. (outlining different discriminatory policies and limitations towards transgender marriage rights); see also Transgender 101, supra note 13.

240. See id. (stating that some states that do not recognize gender transition will still prevent a transgender individual from marrying someone of their original sex before transition because it would be considered a same-sex marriage).

241. FAQ About Transgender People and Marriage Law, supra note 235; see also Transgender People and Marriage: The Importance of Planning, supra note 235.
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that covers the spouse in a state where the marriage is valid.\footnote{247} Limits in the ability to marry hinder transgender access to spousal or dependent health coverage and can prevent premium tax credit benefits under the ACA because the tax credits are affected by changes in marital status and household income.\footnote{248}

In practice, the legal validity of marriage involving transgender spouses is not yet firmly established in many states, which can affect benefit and health care access.\footnote{249} Some courts have ruled that transgender people cannot marry, which is usually justified by a reliance on statutes that refuse to acknowledge gender transition or statutes that ban same-sex marriage.\footnote{250} For example, in \textit{Littleton v. Prange},\footnote{251} an appellate court in Texas invalidated a seven-year marriage between Christine Littleton, a transgender woman, and her deceased husband.\footnote{252} Ms. Littleton brought a wrongful death suit seeking damages for her husband’s death.\footnote{253} The court ruled that a person’s legal sex is genetically fixed at birth and that Ms.

\footnote{247. See Hubert Janicki, \textit{Employment-Based Health Insurance: 2010, Household Economic Studies}, 3, U.S. \textsc{Census Bureau} (Feb. 2013), http://www.census.gov/prod/2013pubs/p70-134.pdf (stating that the unemployed and individuals not employed in the labor force were generally covered by a previous employer’s plan or that of a spouse through dependent coverage). It is important to note that the ACA has sparked a change in this statistic, as of 2012 7% of employers did not cover spouses when other coverage was available to them and 4% of employers with 1,000 more employees reported not providing such spousal coverage. Paul Fromstn, et al., \textit{The Cost of Spousal Health Coverage}, \textsc{Emp. Benefits Research Inst.} (2014), available at http://www.ebri.org/pdf/notespdf/EBRI_Notes_01_Jan-14_SpslCvg-RefPlns.pdf. As of late 2012–early 2013, another 8% of large employers were reporting that they planned to exclude spouses from coverage when other coverage was available. \textit{Id.} However, this is only if other coverage options are available, which often times are not for transgender individuals. But, plans may begin to charge more for spouses; see also Carrns, supra note 180.}

\footnote{248. See Janicki, supra note 247, at page 2 (explaining discriminatory practices that prevent recognition of transgender marriages); see also \textit{Questions and Answers on the Premium Tax Credit}, \textsc{Internal Revenue Serv.} http://www.irs.gov/uac/Newsroom/Questions-and-Answers-on-the-Premium-Tax-Credit (last visited Mar. 4, 2014) (stating that premium tax credits for the year will differ if your family size and household income you report on your return—the more your family size income differs from the Marketplace estimates used to compute your advanced credit payments).}

\footnote{249. See \textit{FAQ About Transgender People and Marriage Law}, supra note 235. (examining cases that have lead to disagreement among the courts in regards to transgender marriages).}

\footnote{250. \textit{Id.}}

\footnote{251. \textit{Littleton v. Prange}, 9 S.W.3d 223 (1999).}

\footnote{252. \textit{Id.}}
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Littleton should be deemed to be legally male, despite her female anatomy and appearance and that she has lived as a woman for most of her life. The marriage was invalidated under Texas’ ban on same-sex marriage and the rights afforded to a legal spouse were denied to Ms. Littleton. Not only was she denied the right to bring a wrongful death suit, but also the right to intestate inheritance, to obtain her deceased husband’s Social Security and retirement benefits. Other courts have made similar rulings regarding non-recognition of medical and legal transitions by transgender individuals.

Evolving trends of acceptance across legislatures and state courts have led to changes in many discriminatory policies regarding transgender marriage rights as well as health care access for spouses. This move towards acceptance of transgender marriage is well illustrated in examining the Texas Legislature and state courts’ recent change in posture regarding transition and marriage. In 2009, the Texas Legislature amended the family code to add a court order related to an applicant’s “sex change” as a form of acceptable proof to establish an applicant’s eligibility to obtain a marriage license. Texas’ ban on same-sex marriage remained unaffected by the law and, until recently, continued to cause problems for transgender individuals. This created confusion about whether someone who has transitioned to a gender they were not assigned at birth can marry someone of the same or opposite gender. The Texas Appeals Court has recently
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259. Id.
260. See TEX. FAM. CODE ANN. § 2.005(b)(8) (2009); see also Zack Ford, Texas Appeals Court: State Must Recognize Transgender Identities in Marriage, THINK PROGRESS (Feb. 13, 2014), http://thinkprogress.org/lgbt/2014/02/13/3289941/texas-appeals-court-state-recognize-transgender-identities-marriage/ (describing recent court case and stating that the lower court had ruled against the transgender individual’s marriage eligibility under Texas’ same-sex marriage even though the 2009 law had been established).
261. Ford, Texas Appeals Court: State Must Recognize Transgender Identities in Marriage, supra note 261.
addressed the confusion in In re Estate of Araguz. The court determined that transgender people should not be denied the right to marry a person of the opposite gender because of the gender they were classified as at birth. The case shows the court’s recognition of not only the 2009 Texas law and the growing trend of acceptance of transgender individuals’ right to marry and access benefits. The court did not explicitly address the confusion about how the statute applies to transgender individuals who identify as gay or bisexual, but it established precedent to recognize their authentic identities that are legally changed. Confusion about transgender marriage rights and same-sex marriage rights in Texas may be changing soon—U.S. District Judge Orlando Garcia ruled on February 26, 2014 that Texas’ ban on same-sex marriage was unconstitutional. The recent ruling is the latest in a series of similar victories for gay rights activists stemming from Windsor, following decisions in Utah, Kentucky, and Virginia which show a continuing trend of legalizing gay marriage. Though the ruling only issued a
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264. See id. (giving background that Araguz was born a man but was diagnosed with gender dysphoria at age eighteen and transitioned into a female; also noting that Araguz legally had her name, driver’s license and birth certificate changed and that at the time of her wedding, she had male sex organs but was living as a woman—she had genital reassignment surgery in 2008).
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272. Tomlinson, supra note 268
preliminary injunction that will remain in effect until the conclusion of an appeal, it is a victory for LGBT Texans and shows a changing tide in LGBT rights as whole in more conservative states.273

The Court’s ruling in *Windsor* has also affected federal LGBT policies that can further benefit transgender couples and increase access to health care and benefits. As a reaction to the Court’s decision, several federal agencies have created rules that recognize the validity of same-sex marriages across state lines. The Internal Revenue Service (IRS) issued a Revenue Ruling in August 2013, which stated that it would recognize same-sex marriages for federal tax purposes, even if the couple resides in a state that does not recognize their union.274 The ruling may also have an important effect on transgender couples’ ability to utilize the premium tax credits of the ACA when they enter into the health exchanges.275

Shortly after the IRS’s ruling, the Employee Benefits Security Administration of the Department of Labor issued a technical release in September 2013 that defined “spouse” and “marriage” under the Employee Retirement Income Security Act (ERISA).276 The release states that the terms spouse and marriage in employee benefit plans will be interpreted to include same-sex partners if the couple was legally married in a state that recognizes same-sex marriages.277 The law of the state in which the couple is living in or domiciled will not be relevant.278 This can also apply to

---
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transgender couples if they are domiciled in a state that refuses to recognize a transition and has a ban on same-sex marriage but were married in a state that recognizes same-sex marriage.\(^{279}\)

The *Windsor* judgment and ERISA guidance do not necessarily increase all same-sex couples' access to health care, though they do benefit transgender couples. Fully insured plans, where the employer pays a premium to a third party insurance company that then provides coverage for employees, are governed by state insurance regulation of the state where the owner of the plan is located.\(^{280}\) If the owner of the plan is in a state that recognizes same-sex marriage the plan must cover same sex couples, but if it is not located in such a state, then coverage for same-sex spouses will not usually be required.\(^{281}\) Self-insured plans, where the employer hires an administrator to manage the plan but provides the coverage and pays claims, are governed by ERISA, which is thought to overrule state insurance regulation for such plans.\(^{282}\) Because these plans are governed by federal law, including Title VII of the Civil Rights Act of 1964, which does not currently recognize sexual orientation as a protected class, employers can and do argue that they do not have to cover the same-sex spouses of employees.\(^{283}\)

The possibility of ERISA provisions requiring coverage for same-sex spouses has recently been questioned. In *Roe v. Empire Blue Cross Blue Shield*,\(^{284}\) the United States District Court for the Southern District of New York found that a self-insured health plan that excludes same sex spouses does not violate ERISA.\(^{285}\) Even though New York allows same-sex marriages under the New York Marriage Equality Act, the court framed the issue as whether a private plan violates a provision of ERISA by excluding

\(^{279}\) Id.


