

Legislative Agenda 2021: [Video Version](#) or [PDF Slides of Video](#)

Families Deserve Timely Access to the Quality Care they Need!

- Help us Reduce & Eliminate Barriers to Care while Increasing Preventative Care
 - We are seeking a **Sunrise Review** to create an additional training option so Licensed Midwives can meet the growing and increasingly diverse demands of the childbearing population in WA State.

Why Support Family Access to Licensed Midwives (LMs) capable of offering all contraceptive options and antibiotics for common perinatal infections?

Decrease morbidity associated with untreated conditions

- Situations where LMs could efficiently treat their clients with antibiotics if permitted include mastitis, urogenital infections, and sexually transmitted infections

Ensure families have the tools to plan their family size & space their pregnancies

- When people must attend an additional visit for a contraceptive prescription or insertion they are more likely to use less effective methods or no method¹

Reduce costs and barriers to care by:

- Eliminating unnecessary additional visits with another provider

Enable the prevention & efficient treatment of common conditions identified by midwives

- Clients might not attend an additional visit with another provider due to cost or insurance obstacles, time, inconvenience, transportation barriers, or new provider trust issues
- Needing to seek contraceptive care from a different provider than their midwife risks delay and loss to follow-up, and this loss to follow-up is significantly more likely to impact already vulnerable and marginalized populations²

Why support a sunrise review of these proposed changes to the law?²

Updates the arcane law that only enables clients to choose from diaphragms and cervical caps from their Licensed Midwife

- These contraceptive methods are rarely used in the United States^{3,4} and have much lower effectiveness than other more common, modern methods

Requires additional didactic and skills-based training for midwives who want to offer these services

- Other health professions employ this approach to practice updates^{5,6}

Improves perinatal outcomes by:

- Increasing midwifery integration into the healthcare system⁷
- Expanding client choice of practitioner who can meet their routine perinatal needs, particularly in medically underserved rural and urban areas

Ensures pregnant and postpartum persons can receive initial basic treatments from their midwife

- Consultation and referral will still be employed for refractory or complicated cases (already law)

Removes current gaps to increase access & improve routine care

- Families who choose midwives for their care, especially those living in underserved rural and urban shortage areas, benefit
- Improves use of services and can affect the size and demographics of the workforce without negatively impacting quality of care⁸⁻¹⁴

Keep the cap on midwife professional licensing fees at \$525 *as noted in the Governor's Budget

Recent data from the State Health Care Authority indicates that Licensed Midwifery care actually results in even greater cost savings to the state than previously estimated, at \$1.9 million annually. In order to continue growing the midwifery workforce and expand this public benefit, we are seeking to maintain the cap on the annual licensing fee. We are requesting to maintain the budget proviso of \$150,000 to provide the necessary backfill to sustain the midwifery program at the Department of Health.

Other bills MAWS supports:

- **Support [SB 5068](#)**: Extends Medicaid coverage for pregnant and postpartum people from 60 days post-pregnancy to one year, post-pregnancy, specifically for groups that have not qualified for the Medicaid expansion (i.e. that are only eligible for Medicaid because of pregnancy)
- **Support [HB 1031/SB 5072](#)**: Certificate of "birth resulting in stillbirth" provides validation and acknowledgment of the family's experience by symbolizing to bereaved parents that their baby is being acknowledged as a real birth and not just a fetal death
- **Support [SB 5140](#)**: Protecting pregnancy and miscarriage-related patient care

Published by the Midwives' Association of Washington State (MAWS)
For more information, please contact: Jen Segadelli, MAWS President info@washingtonmidwives.org or
Amber Ulvenes, MAWS Lobbyist, at (360) 280-0384 amber@ulvenesconsulting.com

References:

1. Zerden ML, Tang JH, Stuart GS, Norton DR, Verbiest SB, Brody S. Barriers to receiving long-acting reversible contraception in the postpartum period. *Women's Health Issues*. 2015;25(6):616-621. doi:10.1016/j.whi.2015.06.004
2. Segadelli J. *The provision of contraceptive services by Licensed Midwives in Washington state: Proposed statutory and regulatory language for expanding the scope of practice* [master's thesis]. Kenmore, WA: Bastyr University, 2016.
3. Washington Administrative Code 246-834-250.
4. Daniels K, Abma JC. Current contraceptive status among women aged 15–49: United States, 2015–2017. Centers for Disease Control and Prevention. <https://www.cdc.gov/nchs/data/databriefs/db327-H.pdf>. Published 2018. Accessed Mar 29, 2020.
5. Washington House Bill 2411. 66th Legislature. 2020 Regular Session.
6. Washington House Bill 1427. 65th Legislature. 2017 Regular Session.
7. Effland, K. J., Hays, K. E., Zell, B. A., Lawal, T. K., & Koontz, M. (2020). Medication access and midwifery integration: An example of community midwifery advocacy for access in Washington State, USA. *Birth*. <https://onlinelibrary.wiley.com/doi/full/10.1111/birt.12523>
8. Beal MW, Batzli ME, Hoyt A. Regulation of certified nurse-midwife scope of practice: Change in the professional practice index, 2000 to 2015. *J Midwifery Womens Health*. 2015;60(5):510-518. <https://doi.org/10.1111/jmwh.12362>
[Wiley Online Library PubMed Web of Science@Google Scholar](#)
9. Kuo YF, Loresto FL Jr, Rounds LR, Goodwin JS. States with the least restrictive regulations experienced the largest increase in patients seen by nurse practitioners. *Health Aff*. 2013;32(7):1236-1243. <https://doi.org/10.1377/hlthaff.2013.0072>
[Crossref PubMed Web of Science@Google Scholar](#)
10. Markowitz S, Adams EK, Lewitt MJ, Dunlop AL. Competitive effects of scope of practice restrictions: Public health or public harm? *J Health Econ*. 2017;55:201-218. <https://doi.org/10.1016/j.jhealeco.2017.07.004>
[Crossref PubMed Web of Science@Google Scholar](#)
11. Neff DF, Yoon SH, Steiner RL, et al. The impact of nurse practitioner regulations on population access to care. *Nurs Outlook*. 2018;66(4):379-385. <https://doi.org/10.1016/j.outlook.2018.03.001>
[Crossref PubMed Web of Science@Google Scholar](#)
12. Perry JJ. State-granted practice authority: Do nurse practitioners vote with their feet? *Nurs Res Pract*. 2012;2012:482178. <https://doi.org/10.1155/2012/482178>
[PubMed Google Scholar](#)
13. Ranchoff BL, Declercq ER. The scope of midwifery practice regulations and the availability of the certified nurse-midwifery and certified midwifery workforce, 2012–2016. *J Midwifery Womens Health*. 2020;65(1):119-130.
[Wiley Online Library PubMed Web of Science@Google Scholar](#)
14. Yang YT, Attanasio LB, Kozhimannil KB. State scope of practice laws, nurse-midwifery workforce, and childbirth procedures and outcomes. *Womens Health Issues*. 2016;26(3):262-267. <https://doi.org/10.1016/j.whi.2016.02.003>