

2. Option: Eliminate General Fund Support for Contraceptives

DPHHS Program: Public Health and Safety Division

General Fund: \$1,000,000

State Special Revenue: \$0

Federal Special Revenue: \$0

For further information see [Reference Book](#) page 12

 Hide replies

- | | |
|---|---------------------------|
| 1. I strongly oppose the elimination of General Fund Support for contraceptives. I work with low income families who are at high risk for unintended pregnancy. A cut in spending would cause the rate of these unplanned pg's to escalate due to inability to afford contraceptives. | Tue, Sep 7, 2010 9:16 AM |
| 2. That will hurt the economy in the long run because there will end up being more children that are not taken care of properly. | Mon, Sep 6, 2010 11:32 PM |
| 3. I strongly oppose this option. This is a PREVENTATIVE resource for low income women. Many of them would require Medicaid services for an unplanned pregnancy, which is a much more expensive option. | Mon, Sep 6, 2010 10:43 AM |
| 4. Penny wise and pound foolish, I guess!! Can lead to more welfare obligation and STD increase in a population taxpayers are obligated to provide for. Government does have an obligation to act in a responsible way under our laws/ | Sat, Sep 4, 2010 11:59 AM |
| 5. Statewide in 2009 these fund helped over 22,800 women and men access affordable contraceptives. In the past year more individuals have lost employer provided health insurance during the recession and employers have had to reduce coverage levels of existing policies due to cost. These factors make contracepting more difficult when women and families have a greater need than ever to plan pregnancies and spacing of children due to economic pressure. The cost to the State of unintended pregnancies covered by Medicaid or uncovered by insurance is exponentially greater than assisting those seeking to plan pregnancies through the use of affordable, effective contraceptive methods.

Retaining these funds in the budget is a far more cost effective economic measure than eliminating them and opening the door to higher rates of unintended pregnancy which ultimately is a significant factor in the economic hardship of many women, children and families. | Sat, Sep 4, 2010 9:29 AM |
| 6. Let the private sector do it | Fri, Sep 3, 2010 10:18 PM |
| 7. I strongly oppose the elimination of General Fund Support for Contraceptives. Eliminating these funds would put many women in low income situations in place of not being able to afford these contraceptives and the options they may need. the | Fri, Sep 3, 2010 9:10 PM |

50 responses per p

answered question

skipped question

2. Option: Eliminate General Fund Support for Contraceptives

DPHHS Program: Public Health and Safety Division

General Fund: \$1,000,000

State Special Revenue: \$0

Federal Special Revenue: \$0

For further information see [Reference Book](#) page 12

result would be an increase in unintended pregnancies and an increase on our communities as we would need to support these women in other ways that would be more costly in the long term.
It is important that Montana continue the General Fund Support for Contraceptives in order to avoid increased costs to the Medicaid program.

8. I strongly oppose the elimination of General Fund Support for Contraceptives. Fri, Sep 3, 2010 6:07 PM

These contraceptive funds would be used to help women and families living at or below 50% of the federal poverty level. Most of these clients would qualify for Medicaid if they had an unplanned pregnancy.

The approximate savings in Medicaid costs for the prevention of one unintended pregnancy in Montana is \$12,257. This savings includes prenatal care, delivery, and the first year of an infant's medical care.

Montana ranks low in the nation in its efforts to help women avoid unintended pregnancy; the state is 35th in service availability and 43rd in public funding.

In 2008, it was estimated that 63,870 women were in need of subsidized family planning services in Montana, 66% (42,062) did not receive the needed services.

The Title X Federal grant accounts for only 30% of the total expenditures of the program. It is important that Montana continue the General Fund Support for Contraceptives in order to avoid increased costs to the Medicaid program.

This will save the state money in the long run. It is time the state starts looking at long term goals of prevention project and not be so short-sighted.