\(^{281}\) Id.

\(^{282}\) Id.

\(^{283}\) Id.

\(^{284}\) Roe v. Empire Blue Cross Blue Shield, 2014 WL 1760343 (S.D.N.Y May 1, 2014).
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same-sex couples from beneficiary status. The court ruled that ERISA gives employers “broad discretion in writing the terms of welfare benefit plans.” Further, the court held that ERISA Section 510, which prohibits any employer from discriminating against a beneficiary for exercising his or her benefit rights or the attainment of any benefit right, does not apply to the facts of the case because there was no adverse employment action. Importantly, the court made clear that it was not ruling on whether plans that exclude same-sex couples from the definition of spouse are constitutional, but nonetheless denied the claim.

Representatives believe that the ruling emphasizes the need for EEOC guidance with respect to the rights of same-sex spouses under employer health insurance plans. Similar standards used by employers could also have negative ramifications for transgender couples if a spouse has not completed the legal transition process and is still considered their original sex, effectively rendering the couple a same-sex couple and subject to the same limitations.

Though there are limitations, there is a growing trend among the U.S. agencies to issue guidance that provides more transgender discrimination prohibitions and rights to access to health care. The U.S. Office of Personnel Management (OPM) has issued guidance regarding transgender individuals in the federal workplace. The OPM stated, “[i]f employees in transition are validly married at the time of the transition, the transition does not affect the validity of that marriage, and spousal coverage should be extended or continued even though the employee in transition has a new name and gender.”

CMS also issued guidance to state health officials as a result of the Windsor ruling and in light of the IRS’s revenue ruling. First, eligibility
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rules in regards to the treatment of same-sex spouses’ eligibility for premium tax credits will be treated in the same manner as opposite-sex spouses. Second, the guidance allows state officials to take a different approach towards how they treat same-sex couples for Medicaid and CHIP eligibility. CMS clarifies that a state is “permitted and encouraged, but not required,” to recognize same-sex couples that are legally married under the laws of the jurisdiction in which the marriage occurred. The guidance suggests that CMS will issue additional guidance on non-Modified Adjusted Gross Income (MAGI) Medicaid eligibility after the SSA releases its forthcoming guidance interpreting the DOMA decision. The guidance further notes that CMS will require states to formally clarify whether they will adopt marriage definitions for Medicaid that differ from federal policy used by the IRS and other entities.

The regulations signal not only the federal government’s acceptance of Windsor, but also their push to make sure that it is enforced. The changes are crucial for the LGBT community because they provide more access to benefits and health care for couples. The regulations also signal a move towards more acceptance and recognition of the needs for equal LGB, particularly transgender, health care access. The change in federal policy will hopefully lead to more coverage for transgender individuals as government agencies become more and more accepting. But, the regulations and Windsor fall short in various areas and leave open many questions regarding transgender and same-sex spousal health care.
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Particularly because states still maintain a substantial amount of control over transgender marriage and health care access.

4. Ban Lifted on Medicare Discrimination

In May of 2014, the Obama administration made more headway towards advancing transgender rights and transgender health care access by ending a decades-long blanket ban that prevented Medicare from covering sex reassignment surgery. The lift on the thirty-three year ban on Medicare coverage was the result of a ruling by a Department of Health and Human Services Department Appeals Board (“DAB”) board in response to a lawsuit filed last year on behalf of Denee Mallon, a seventy-four-year-old transgender woman. The DAB is an internal review structure within HHS that provides independent review of disputed decisions on Department programs and provides binding decisions on HHS. The blanket Medicare ban was established in 1981, as a result of a belief that transition surgeries were purely experimental, but now most medical associations consider it a safe option for those suffering from gender dysphoria. In rendering its decision, the DAB determined that medical studies published over the past three decades showed that the grounds for the exclusion of coverage are no longer “reasonable” and lifted the ban. The DAB stated that even assuming the National Coverage Determination’s exclusion of coverage at the time were reasonable, that lack of coverage was no longer reasonable. The DAB further ruled that denying Medicare coverage of all transsexual surgery as a treatment for transsexualism is not valid under the
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reasonableness standard nor under established standards of treatment accepted by medical experts.\textsuperscript{307}

Many advocates believe that this ruling is long overdue and that it is a step towards increased acceptance of transgender people. Some believe that the change to Medicare could have far reaching implications for American medicine and help drive more private insurers to offer coverage for sex reassignment surgery and related care.\textsuperscript{308} Though this ruling can be viewed as a victory in some respects, it is still limiting and does not truly change insurance companies or the government’s ability to discriminate against transgender individuals. The ruling does not mean Medicare will automatically start covering sex reassignment surgery and transition related care, though the program will no longer be prevented from doing so when claims are made.\textsuperscript{309} Patients under Medicare will not be guaranteed coverage for surgeries under the decision, they will have to justify their need just as they have to for any other medical treatments.\textsuperscript{310} Further, the ruling does not apply to Medicaid.\textsuperscript{311}

Though the ruling will not fully change access to gender reassignment care, the statement is a rare on-the-record communication from an agency that has—in the past—sought to avoid controversy by keeping DAB deliberations out of the headlines.\textsuperscript{312} The current ruling is a marked change; particularly because the Obama administration and Health and Human Services first broached the idea of allowing Medicare to cover transgender surgery in 2013.\textsuperscript{313} In 2013, HHS released that it would consider revising the Medicare policy to cover medically necessary gender transition

\textsuperscript{307} See \textsc{Dep’t of Health \& Human Servs.}, supra note 158 (stating that a reasonableness standard is going to be used and that a blanket ban on Medicare coverage of transition related surgeries does not meet the reasonableness standard).

\textsuperscript{308} See McMorris-Santoro, \textit{supra} note 155 (asserting that changes in Medicare coverage determinations can effect private insurance company coverage).

\textsuperscript{309} See \textit{id.} (explaining the limits to the DAB ruling).

\textsuperscript{310} \textit{Id.}

\textsuperscript{311} \textit{Id.}

\textsuperscript{312} \textit{Id.}

\textsuperscript{313} See Sunnivie Brydum, \textit{Medicare Won’t Yet Decide Whether to Cover Gender Reassignment Surgery}, \textsc{The Advocate} (Apr. 1, 2013), available at http://www.advocate.com/politics/transgender/2013/04/01/medicare-wont-yet-decide-whether-cover-gender-reassignment-surgery (explaining the backlash and rescission after HHS released that it would seek comments on a potential policy change on Medicare’s long-standing ban on coverage for gender reassignment surgeries).
surgeries and sought public input on the topic. However, the same day the topic was opened for comment HHS withdrew the request, stating that the ban would instead be reviewed through the independent Department Appeals Board process. The move was generally viewed as positive, but some believe it was caused by vocal opposition from conservative critics to have the Medicare policy change pursued through the less public DAB. Nonetheless, the ruling stands for the supposition that government, at least through Medicare, is finally accepting and executing policies consistent with the consensus of the medical and scientific community that access to gender transition-related care is medically necessary for many people with gender dysphoria. Though limited, it is a step in the direction towards more accessible care for individuals with gender dysphoria.

