	• The voice will deepen, but other aspects of the way I speak may not sound more masculine
	Mood changes may be caused by these medicines, and I will continue therapy with a licensed mental health care professional during treatment.
	Using these medicines to masculinize is an off-label use of the medications. This means these medications are not approved by the FDA for this purpose. I know that the medicine and dose that is recommended is based solely on the judgment and experience of the prescribing physician and there is no data in the medical literature or controlled research studies that support the timing, dosing, and type of administration of HRT.

Risks of Testosterone

Patient	Statement
	Testosterone **SHOULD NOT** be used by anyone who: • Is pregnant • Has uncontrolled coronary artery disease as it could increase your risk for a fatal heart attack
	It should be used **WITH CAUTION** and only after a full discussion of risks by anyone who: • Has acne • Has a family history of heart disease or breast cancer • Has had a blood clot • Has high levels of cholesterol • Has liver disease • Has a high red blood cell count • Is obese • Smokes cigarettes
	The medical effects and the safety of testosterone are not completely known and there may be unknown long-term risks.
	Taking testosterone causes changes that other people will notice.
	Treatment with testosterone will not prevent serious psychiatric events, including suicide.
	Taking more testosterone than prescribed: • Will increase health risks; • Will not make changes happen more quickly or more significantly; and • May cause the body to convert extra testosterone into estrogen that can slow down or stop me from appearing more masculine.
	Taking testosterone can cause changes that increase the risk of heart disease. These changes include: • Less good cholesterol (HDL) that may protect against heart disease and more bad cholesterol (LDL) that may increase the risk of heart disease;

	• Higher blood pressure; and • More deposits of fat around the internal organs
	Taking testosterone can damage the liver and possibly lead to liver disease.
	Taking testosterone can increase red blood cells and hemoglobin, which may increase my risk of life-threatening problems such as stroke or heart attack.
	Taking testosterone can increase the risk for diabetes (high blood sugars), which decrease the body's response to insulin, cause weight gain, and increase deposits of fat around internal organs increasing the risk of heart disease and stroke.
	Treatment with testosterone can cause ovaries to not release eggs and may cause infertility.
	Treatment with testosterone increases the risk of cancer to the uterus, ovaries, or breasts. It is unclear if taking testosterone plays any role in HPV infection or cervical cancer.
	Taking testosterone causes or worsens migraines.
	Taking testosterone can cause emotional changes, such as irritability, frustration, aggression, and anger.

Risks of Finasteride

Patient	Statement
	Finasteride may be an appropriate treatment option in individuals experiencing bothersome alopecia resulting from testosterone treatment.
	Finasteride may have side effects which include: • decreased libido • dry skin • acne • Breast swelling and tenderness • headache • irregular menstruation • dizziness • increased body hair
	Finasteride is not approved by the FDA for use in biological women and is forbidden in pregnant women due to birth defects.

Requirements of Treatment with HRT

Patient	Statement
	Compliance with the requirements explained above is a prerequisite to receive treatment with testosterone.
	The prescribing physician may stop prescribing testosterone if the prescribing physician or mental health care professionals providing treatment pursuant to this consent determine the benefit of treatment no longer outweighs the risks, there is insufficient social or psychological support, or the requirements in this consent are not met.
	I understand that I may decide to stop treatment at any time.

Prevention of Complications while under Treatment of HRT

Patient	Statement
	I agree to notify the prescribing physician if I suffer from any side effects during treatment or am unhappy with the treatment in any way, and if I have any concerns that I have worsening signs of depression or anxiety or wants to harm myself or attempt suicide or attempt suicide.
	The prescribing physician is required to monitor me for any side effects during treatment and may refer me to another physician or specialist for treatment.

CONSENT:

My signature below confirms that:

1. My prescribing physician has talked with me about:
   a. the benefits and risks of taking testosterone;
   b. the possible or likely consequences of hormone therapy; and
   c. potential alternative treatments.