9. I want to express my strong opposition to elimination of General Fund Support for Contraceptives. Fri, Sep 3, 2010 4:44 PM

These funds help to provide contraception to women and families living below 50% of the federal poverty level. The numbers of families living at this poverty level is increasing due to the current economy. If these women became pregnant, most would qualify for Medicaid.

50 responses per page

answered question

skipped question

2. Option: Eliminate General Fund Support for Contraceptives

DPHHS Program: Public Health and Safety Division

General Fund: \$1,000,000

State Special Revenue: \$0

Federal Special Revenue: \$0

For further information see [Reference Book](#) page 12

It is well known that contraception saves about \$12,000 in the Medicaid costs of ONE pregnancy and the 1st year of that infant's medical care.. Montana cannot afford reduce contraceptive availability and affordability to low income women and families.

Montana ranks 43rd in public funding to help low income women and men avoid unintended pregnancy.

Family Planning's Title X Federal grant accounts for only 30% of the total expenditures of the Family Planning program.

General Fund Support to Family Planning clinics for the purchase of contraceptives is an excellent investment of tax dollars because it prevents unintended pregnancy and the subsequent increased Medicaid costs for more expensive pregnancy related health care and infant care. In short, contraception helps keeps Medicaid costs from increasing.

-
10. This program saves money in the long run by preventing unintended pregnancies. These pregnancies result in more health care costs. Montana is a state that has one of the lowest support levels for family planning in the entire country, yet we have a high rate of teen pregnancy. Fri, Sep 3, 2010 3:54 PM

-
11. I strongly oppose the elimination of General Fund Support for Contraceptives. Fri, Sep 3, 2010 3:30 PM

These contraceptive funds would be used to help women and families living at or below 50% of the federal poverty level. Most of these clients would qualify for Medicaid if they had an unplanned pregnancy.

The approximate savings in Medicaid costs for the prevention of one unintended pregnancy in Montana is \$12,257. This savings includes prenatal care, delivery, and the first year of an infant's medical care.

Montana ranks low in the nation in its efforts to help women avoid unintended pregnancy; the state is 35th in service availability and 43rd in public funding.

In 2008, it was estimated that 63,870 women were in need of subsidized family planning services in Montana, 66% (42,062) did not receive the needed services.

The Title X Federal grant accounts for only 30% of the total expenditures of the program. It is important that Montana continue the General Fund Support for Contraceptives in order to avoid increased costs to the Medicaid program.

-
12. This is an inexpensive investment by the legislature in the future of Montana. The increased costs of contraceptives has not gone away. The choices have been drastically reduced. This is a vital expenditure for the women of all ages in Montana. It will save the State money in the long run by preventing unnecessary, unwanted and unintended pregnancies, thereby reducing Medicaid costs, (one premature infant can cost over \$1 million dollars, and that is just one.)Department Fri, Sep 3, 2010 3:03 PM

50 responses per p

answered question

skipped question

2. Option: Eliminate General Fund Support for Contraceptives

DPHHS Program: Public Health and Safety Division

General Fund: \$1,000,000

State Special Revenue: \$0

Federal Special Revenue: \$0

For further information see [Reference Book](#) page 12

of Family Services costs (for costs associated with child abuse and neglect, foster care services, and all of the associated costs of these services, legal and medical). This is an extremely cost effective use of Tax payor dollars.

-
13. I strongly support the funding for contraceptives. The cost of contraceptives are skyrocketing and the end result of a cut like this will more unplanned and unwanted pregnancies. Please do not make this cut that will have such a devastating impact on the women and families of Montana. Thanks you for your consideration. Fri, Sep 3, 2010 2:08 PM

-
14. I strongly oppose the elimination of General Fund Support for Contraceptives. Fri, Sep 3, 2010 1:51 PM

These contraceptive funds would be used to help women and families living at or below 50% of the federal poverty level. Most of these clients would qualify for Medicaid if they had an unplanned pregnancy.

The approximate savings in Medicaid costs for the prevention of one unintended pregnancy in Montana is \$12,257. This savings includes prenatal care, delivery, and the first year of an infant's medical care.