B. Continuing Problems/Shortcomings in Health Care Access

Though the ACA and the Court’s ruling in *Windsor* are moving the United States towards more acceptance of the LGBT community, there are still many lingering issues regarding health care access that have yet to be addressed. The ACA takes needed steps to improve LGBT health care as a whole, but it does not solve all of the existing problems, especially transgender health care issues. The elimination of pre-existing conditions and discrimination will not necessarily end discriminatory practices against transgender individuals. Even if transgender exclusions are removed from plans, insures are not prohibited from creating health plans that deny coverage for services that are not medically necessary, that are experimental, or that are comparatively more expensive than other treatments. Finally, there are issues concerning care exclusions for
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316. See id. (stating that the National Center for Transgender Equality viewed the HHS move as positive even though it was reneged and believed that HHS did not stop considering changing the policy, just through a different administrative process); see also McMorris-Santoro, supra note 155 (stating that the public process primed conservative critics to launch a vocal opposition campaign that caused HHS to step back and pursue the change through the DAB).

317. Lucia, supra note 168.

transgender individuals’ post-transition needs that fall under transition-related bans. These problems may still occur under the ACA, particularly with the lack of federal guidance and regulator of non-discriminate and continued unclear standards for transgender individuals.

1. Non-Discrimination Provisions Not as Strong as Many Believe

Recent findings by the Georgetown University Health Policy Institute (the Institute) suggest that the nondiscrimination standards have not significantly changed the way that state regulators or insurers approach benefit design and that regulators face practical limitations in trying to implement the mandated requirements. The Institute found that some regulators are not willing to assume a broader role in defining discriminatory benefit design without clearer federal standards. Particularly, the lack of clear guidance leaves questions of how nondiscrimination requirements relate to the essential health benefits benchmark plans. The non-discrimination provision and the end to pre-existing condition exclusions provide more opportunities for transgender individuals and persons with gender dysphoria to access health care. Though insurers may no longer limit coverage based on an individual’s gender identity, the ACA does not require insurers—public or private—to cover gender reassignment surgeries, hormone therapy, or other treatment needs. The Institute’s study found that stakeholders struggled to articulate an ideal standard for identifying discriminatory benefit design and that there are still questions as to how nondiscrimination requirements relate to essential health benefits plans. The study also determined that some regulators may not be willing to assume a broader role in defining discriminatory benefit design without

progress.org/issues/lgbt/report/2012/10/03/40334/faq-health-insurance-needs-for-transgender-americans/.
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clearer federal standards. In support of the Institute’s assertions, a recent survey conducted by the HHS Office of Inspector General found that five of the six states surveyed did not monitor Medicaid Managed Care Entities compliance with the federal provider nondiscrimination contract provisions and that Centers for Medicare and Medicaid Services (CMS) oversight to ensure compliance of state contracts was inconsistent. The limitations to state and federal compliance monitoring and gaps in the statute may leave the transgender population open to continued discrimination. This is particularly true in considering coverage options available to transgender individuals.

2. Discrimination Through Defining Transition Surgery as Cosmetic

The ACA has eliminated discrimination for pre-existing conditions, but insurers can still limit treatment options for gender dysphoric patients requiring transition through cosmetic and experimental exclusions. Insurers often classify gender-confirming care as either cosmetic or experimental and use that classification to deny coverage. Insurers use this strategy to draw a line that limits the number of nonessential procedures covered, which is part of an overall strategy to control health care costs. Cosmetic procedures are generally considered optional or elective in nature, while experimental interventions are usually believed to have questionable medical value. Some insurers explicitly restrict

325. See id. (noting the different challenges raised by state officials in regards to nondiscrimination under the ACA). The study found that states and insurers have not changed their approach to nondiscrimination but are using new tools, such as attestations, outlier analysis, and internal tracking databases, to monitor for compliance. Id. States raised questions about how nondiscrimination requirements relate to the essential health benefits benchmark plan and identified challenges in enforcement because of a lack of clinical expertise and the inability of fully see benefits in the filing process. Id.
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329. See Cray, supra note 318 (noting that insurers use a variety of measures to lower premiums costs by denying certain procedures that they deem cosmetic or unnecessary).

330. See Cristine Nardi, Comment, When Health Insurers Deny Coverage for Breast
coverage for transition-related treatments by classifying them as cosmetic or experimental while others rely on contract interpretation to reject claims for gender-confirming care under these categories.331

Transition-related surgeries are generally believed to be more than cosmetic, though they have some cosmetic features.332 There is a significant body of medical evidence and behavioral science research documenting the efficacy for transition-related interventions, which casts doubt on insurers’ classification of gender-confirming care as experimental.333 Medical professionals have been providing transitional treatments to transgender patients for over thirty years and procedures have been continuously improving parallel to medical advancements.334 Even some state Medicaid agencies have found that such interventions can be “appropriate and medically necessary for some people and [should not be] considered experimental.”335 Gender transition procedures can be considered more akin to reconstructive surgery, which is a procedure performed on abnormal structures of the body, “caused by congenital defects, developmental abnormalities, trauma, infections, tumors or disease,”336 rather than

Reconstructive Surgery: Gender Meets Disability, 1997 WIS. L. REV. 777, 784 (1997) (defining cosmetic procedure as a procedure intended to enhance a normal structure); see also Mark A. Hall & Gerard F. Anderson, Health Insurers’ Assessment of Medical Necessity, 140 U. PA. L. REV. 1637, 1638 (1992) (“The ’experimental’ exclusion common in health insurance policies responds to a growing concern that most current medical procedures were adopted without ever having been tested rigorously and that at least some of the procedures commonly used today have limited or no medical value.”).

331. See Health Insurance Discrimination for Transgender People, supra note 44 (providing examples of transgender insurance exclusions and how insurance companies argue exclusions based on vague provisions of insurance contracts that can be interpreted as prohibiting procedures necessary for transition-related care).

332. See Khan, supra note 113, at 396 (describing how transition-related procedures have some cosmetic qualities, but that in the case of patients with GID, they are more than cosmetic).

333. For discussion about the general acceptance of hormonal therapy and surgical reassignment surgery as appropriate treatments for gender dysphoria, see P.T. Cohen-Kettenis & Louis J. G. Gooren, Transsexualism: A Review of Etiology, Diagnosis and Treatment, 46 J. PSYCHOSOMATIC RES. 315, 326 (1999); see also David A. Gilbert et al., Transsexual Surgery in the Genetic Female, 15 CLINICS PLASTIC SURGERY 471, 486 (1988); see also Donald R. Laub et al., Vaginoplasty for Gender Confirmation, 15 CLINICS PLASTIC SURGERY 463, 470 (1988).
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cosmetic surgery, which is performed to reshape normal structures “of the body in order to improve the patient’s appearance and self-esteem.”

Though psychological and environmental factors can influence gender identity, genetic, hormonal, and psychological factors appear to play a significant role, which further distinguishes gender variance from cosmetic conditions.

Another important factor that differentiates transition-related care from cosmetic procedures is the fact that the decision to pursue gender-confirming care is not exclusively at the discretion of the patient; doctors impose stringent requirements on transgender patients.

To qualify for sex reassignment surgery, a gender dysphoric patient wishing to transition must show: (1) a recommendation in writing by two behavioral scientists, one whom has known the patient in a therapeutic relationship for 6 months; (2) a successful cross-living test over a one-year period; and (3) legal, social, psychological, sexual and endocrine success during cross living. Overall, it is difficult to find any real medical support for the “cosmetic” argument proffered by insurance agencies in refusing to cover gender transition surgeries.

Hormone therapy and sex reassignment surgery do not simply enhance ordinary biological features, they radically change the anatomy and biological function of a patient’s body.

Transitioning can also put family relationships, friendships, and employment at risk; few undergo the procedure just to improve their appearance or their self-esteem.