2. The information provided to me in this form and by the prescribing physician includes the known effects and risks of treatment with testosterone. I know that there may be other unknown short-term and long-term effects or risks which may be irreversible.

3. I have had sufficient time and opportunity to discuss relevant treatment options with my prescribing physician.

4. All my questions have been answered to my satisfaction by my prescribing physician.

5. I know enough to give informed consent to take, refuse, or postpone taking testosterone.

6. The Florida Board of Medicine or the Florida Board of Osteopathic Medicine requires that your prescribing physician provide this form in accordance with section 456.52, F.S. This form contains information required to be disclosed to you by Florida law and does not necessarily reflect the views or opinions of your physician.

7. My signature below attests to my consent to begin treatment with testosterone.

Based on all this information:

_____ I want to begin or continue taking testosterone
_____ I want to begin or continue taking finasteride
_____ I do not wish to begin or continue taking masculinizing medication

_____
Patient's printed name (required)

_____ _____
Patient's signature (required) Date

PRESCRIBING PHYSICIAN:

My signature below attests to my compliance with 456.52, Florida Statutes.

_____
Prescribing physician's printed name (required)

_____ _____
Prescribing physician's signature (required) Date

WITNESS:

_____
Witness' printed name (required)

_____ _____
Witness' signature (required) Date

FOR PATIENTS WHOSE PRIMARY LANGUAGE IS NOT ENGLISH:

I certify that I am fluent in English and in the native language of the person indicating consent and/or assent on the above form. I certify that I have accurately and completely interpreted the contents of this form, and that the patient has indicated understanding of the contents of this form.

_____
Interpreter's printed name

_____ _____
Interpreter's signature Date

Surgical Treatment for Adults with Gender Dysphoria

Patient Information and Informed Consent

Before having surgery to treat gender dysphoria, you need to be aware of the effects and possible risks of these procedures. Your surgeon will make a medical decision, in consultation with you, about the procedures that are best for you, keeping in mind your overall health.

Your surgeon will discuss with you all the information relating to the surgery. You are asked to read and understand the following information and to discuss any questions you have with your surgeon. After your questions or concerns are addressed and you have decided to have surgery you must initial the statements below and sign this form in person with your surgeon.

Medical treatment of people with gender dysphoria is based on very limited, poor-quality research with only subtle improvements seen in some patient's psychological functioning in some, but not all, research studies. This practice is purely speculative, and the possible psychological benefits may not outweigh the substantial risks of medical treatments and, in many cases, the need for lifelong medical treatments.

What are the types of surgery to treat gender dysphoria?

Surgery to treat gender dysphoria may involve procedures on the face, chest, or genitalia. Common surgery options include:

- **Facial reconstructive surgery** to make facial features more masculine or feminine.
- **Chest or "Top" surgery** to remove breast tissue for a more masculine appearance or enhance breast size and shape for a more feminine appearance.
- **Genital or "Bottom" surgery** to transform and reconstruct the genitalia.
  - **Orchiectomy:** A bilateral orchiectomy is a procedure performed by a urologist that involves surgical removal of the testicles through a small scrotal incision. This procedure is done with a particular technique that allows for vaginoplasty later, if desired. Afterward, patients may adjust their dose of estrogens downward and no longer require spironolactone. Recovery takes approximately 2 weeks. Individuals seeking orchiectomy may wish to consider semen banking to preserve future fertility options.

Please initial below to acknowledge your understanding of the information on this page.