Montana ranks low in the nation in its efforts to help women avoid unintended pregnancy; the state is 35th in service availability and 43rd in public funding.

In 2008, it was estimated that 63,870 women were in need of subsidized family planning services in Montana, 66% (42,062) did not receive the needed services.

The Title X Federal grant accounts for only 30% of the total expenditures of the program. It is important that Montana continue the General Fund Support for Contraceptives in order to avoid increased costs to the Medicaid program.

-
15. I strongly oppose the elimination of General Fund Support for Contraceptives. Fri, Sep 3, 2010 1:08 PM

The general fund support for contraceptive would be used to help women and families living at or below 50% of the federal poverty level. Many to most of these clients would qualify for Medicaid if they had an unplanned pregnancy.

The Title X Federal grant accounts for only 30% of the total expenditures of the program. It is important that Montana continue the General Fund Support for Contraceptives in order to avoid increased costs to the Medicaid program.

The approximate savings in Medicaid costs for the prevention of one unintended pregnancy in Montana is \$12,257. This savings includes prenatal care, delivery, and the first year of an infant's medical care.

Montana ranks low in the nation in its efforts to help women avoid unintended pregnancy; the state is 35th in service availability and 43rd in public funding.

50 responses per p

answered question

skipped question

2. Option: Eliminate General Fund Support for Contraceptives

DPHHS Program: Public Health and Safety Division

General Fund: \$1,000,000

State Special Revenue: \$0

Federal Special Revenue: \$0

For further information see [Reference Book](#) page 12

In 2008, it was estimated that 63,870 women needed subsidized family planning services in Montana, 66% (42,062) did not receive such needed services.

16. Access to affordable contraception is critical to the economic well-being of Montana's women and affects other social services as well as other areas of the economy. In addition, evening the playing field for all Montana men and women when it comes to family planning increases access to education and employment for all people. I strongly disagree with the option of eliminating the General Fund Support for Contraceptives. Fri, Sep 3, 2010 1:07 PM

17. The Medicaid cost for ONE unintended pregnancy in Montana is over \$12,000. Compare that to the cost of even a year's worth of contraception. And that's just the pregnancy itself--not ongoing health care for a social-services-dependent woman and her child (General Fund money for contraceptives is used to help women and families living at or below 50 percent of the federal poverty level, most of whom would qualify for Medicaid if they had an unplanned pregnancy). Fri, Sep 3, 2010 12:05 PM

In 2008, some 66 percent of Montana women needing subsidized family planning services didn't get those services (42,062 women). The resultant, ripple-effect statistics would be interesting to know.

So, I strongly believe that Montana should continue the General Fund Support for Contraceptives. We have both a social (moral) and economic obligation to help women avoid getting pregnant when that is their responsible choice.

Thank you.

18. do not eliminate funds for contraceptives. this is the most cost effective way to prevent unwanted pregnancies. Fri, Sep 3, 2010 11:43 AM

19. I am opposed to eliminating funding for birth control. Preventing unintended pregnancies is very important for women in Montana. Fri, Sep 3, 2010 11:27 AM

Let alone, the cost of preventing pregnancies compared to the price it will cost the state who then support these unintended pregnancies through prenatal care, labor and delivery and care for the infant. This expense has been estimated to cost Medicaid over \$12,000.

It is important that Montana continue the General Fund Support for Contraceptives in order to avoid increased costs to the Medicaid program.

20. I strongly oppose the elimination of General Fund Support for Contraceptives. Fri, Sep 3, 2010 11:18 AM

These contraceptive funds would be used to help women and families living at or below 50% of the federal poverty level. Most of these clients would qualify for Medicaid if they had an unplanned pregnancy.

50 responses per p

answered question

skipped question

2. Option: Eliminate General Fund Support for Contraceptives

DPHHS Program: Public Health and Safety Division

General Fund: \$1,000,000

State Special Revenue: \$0

Federal Special Revenue: \$0

For further information see [Reference Book](#) page 12

The approximate savings in Medicaid costs for the prevention of one unintended pregnancy in Montana is \$12,257. This savings includes prenatal care, delivery, and the first year of an infant's medical care.