Insurers also attempt to support their “cosmetic” claim by asserting that transition-related interventions only alter “normal” features that are fully functional. This claim has little merit as insurers regularly cover procedures that do not result in any new functional
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capacity, such as breast reconstruction following a mastectomy; insurers also cover procedures such as prosthetic eyes.\textsuperscript{345} Biologically, the procedures have no functional outcome, but they are generally viewed as improving quality of life that is distinguishable from cosmetic surgery.\textsuperscript{346}

3. Discrimination Through “Medically Necessary Standard”

Public and private insurers also attempt to refuse transition-related coverage by deeming procedures “medically unnecessary,” which is arguably the least well-defined exclusion clause in most insurance plans.\textsuperscript{347} Despite endorsement of transition-related interventions in the medical community, insurers and courts remain skeptical of their medical necessity for several reasons.\textsuperscript{348} First, insurers and courts argue that coverage of transition-related health benefit is justified because the gender-confirming care is expensive, with costs as high as $75,000 per person.\textsuperscript{349} However, the experience of insurers who cover transition-related care suggests that expenses are not as high as many imagine.\textsuperscript{350} For example, when San Francisco’s coverage of transition-related procedures for city employees began, actuaries estimated that thirty-five of the city’s thirty-seven thousand employees would use the new benefits in the first year at a cost of $1.75 million to the city.\textsuperscript{351} Data showed that in 2005 the city paid out only eleven
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347. See id. (noting that there is no standard definition for what is “medically necessary”); see also Khan, supra note 113, at 399 (stating that “[m]edical necessity does not mean life-or-death necessity; it refers to medically appropriate or medically beneficial treatment. The intent of the standard is to exclude coverage for care that is harmful, of no benefit, or nonstandard”); see Dallis v. Aetna Life Ins. Co., 574 F. Supp. 547, 551 (N.D. Ga. 1983) (discussing the meaning of the term “necessary”), aff’d, 768 F.2d 1303 (11th Cir. 1985).
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351. See Diskin, supra note 106, at 154 (2008) (explaining the city’s coverage of transition-related procedures and care); see also Lambda Provider Discrimination, supra note 104; see also Rachel Gordon, S.F. to Finance Staff Sex-Changes, S.F. CHRON. (May 1, 2001), available at
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gender dysphoria-related claims and the surcharge that employees had been paying to cover the policy change was reduced to zero.\textsuperscript{352} Financing gender reassignment surgery for transgender city employees only cost $182,374 over four years.\textsuperscript{353} This was less than the thirty-five cases estimated by actuaries when the city was debating whether to cover such care.\textsuperscript{354}

Second, insurers and courts question the medical necessity of gender-confirming care because not all transgender individuals seek transition-related interventions.\textsuperscript{355} It is often difficult to justify health expenditures for a “condition” that is not always treated with medicine.\textsuperscript{356} Insurers seeking to deny coverage for transition procedures often rely on the fact that some transgender individuals resist the idea that medical interventions are necessary to correct non-normative gender identities.\textsuperscript{357} But, just because not all transgender individuals want to transition through medical means does not mean that transition-related procedures are not medically necessary for some transgender individuals. Incongruence between physical appearance and gender identity can cause severe
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\textsuperscript{354} See San Francisco Transgender Benefit: Actual Cost & Utilization (2001-2006), HUMAN RIGHTS CAMPAIGN, http://www.hrc.org/resources/entry/san-francisco-transgender-benefit-actual-cost-utilization-2001-2006 (last visited Mar. 4, 2014) (noting that initial actuarial costs estimated 35 claimants per year, although actuaries and advocates know this was an overestimate); see also Corporate Equality Index, HUMAN RIGHTS CAMPAIGN (2014), available at http://hrc-assets.s3-website-us-east-1.amazonaws.com//files/assets/resources/CEI_2014_final_draft_7.pdf#__utma=149404063.1289414064.1380831485.1406771431.1415461948.27&__utmb=149404063.4.10.1415461948&__utmc=149404063&__utmz=&__utmp=149404063.3.1415461948.27.18.utmcsr=google|utmccn=(organic)|utmcmd=organic|utmctr=(not%20provided)&__utmv=&__utm=23968826 (noting how other cities and companies have followed suit based on San Francisco’s experience).
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\textsuperscript{356} See id. (noting the difficulty that courts and insurers face in determining the medical necessity of gender-confirming care).
\textsuperscript{357} See Jerry L. Dasti, Advocating a Broader Understanding of the Necessity of Sex Reassignment Surgery Under Medicaid, 77 N.Y.U. L. REV. 1738, 1743 (2002) (noting that people are able to choose their gender rather than being bound by their anatomical configuration).
psychological distress and limit some transgender individuals’ “ability to function and survive in society, given current biases and beliefs.”

Medical necessity review is particularly prevalent in Medicaid determinations and has played a significant role in determining whether Medicaid recipients receive access to transition-related care. Because Medicaid is a state-run program funded with federal and state dollars, states have significant discretion in determining which services they will provide under the Medicaid Act. As long as states follow a “formal” rulemaking process, they are free to exclude certain interventions by classifying them as medically unnecessary, which results in different decisions about which procedures are eligible for Medicaid coverage as rulemaking procedures are not necessarily consistent across states. Most states have restricted Medicaid coverage for some transition-related intervention on medical-necessity grounds. A survey by the Iowa Department of Human Services found that forty states do not fund sex reassignment surgery through Medicaid.

Similarly, state courts have been inconsistent in their determinations of whether or not transition-related care must be funded through state benefit programs. In Smith v. Rasmussen, the Eighth Circuit upheld Iowa’s refusal to fund sex reassignment surgery. The court notes that though the surgery may be medically necessary in some cases, the “availability of other treatment options” for gender identity disorder and “lack of consensus” in the medical community about the efficacy of surgery permits
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states to refuse coverage for transition intervention under Medicaid. Some courts have not accepted broad restrictions against transition-related interventions in Medicaid programs. For example, in Doe v. Minnesota Department of Public Welfare, the state supreme court found that the state’s total exclusion of transsexual surgery from eligibility for medically necessary assistance was void because the ban was “directly related to the type of treatment involved” rather than to an evaluation determining whether the intervention was in fact medically necessary.

In general, it seems the courts have yet to determine the proper approach for assessing the medical necessity of transition-related care. Further, the American Medical Association, has formally announced its support for gender confirming since 2008, stating that “medical literature has established the effectiveness and medical necessity of mental health care, hormone therapy, and sex-reassignment surgery in the treatment of patients diagnosed with gender dysphoria.

4. Care problems After Transition Has Occurred

Patients may now have more access to care under the ACA, but transgender patients can still be denied coverage for conditions unrelated to transitioning when providers erroneously assume a connection. Many
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371. See Young, supra note 95 (describing the difficulties that transgender people often
medical services needed by transgender people during transition and other points in their lives are part of the course for care required for other medical conditions and are routinely covered by health insurance plans.\(^{372}\) For example, hormone therapy is often utilized by patients to treat low testosterone or estrogen levels.\(^{373}\) But, insurers frequently expand transgender exclusions to deny transgender people coverage for basic services unrelated to transition.\(^{374}\) For example, if a man transitions into a woman but retains her prostate, an insurer may no longer cover a necessary annual prostate exam.\(^{375}\) As another example, a transgender woman in New Jersey was denied coverage for a mammogram on the basis that it fell under the plan’s exclusions for treatments “related to changing sex.”\(^{376}\) It took a two-year appeal process before the insurer agreed that the exclusion unfairly prevented her from receiving medically necessary care and reimbursed her for the mammogram.\(^{377}\)

### III. Current Proposals and Solutions

There are many options to improve transgender health care, but the most crucial is actually providing access to care. Many companies and private insurers have begun to cover transgender transition-related care, and sponsored programs to educate physicians and practitioners about transgender specific needs.\(^{378}\) Before proficient transgender health care can occur, issues of access and discriminatory practices need to be addressed. Part III of this note will examine possible solutions advanced by advocates to address problems that continue to exist under the ACA and in America’s health care system for transgender individuals.
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A. Increase Health Care Access by Limiting Employment Discrimination

Most transgender individuals who lack health care do not have access to it because they are unemployed. Unemployment not only limits transgender individuals’ ability to obtain employer based coverage, but it also inhibits their ability to purchase private insurance. Currently, people can be legally fired or refused employment for being gay in twenty-nine states and individuals can also be fired because of their gender non-conforming status in thirty-three states. The discrepancy in employment laws occurs because states have the ability to draft their own nondiscrimination laws and there is no federal law that consistently protects LGBT individuals from employment discrimination. As a result LGBT, and particularly transgender individuals, face discrimination in employment including being fired, denied a promotion, and experiencing harassment. On November 7, 2013, the Senate Passed the Employment Nondiscrimination Act (ENDA) for the first time in the legislation’s two-decade history. Advocates believe that passing this bill through the House will lead to more protection of transgender individuals and as a result improve access to health care.

380. See id. (discussing how employment discrimination poses significant problems for the LGBT community).
383. See id. (noting the purpose of the Employment Non-Discrimination Act (ENDA) is to provide protections against workplace discrimination on the basis of sexual orientation or gender identity).
384. See ENDA Passes Senate 64-32, supra note 379; Ford, supra note 381; see also Eric Krupke, Employment Non-Discrimination Act Passes First Senate Hurdle, NPR (Nov. 7, 2013), http://www.npr.org/blogs/itsallpolitics/2013/11/04/243023548/senate-poised-to-pass-employment-non-discrimination-act (stating that the last time the ENDA faced a vote in the Senate was in 1996, when Republicans held the majority and it failed with a final vote of 49–50).
385. See Employment Non-Discrimination Act, HUMAN RIGHTS CAMPAIGN,
The ENDA would provide basic protections against workplace discrimination on the basis of sexual orientation or gender identity. The bill prohibits employers, employment agencies, and labor unions from using an individual’s sexual orientation or gender identity as the basis for employment decisions, such as hiring, firing, promotion, or compensation. The ENDA prohibits covered entities from subjecting an individual to different standards or treatment based on the individual’s actual or perceived sexual orientation or gender identity. The act also bars discrimination based on the sexual orientation or gender identity of those with whom the individual associates. The bill is closely modeled on existing civil rights laws and explicitly prohibits preferential treatment and quotas. But unlike Title VII, the ENDA does not permit disparate impact suits. The limitation on disparate impact suits would require a plaintiff to prove that an employer intended to discriminate, which is a higher evidentiary threshold and provides additional protection for employers. The provision also bars the EEOC from requiring employers to collect or provide statistics on sexual orientation and gender identity. This allows for the preservation of employee privacy by not requiring employees to disclose whether or not they identify as LGB or are transgender.

The ENDA is not without limitation. The ENDA does not cover small businesses with fewer than fifteen employees nor does it apply retroactively. The bill also does not apply to religious organizations—all religious entity that is exempt from Title VII’s prohibition on religious discrimination will continue to be able to exclude gay, lesbian, bisexual, and transgender employees. Even with its shortcomings and though it has
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yet to pass the House, the passage of the ENDA by the Senate is a crucial step in establishing rights for transgender individuals. By establishing employment rights through the ENDA transgender individuals will be given more access to necessary health care. In passing the ENDA, the legislature has sent a crucial message to transgender individuals that their plight is not ignored and that the government is interested in protecting their rights. The passage of ENDA can help build trust with the transgender community and lead to more balanced federal policies in the health care exchanges, which in turn may motivate more transgender individuals to enter the health care exchanges.

Many transgender and transsexual individuals have chosen to not get health care because of the long history of discriminatory practices used by insurance companies and providers. A 2013 survey by the Center for American Progress on HHS’s LGBT health care awareness campaign found that though the campaign reached many LGB individuals, it did not spark awareness about the exchanges and other health programs that are emerging under the ACA. The same survey noted that many transgender individuals have an extreme wariness of any representative of the health care system that has resulted from years of discrimination. A similar survey conducted by a state health project in Missouri determined that transgender individuals in the state struggled to even obtain information from insurers about transgender coverage. These recent surveys show
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that transgender individuals are wary of the health care system as whole and are even reluctant to call navigators.\textsuperscript{401} Thus there is a grave possibility that even with increased protections, the health insurance exchanges and other insurance programs being offered under the ACA will continue to be inaccessible to transgender individuals.\textsuperscript{402} Advocates believe the ENDA and more statutes protecting transgender individuals can help improve the bleak turnout of transgender individuals in the exchanges.\textsuperscript{403} Regulations and acts similar to ENDA would give the federal government footing for proving that they are concerned with the plight of transgender individuals. In doing so, more transgender people are likely to engage with the federal health care system.

\textit{B. Discriminatory Health Care Practices Need to Be Addressed}

Even if transgender individuals obtain health insurance coverage, transsexual people with gender dysphoria may still be limited. As addressed in Part II, many insurance companies still discriminate against transgender and transsexual individuals, particularly with coverage of transition-related care.\textsuperscript{404} In order to address the continuing discrimination against transgender people in need of transition procedures, advocates believe HHS should promulgate further non-discrimination provisions that are more LGBT—and specifically transgender—focused. Second, advocates assert that HHS should clarify what “medically necessary” means for transgender individuals—particularly that SRS and other transition procedures are medically necessary for transsexual people with gender dysphoria.\textsuperscript{405}

\textsuperscript{401} See Scout, \textit{supra} note 160; see also Glossary: Navigator, HEALTHCARE.GOV, https://www.healthcare.gov/glossary/navigator/ (last visited Mar. 6, 2014) (defining a health care navigator as an individual or organization trained to help consumers, small businesses, and their employees as they look for health coverage through the Health Insurance Marketplace—a resource for learning about health care options—including completing eligibility and enrollment forms) (on file with the Washington and Lee Journal of Civil Rights and Social Justice).
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\textsuperscript{404} See \textit{infra} Part III (explaining how insurance companies discriminate against transgender individuals through medical-necessity reviews and classifying transition procedures as cosmetic).

\textsuperscript{405} See DSM-V Fact Sheet, \textit{supra} note 19 (stating that SRS and other transitions procedures are necessary treatment for individuals diagnosed with gender dysphoria).
1. HHS Needs to Promulgate Further Non-Discrimination Provisions with an LGBT Focus

Many advocates believe that the current non-discrimination provision of the ACA and the clarifications that have followed are not enough to protect transgender health care access. For example, on September 30, 2013, the Fenway Institute, an LGBT health care, education, research, and advocacy organization, submitted a public comment to HHS, urging the department to issue a nondiscrimination provision to ensure LGBT Americans’ ability to access nondiscriminatory health care in all settings, regardless of sexual orientation or gender identity. The Fenway Institute believes that such a regulation would be consistent with other HHS-published regulations such as the 2012 federal regulation that outlaws sexual orientation and gender identity discrimination by Qualified Health Plans traded on state Marketplaces. This 2012 nondiscrimination regulation protects against insurance discrimination on the basis of sexual orientation and gender identity, but not against discrimination in health care. There is no federal civil rights statute covering sexual orientation and no federal sexual orientation health care nondiscrimination regulation—lesbian, gay, and bisexual individuals remain vulnerable to discrimination in states without nondiscrimination protections.

An HHS nondiscrimination regulation covering sexual orientation and gender identity, as proposed by the Fenway Institute, would make it more likely that transgender people will self-disclose to health care providers. Self-disclosure of sexual orientation and gender identity, and the tracking of such data is a critical step towards understanding and reducing LGBT health disparities. Such a regulation would also be consistent with the steps taken by non-governmental bodies to protect LGBT patients. For example,
the Joint Commission\(^\text{412}\) now requires the hospitals it accredits to establish nondiscrimination policies that are inclusive of sexual orientation and gender identity and expression and to implement equal visitation policies.\(^\text{413}\) A federal regulation banning discrimination on the basis of sexual orientation and gender identity in health care will help further transform the United States health care system and lead to more comprehensive care for the LGBT population.