Montana ranks low in the nation in its efforts to help women avoid unintended pregnancy; the state is 35th in service availability and 43rd in public funding.

In 2008, it was estimated that 63,870 women were in need of subsidized family planning services in Montana, 66% (42,062) did not receive the needed services.

The Title X Federal grant accounts for only 30% of the total expenditures of the program. It is important that Montana continue the General Fund Support for Contraceptives in order to avoid increased costs to the Medicaid program.

21. This should not be eliminated. Fri, Sep 3, 2010 11:11 AM

22. I thought the governer was not going to cut social programs ? Fri, Sep 3, 2010 11:03 AM

23. I strongly appose the elimination of General Fund Support for Contraceptives. Fri, Sep 3, 2010 10:57 AM

These contraceptive funds would be used to help women and families living at or below 50% of the federal poverty level. Most of these clients would qualify for Medicaid if they had an unplanned pregnancy.

The approximate savings in Medicaid costs for the prevention of one unintended pregnancy in Montana is \$12,257. This savings includes prenatal care, delivery, and the first year of an infant's medical care.

Montana ranks low in the nation in its efforts to help women avoid unintended pregnancy; the state is 35th in service availability and 43rd in public funding.

In 2008, it was estimated that 63,870 women were in need of subsidized family planning services in Montana, 66% (42,062) did not receive the needed services.

The Title X Federal grant accounts for only 30% of the total expenditures of the program. It is important that Montana continue the General Fund Support for Contraceptives in order to avoid increased costs to the Medicaid program.

24. The support for contraceptive services is critical in ensuring that Family Planning programs across the state of Montana move forward in their mission of reducing the incidence of unintended pregnancy. Fri, Sep 3, 2010 10:37 AM

25. I provide reproductive care in a small county. Many women are married, have children, have no health insurance and are under-employed come to me for services because contraceptives are more affordable from the clinic. This option would make contraceptives too expensive for many of these women, who are trying very hard to avoid a pregnancy they cannot afford. If they do get pregnant they will apply for Medicaid and the state will pay more for the unwanted pregnancy. Fri, Sep 3, 2010 10:27 AM

50 responses per p

answered question

skipped question

2. Option: Eliminate General Fund Support for Contraceptives

DPHHS Program: Public Health and Safety Division

General Fund: \$1,000,000

State Special Revenue: \$0

Federal Special Revenue: \$0

For further information see [Reference Book](#) page 12

then it is currently paying to make contraceptives affordable for this very vulnerable group.

- | | | |
|-----|---|----------------------------|
| 26. | This funding is a critical component of the state family planning network. Not only does this allocation support the health care needs of almost 27000 low-income women and families, but it provides the state match for expansion of family planning services under Medicaid. Elimination of the funding will result in an increase in costs to low-income women, less availability of high-cost, long-acting contraceptives, and the possibility that family planning expansion will be put on hold. | Fri, Sep 3, 2010 10:04 AM |
| 27. | It is neither cost-effective nor humane to take action that results in more unplanned pregnancies. | Thu, Sep 2, 2010 5:03 PM |
| 28. | For what population. Can they afford their own? | Thu, Sep 2, 2010 4:07 PM |
| 29. | I do not support reducing funds for this. | Thu, Aug 26, 2010 10:51 AM |
| 30. | No, No, NO!! | Wed, Aug 25, 2010 1:23 PM |
| 31. | Agree | Sun, Aug 22, 2010 5:07 PM |
| 32. | Drop. | Mon, Aug 9, 2010 6:21 AM |
| 33. | Births will increase. My daughter is on birth control because of this program, with her income it is the difference on feeding her children or birth control if she had to pay for it out right. It si expensive and with this assistance you are keeping down the unwanted pregnancies that Medicaid will most likely be paying for. | |

50 responses per p

answered question

skipped question