2. **HHS or Other Government Agencies Should Clarify What “Medical Necessity” is in Relation to Transition-Related Care**

Many advocates believe that the government should determine and clarify, as the medical community has,\(^\text{414}\) that SRS and other gender confirming procedures are medically necessary for individuals with gender dysphoria.\(^\text{415}\) Since 2008, the American Medical Association (AMA) has stated that, “[A]n established body of medical research demonstrated the effectiveness and medical necessity of mental health care, hormone therapy and sex reassignment surgery as forms of therapeutic treatment for many people diagnosed with GID… the AMA support[s] public and private health insurance coverage for the treatment of gender identity disorder."\(^\text{416}\)

\(^{412}\) See *About the Joint Commission*, Joint Comm’N, http://www.jointcommission.org/about_us/about_the_joint_commission_main.aspx (last visited Sept. 10, 2014) (explaining that the Joint Commission is an independent, not-for-profit organization that accredits and certifies more than 20,500 health care organizations and programs in the United States) (on file with the Washington and Lee Journal of Civil Rights and Social Justice).

\(^{413}\) See Cahill, *supra* note 93.

\(^{414}\) See *AMA Policies on LGBT Issues*, Am. Med. Ass’n, https://www.ama-assn.org/ama/pub/about-ama/our-people/member-groups-sections/gltb-advisory-committee/ama-policy-regarding-sexual-orientation.page (last visited Sept. 10, 2014) (stating that—through its H-65.983 Nondiscrimination Policy—the AMA affirms it has not been its policy to discriminate with regard to sexual orientation or gender identity, and that—through its H.185-950 Removing Financial Barriers to Care for Transgender Patients—it supports treatment for patients with GID) (on file with the Washington and Lee Journal of Civil Rights and Social Justice); see also Khan, *supra* note 113, at 414 (explaining that transition-related procedures are medically necessary because of psychological benefits people with gender-identity disorder attain through the procedures and because it is often what the physician believes is the necessary mode of treatment for the condition).

\(^{415}\) See *DSM-V Fact Sheet*, *supra* note 19, 25 (explaining that SRS and hormone therapy as well as psychotherapy are necessary treatments for gender dysphoria); see also Am. Med. Ass’n, *supra* note 411.

Contrary to the findings and beliefs of the medical community, insurers have and continue to use medical-necessity reviews to restrict transgender patients’ access to transition-related and gender confirming health care.417 Advocates now fear that because the ACA’s nondiscrimination provisions prevent pre-existing condition discrimination, insurance companies will increase their reliance on medical necessity reviews to deny coverage of transition-related procedures.418 Thus under the ACA, insurers have more incentive to narrow the kinds of services considered medically necessary, especially for a politically powerless group like transgender individuals.419 Unless there is some form of intervention, insurers may continue to use medical necessity review to discriminate against transgender individuals and continue to deny necessary coverage for those with gender dysphoria.420 Though medical necessity review in itself is not a bad practice, the way insurers use it to make coverage determinations for transgender patients requires further regulation.

In order to achieve equal care for transgender individuals, regulators must first clarify what a “medical necessity” is. Advocates believe medical necessity should be defined as more than a specific treatment that is essential to one’s bodily or mental well-being.421 Such a strict definition of medical necessity does not comport with how modern medicine treats medical conditions—patients with the same condition often have diverse medical needs and treatments that are necessary interventions for one patient may not be necessary for another.422 For example, treatment for individuals with diabetes varies depending on the individual’s health history and other factors. Sometimes diabetes is treated through changing one’s diet and adding in exercise, while sometimes insulin injections are required. The same can be said of gender dysphoria—it is a classified

417. See Khan, supra note 113, at 414 (2011) (outlining different occurrences of insurance company discrimination based on the medical necessity standard).
418. Id.
419. Id.; see also Cahill, supra note 93.
420. Id.
421. See Kahn, supra note 113, at 414 (explaining how medical necessity is sometimes defined).
422. See DSM-V Fact Sheet, supra note 19 (explaining the psychological and physical strain faced by transsexual individuals with gender dysphoria and how if left untreated, it could lead to destructive behavior and even suicide).
diagnosis with steps for diagnosis and treatment that must be met before any form of transition care is started.\textsuperscript{423}

Many advocates believe that the necessity of transition procedures should be left to the treating physician’s judgment.\textsuperscript{424} This view is consistent with past medical and insurance practices for other treatments. A given treatment is generally considered necessary when a patient’s physician finds that the intervention is medically appropriate for a patient’s condition.\textsuperscript{425} In the past, insurers and courts have deferred to the physician’s judgment, provided that it aligns with the medical community’s recommended treatment for the condition.\textsuperscript{426} Under such a standard, the medical necessity for transition-related care should not even be in question, given that the American Psychosocial Association, with the DSM-V, has established a standard of treatment for gender dysphoria that is also in conjunction with international medical practices.\textsuperscript{427} Thus, the establishment of a standard in the form of rule promulgated by HHS or another agency would serve only to clarify an existing standard, not create a new one. Doing so would prevent private insurance companies from denying legitimately diagnosed transsexuals with gender dysphoria transition-related treatments under the guise that the procedures are medically unnecessary.

\begin{itemize}
\item \textsuperscript{423} See id. (stating that to be diagnosed an individual must experience a marked difference than the individual’s expressed gender and the gender others would assign him or her and it must continue for at least six months).
\item \textsuperscript{424} See Khan, \textit{supra} note 113, at 414 (emphasizing that many transgender advocates and physicians believe that the medical necessity of transition-related care should be left up to the patient and their physician).
\item \textsuperscript{425} See \textit{id.} (discussing how courts and medical professional review boards generally defer to the treating physician’s diagnosis and treatment plan in cases of medical necessity questions).
\item \textsuperscript{426} See James P. Jacobson, \textit{To Pay or Not to Pay, That Is the Question: Coverage Disputes Between Health Plans and Members}, 29 HAMLIN J. PUB. L. & POL’Y 445, 448–49 (2007) (discussing exclusions for cosmetic and experimental treatments).
\item \textsuperscript{427} See DSM-V Fact Sheet, \textit{supra} note 19 (stating that treatment for gender dysphoria is based on a triadic care method that incorporates psychological treatment with hormone therapy and transition-related services such as SRS); \textit{see also} WORLD PROF’L ASSOC. FOR TRANSGENDER HEALTH, \textit{supra} note 7 (providing flexible standards of care for Gender Identity Disorders).
\end{itemize}
C. Require Coverage of Transition-Related Care in Public and Private Insurance Plans

The federal government should consider requiring coverage for transition procedures under all health insurance plans, including public health programs. Some states and cities have already taken it upon themselves to do so and it has resulted in more comprehensive care for transgender individuals with no increase in cost.428 As discussed in Part III of this note, public and private insurance programs alike discriminate against transgender individuals on a multitude of fronts.429 But most importantly, both forms of health care often fail to realize or cover transgender- and transsexual-specific health care needs.430 Plans will not cover certain types of treatments for transgender people, namely SRS and hormone therapy,431 and at times will change coverage options after an individual has transitioned.432 Many plans, even under the ACA, continue to discriminate through the medical-necessity standard and some public programs do not even afford transgender patients medical-necessity review with the state’s department of insurance.433

428. See Corporate Equality Index, supra note 354 (noting that numerous public employers offer inclusive coverage including the University of California and the University of Michigan, as well as the cities of Minneapolis, New York, and San Francisco).
429. Id.
430. Id.
431. SRS and hormone therapy are generally referred to as “transition related procedures” or “gender confirming care.”
432. See Kate Walsham, De-Gendering Health Insurance: A Case for a Federal Insurance Gender Nondiscrimination Act, 24 HASTINGS WOMEN’S L.J. 197, 206–07 (2012) (explaining that many plans will not cover transition-related procedures, often referred to as “gender incongruent procedures,” but will cover the same procedures for a nontransgender patient providing examples of denials for Pap smears for a transgender male).
In failing to provide care within public programs, the United States is far behind a surprising array of countries—including Iran, Brazil, Argentina, and the United Kingdom—that cover procedures like hormone therapy and SRS either free of charge or at a low cost. For example, though Iran has some of the strictest laws on sexuality and same-sex relations in the world, Iran also has an extremely liberal sex-change operations industry. According to a 2012 report by the BBC, the Iranian regime made sexual reassignment surgery more accessible by announcing that health insurance companies must cover the full cost of sex-change operations. Similarly, in 2012 Argentina passed a law that not only gives people the right to specify how their gender is listed at the civil registry, but that also covers sex-change surgery or hormone therapy for adults as part of their public or private health care plans. It is crucial that the United States

434. See Jillian Berman & Jeffrey Young, Transgender Americans Struggle for Coverage as U.S. Lags ‘Far Behind’ Even Iran, HUFFINGTON POST (Aug. 22, 2013), http://www.huffingtonpost.com/2013/08/22/transgender-coverage_n_3797843.html (detailing transgender health care coverage in other countries and, based on the United States’ National Transgender Discrimination Survey, how these foreign nations cover more procedures than American insurance programs).


436. Id.; see also Iran’s Health Insurers to Pay for Sex Change Operations, BBC (May 29, 2012), http://www.bbc.com/news/world-middle-east-18258276 (last visited Sept. 12, 2014) (interviewing and reporting on how health insurance companies in Iran are obliged to cover the costs of sex reassignment surgery); see also Ali Hamedani, The Gay People Pushed to Change Their Gender, BBC PERSIAN (Nov. 4, 2014) http://www.bbc.com/news/magazine-29832690 (stating that Ayatollah Khomeini passed a fatwa in the 1980’s allowing sex-change operations in the country); see also Mehrnaz Samimi, Fatwa Allows Sex Changes in Iran, but Stigma Remains, AL MONITOR (Oct. 7, 2013) http://www.al-monitor.com/pulse/originals/2013/10/iran-subsidizes-sex-change-surgery.html (detailing how the Iranian government subsidizes sex reassignment surgeries and treatment). It is important to note that while this is in stark contrast to United States policy, Iran is still a country where same-sex relationships are punishable by execution, making sex-change surgeries often the only difference between life and death. See von Oldershausen, supra note 435 (noting that although the freedom to change sex might be a relief to some Iranians, there is also a pressure felt by gay men and women in Iran to have sex reassignment surgeries as a means of legitimizing their sexual orientation because as gay individuals, they are committing a crime, while as transsexuals, they can exist under Iranian law).

follows suit given that transgender Americans are disproportionately poorer than the rest of the population with more than one-quarter living off $20,000 per year or less. Many transgender individuals cannot afford health care in general let alone transition-related care. Thus, it is crucial that public programs expand their coverage, as doing so would not increase health care costs. A study of San Francisco’s experience with offering coverage of transition procedures to city employees found that costs and claims fell well under the figures estimated by actuaries and in the end did not cost the city or its employees more to cover transition procedures. Advocates believe that based on the statistics from San Francisco, there is no monetary justification for not covering gender confirming care for transsexual individuals with gender dysphoria because it will likely not increase insurance costs and premiums. Requiring coverage for transition-related care within public programs can help shape the standard for how private insurance companies determine coverage, thus leading to more transition-related care available to transgender individuals.

Some states have already reformed their insurance regulations and many advocates believe the federal government should follow suit and take similar action. The different state statutes and bulletins can serve as a framework within which a federal policy can be developed. The insurance and managed care departments of Vermont, the District of Columbia, California, Colorado, Massachusetts, and Oregon have issued regulations and bulletins in 2012, 2013, and 2014 that have banned transgender discrimination in state health care programs and required coverage of some


438. See Berman, supra note 434 (citing the United States’ National Transgender Discrimination Survey).


440. See Transgender-Inclusive Health Care Coverage, supra note 439 (noting that actuaries estimated that 35 people per year would access $50,000 in services and the actual utilization over a five year span from 2001–2006 was a total of 37 claims and a total expenditure of $383,000, which was far less than expected).

441. Id.

442. See Baker, supra note 78 (summarizing how state insurance departments in California, the District of Columbia, Vermont, Oregon, and Colorado have released bulletins that further limit transgender discrimination in insurance coverage).
transition-related procedures. The District of Columbia has passed the Unfair Insurance Trade Practices Act that prohibits any treatment procedure designed to alter an individual’s physician characteristics to those of the opposite sex. In Vermont, the state Insurance Department has released a bulletin clarifying that insurance companies shall not exclude coverage for medically necessary treatments including gender reassignment surgery for gender dysphoria and related health conditions.

Prior to the publication of the HHS regulation clarifying that plans may not discriminate based on gender identity or sexual preference, California, in 2005, passed the Insurance Gender Nondiscrimination Act (IGNA). The IGNA established a state insurance framework wherein an insurer that covers a procedure for a non-transgender patient, must cover that procedure for a transgender patient. The IGNA was passed to recognize and address problems transgender individuals face accessing care even when they have insurance.


445. See id. at 4 (explaining the Vermont Insurance Department’s bulletin).

446. See Insurance Gender Nondiscrimination Act, 2005 CAL. LEGIS. SERV. 421 (West).

447. See Minter, supra note 433, at 39 (explaining how the IGNA requires equal coverage among all patients in regards to procedures); see also Walsham, supra note 432, 448. Id.
of the opposite sex and that health plans that deny such procedures because of transgender status are contrary to effective public health practices.\(^{449}\)

The California Department of Managed Health Care (DMHC) has built on the IGNA and the HHS non-discrimination clarification and ordered that California’s health plans remove exclusions of coverage based on gender identity and expression.\(^{450}\) The guidance from the DMHC was issued in 2013 and states that the IGNA guarantees all people the right to access coverage for medically necessary care regardless of their gender identity or gender expression.\(^{451}\) This effectively removes the medical necessity limitation used by insurance companies to deny coverage of transition procedures for patients with gender dysphoria.\(^{452}\) The directive applies to HMOs and PPOs regulated by the DMHC and builds on a parallel nondiscrimination regulation issued by the Department of Insurance in 2012 that covers health insurance under their regulation.\(^{453}\) As a result, all California health plans and insurers cannot arbitrarily deny medically necessary services provided to policy-holders simply because they are transgender.\(^{454}\) The DMHC letter also instructs health plans to revise current plan documents to remove exclusions and limitations related to

\(^{449}\) See Cal. Health & Safety Code § 1365.5(a) (2005); Cal. Ins. Code § 10140(a) (2005). California’s health insurance regulation statutes are bifurcated into the Health and Safety code and the Insurance code. The IGNA appears in both section 1365.5 of the California Health and Safety code and section 10140 of the California Insurance code—these provisions are identical; see also CA Bans Insurance Discrimination Against Transgender Patients, \(\text{TRANSGENDER LAW CTR. (Apr. 9, 2013), http://transgenderlawcenter.org/archives/3920}\) (stating “insureds may identify themselves as a certain sex, they may still need medical services typically given to members of the opposite sex … A health plan that automatically denies coverage of gynecological services for men as inappropriate could then deny appropriate medically necessary services for transgender enrollees.”).

\(^{450}\) See CA Bans Insurance Discrimination Against Transgender Patients, supra note 449 (clarifying that California’s health plans under the IGNA must give all people the right to access coverage for medically necessary care regardless of the patient’s gender identity or expression).

\(^{451}\) CA Bans Insurance Discrimination Against Transgender Patients, supra note 449; see also FAQ: California’s Ban on Transgender Exclusions in Health Insurance, supra note 443.

\(^{452}\) See CA Bans Insurance Discrimination Against Transgender Patients, supra note 449 (detailing how California law removes the medical necessity limitation that insurance companies use to justify transition related health care exclusions).

\(^{453}\) Id.

\(^{454}\) Id.
gender transition.\textsuperscript{455} The Letter also directs that transgender individuals be given access to DMHC’s Independent Medical Review (IMR) process if a health plan denies a specific medical service or treatment.\textsuperscript{456} The letter impacts 22.5 million Californians who are enrolled in health plans regulated by the DMHC and an additional 3.7 million people who are enrolled in health plans regulated by the DOI.\textsuperscript{457} Because insurance companies must comply with the DMHC and DOI Director’s letters in order to sell insurance in the state, the letters carry the force of the law in California.\textsuperscript{458} The letters are not without limitation, the DMHC and DOI Letter’s do not impact self-insured plans—generally used by larger businesses—because they are regulated under ERISA\textsuperscript{459} and by the Department of Labor.\textsuperscript{460}

Similarly, Colorado’s Division of Insurance has released a bulletin that bans health insurance discrimination against transgender Coloradans.\textsuperscript{461} The bulletin mandates that transgender citizens of the state be afforded the same care and treatment as all other Coloradans under their health insurance plans.\textsuperscript{462} Further, it bars the practice of excluding medically necessary care prescribed for the treatment of gender dysphoria and requires private health insurance companies to cover medically necessary care for transgender Coloradans on the same terms they cover all care.\textsuperscript{463} The Oregon Insurance Division has also ruled that insurance companies cannot discriminate.

\begin{itemize}
\item \textsuperscript{455} See FAQ: California’s Ban on Transgender Exclusions in Health Insurance, supra note 443.
\item \textsuperscript{456} See id. (highlighting that, Kaiser Permanente, one of the largest insurers in California, is regulated by and subject to DMHC guidance).
\item \textsuperscript{457} Id.
\item \textsuperscript{458} 29 U.S.C. §§ 1021–1453. ERISA is a federal insurance law that preempts state nondiscrimination protections.
\item \textsuperscript{459} FAQ: California’s Ban on Transgender Exclusions in Health Insurance, supra note 443.
\item \textsuperscript{461} Id.
\item \textsuperscript{462} Id.
\item \textsuperscript{463} Id.
\end{itemize}
against transgender individuals.\textsuperscript{464} The regulations are similar to Colorado and California in that they mandate that any procedure or treatment that would be provided to a non-transgender person, such as counseling, hormone treatment, or genital surgery, cannot be denied to a transgender individual.\textsuperscript{465} For example, an insurance company that offers genital surgery for someone who was maimed or intersex will now also have to cover the same procedure for transgender individuals.\textsuperscript{466}

The states adopting these policies are not requiring coverage for specific medical treatments; instead they are simply guaranteeing transgender individuals the same rights to coverage as all other individuals seeking identical procedures. In doing so these states are taking a major step forward in providing better and more comprehensive care for transgender people and removing tools used by insurance companies to deny coverage of transition-related care. The regulations are making crucial strides in expanding transgender health care access, but they do not cover people eligible for Medicare and/or Medicaid programs.\textsuperscript{467} Though California Medicaid, Medi-Cal, covers some transition procedures such as hormone replacement therapy and some forms of SRS.\textsuperscript{468} Proponents of transgender rights believe HHS should promulgate an additional nondiscrimination provision that builds on 1557’s clarification and parallels what California, Oregon, and Colorado have done.\textsuperscript{469} These regulations are crucial because they create a fair system, by guaranteeing the same coverage to all insureds and effectively end the denial of transition-related care coverage.\textsuperscript{470} Advocates believe that promulgating

\begin{itemize}
  \item \textsuperscript{464} See Blanchard, supra note 443 (explaining Oregon Insurance Division determination prohibiting transgender discrimination); see also Jonathan J. Cooper, \textit{California & Oregon Direct Insurance Companies to Provide It}, HUFFINGTON POST (Nov. 11, 2013) http://www.huffingtonpost.com/2013/01/12/transgender-health-coverage-california-oregon-insurance_n_2463615.html.
  \item \textsuperscript{465} Id.
  \item \textsuperscript{466} Id.
  \item \textsuperscript{467} Id.
  \item \textsuperscript{469} Id.; see \textit{COLORADO ASS’N OF HEALTH PLANS}, supra note 461; see also Cooper, supra note 464.
  \item \textsuperscript{470} See \textit{What Transgender Californians Need to Know About Health Care Reform}, supra note 468 (quoting Ray Crider, a 28-year-old transgender man, “I just never felt that I was anybody else. I see everybody else being taken care of without having to fight the
such a rule or issuing a regulation at the federal level will give transgender individuals the equal standing they deserve and provide them with the needed confidence to pursue treatment options they desire.\textsuperscript{471} The state directives have been met with much support by LGBT advocates, and after seeing the success of expanding city-based health insurance for employees in Portland and San Francisco many believe these state regulations will have nothing but a positive effect on statewide health care access.\textsuperscript{472} Thus, advocates believe that these successes at the state level could serve as a framework for expanding federal non-discrimination laws for transgender health care access.\textsuperscript{473} These changes will not only effect private insurers, but also serve to improve state Medicaid coverage for transition related care, as it has in California.\textsuperscript{474}

\textit{IV. Conclusion}

In examining the history of transgender health care discrimination, it is clear that the situation for transgender individuals in the U.S. is beginning to improve. More and more corporations and public employers cover transition-related care for transsexual employees and culturally competent care for transgender employees.\textsuperscript{475} HHS has taken some steps to improve access for transgender individuals with gender dysphoria by lifting Medicare’s blanket ban on covering transition related care.\textsuperscript{476}

But discrimination in the workplace and health care market still exists. The first step to eliminate discrimination should be to pass the ENDA through the House. The ENDA will, by limiting employment discrimination, address crucial health care access issues.\textsuperscript{477} More employment opportunities will either provide transgender individuals with

\begin{itemize}
  \item \textsuperscript{471} See \textit{id.} (emphasizing the importance for transgender individuals to have a rule or regulation to base advocacy and rights on).
  \item \textsuperscript{472} Id.
  \item \textsuperscript{473} Id.
  \item \textsuperscript{474} Id.
  \item \textsuperscript{475} See \textit{Corporate Equality Index, supra} note 354 (listing corporations that provide health care coverage for transition related procedures).
  \item \textsuperscript{477} See \textit{Ford, supra} note 381.
\end{itemize}
employer-based health insurance or provide them with the funds to enter the Health Exchanges or examine a broader array of private health plans that may cover transition-related care. The passage of the ENDA will also be a crucial signal to the transgender community that the government not only recognizes their struggle, but that they are seeking to remedy it through the legislative process.

The second step is for the federal government to build on the 2012 HHS nondiscrimination clarification and promulgate additional nondiscrimination provisions specific to transgender health care access issues. These provisions should mirror those already established by California, Oregon, and Colorado state insurance departments. One such provision should clarify that the treating and diagnosing physician, not the insurance company, should determine the medical necessity of transition-related procedures. Other provisions should clarify that health plans and insurers, both public and private, cannot arbitrarily deny medically necessary services provided to policyholders because they are transgender. Further, there should be a rule requiring insurance companies to cover medically necessary care for transgender individuals on the same terms as all other care provide to plan members.

The fact that the ACA has yet to improve care, still allowing for medical necessity and cosmetic discrimination in transition-related care, is telling of the state of the health care system in the U.S. Clearly, we still have a long way to go towards improving transgender health care disparities. The ACA has launched a new era in American health care and refocused government interest on social legislation. It presents an opportunity for transgender individuals and advocates to legislate federal protection for access to health care and should be capitalized on by advocates. An end to discriminatory practices is not likely to come without further forms of federal protection and it is up to the government to seize this pivotal moment for change in the treatment of transgender individuals in the health care system.

478. What Coloradans Need to Know About the Division of Insurance Recent Bulletin on Health Insurance, ONE COLORADO, http://www.one-colorado.org/what-coloradans-need-to-know-about-the-division-of-insurance-recent-bulletin-on-health-insurance/ (last visited Feb. 12, 2014); see also FAQ: California’s Ban on Transgender Exclusions in Health Insurance, supra note 443; see also Blanchard, supra note 443.