Patient

DH-MQA XXXX (Rev. XX/XX)
Rules 64B8-X.XXX and 64B15-XX.XXX

- **Vaginoplasty**: In addition to an orchiectomy, a person may elect to undergo a vaginoplasty, which is a surgical procedure that involves reconstructing the genitals to create external female genitalia with or without a vaginal cavity. For those patients treated with puberty blockers as a minor, such treatment may lead to insufficient penile tissue that could necessitate the use other tissues, such as the colon, to create a vagina.
- **Phalloplasty:** This surgery involves a multi-staged procedure for the creation of a penis, urinary channel to allow urination, scrotum, and the obliteration of the vaginal cavity with closure. The removal of the female genital organs such as the uterus and ovaries and fallopian tubes are required and usually performed separately and prior to the phalloplasty surgery. The creation of the penis is performed with use of tissue from other parts of the body, which could include, more commonly the radial forearm free flap, or anterolateral thigh flap, and latissimus dorsi (MLD) flap. Prosthetics such as silicone or saline testicles can be placed as well as inflatable penile prosthetics in the final stage.
- **Metoidioplasty:** In this procedure, the surrounding tissue of the clitoris is released to achieve maximal length and a more natural-looking male position. A urethra is also reconstructed using either local skin tissue or a graft from the mouth depending on the amount of tissue present. Construction of a scrotum with testicular prosthetics can also be performed at the same time.
- **Hysterectomy:** Removal of the uterus and cervix via laparoscopic or vaginal techniques.
- **Salpingo-oophorectomy:** Removal of the fallopian tubes and ovaries.
- **Vaginectomy:** Obliteration of the vaginal canal and opening.

Is surgery the only treatment for gender dysphoria?

Surgery is just one option. Not everyone who has gender dysphoria chooses to have surgery. Depending on your age and preferences, you may choose:

- Treatment by a licensed mental health care professional that has experience in treating people with gender dysphoria, which is recommend regardless of whether you undergo surgery due to the high risk of anxiety, depression, self-harm, and suicide.
- Hormone replacement therapy to increase masculine or feminine characteristics.

Other options may be discussed with your prescribing physician.

Please initial below to acknowledge your understanding of the information on this page.

Patient

What are some potential complications of surgery to treat gender dysphoria?

Potential complications include:

- Changes in sexual sensation
- Diminishment of bladder function
- Problems with urination
- Bleeding
- Infection
- Nerve damage
- Poor healing
- Scarring that can cause pain, firmness, asymmetry
- Side effects of anesthesia, including death

What happens after surgery to treat gender dysphoria?

Recovery times vary based on what procedures or combination of procedures you have as follows:

- **Cheek and nose surgery:** Swelling lasts for around two to four weeks.
- **Chin and jaw surgery:** Most swelling fades within two weeks but may take up to four months for swelling to completely disappear.
- **Chest surgery:** Swelling and soreness lasts for one to two weeks with physical limitations lasting at least one month.
- **Bottom surgery:** Most people do not resume usual activities until at least six weeks after surgery and weekly follow-up visits with your surgeon for several months will be necessary.

When should I see my surgeon?

After surgery, you should see your surgeon if you experience:

- Bleeding for more than a few days.
- Pain that does not go away after several weeks.
- Signs of infection, such as a wound that changes color or does not heal.

Please initial below to acknowledge your understanding of the information on this page.

Patient

Please initial each statement on this form to show that you understand the risks and changes associated with gender dysphoria surgeries.

Patient	Statement
	I understand that my surgeon will discuss with me during the preoperative process the available surgical procedures to treat gender dysphoria, the aftercare needs following surgery, and the importance of postoperative follow-up.
	I understand that these surgeries are permanent.
	I understand that if I have my breasts removed, I must undergo reconstructive surgery if I wish to have breasts in the future. If implants are used, complications may include pain, numbness, infection, bleeding, asymmetry, hardening, rippling, scarring, and the possible need for multiple surgeries.
	I understand that if I have my breasts removed that breast feeding will never be possible.
	I understand that if I have breast augmentation surgery, complications may include pain, numbness, infection, bleeding, asymmetry, hardening, rippling, scarring, and the possible need for multiple surgeries.
	I understand that my surgeon will assess me for risk factors associated with breast cancer prior to breast augmentation or mastectomy, including genetic mutations (e.g.., BRCA1, BRCA2), family history, age, radiation, exposure to estrogen, and the amount of breast tissue anticipated to remain after surgery.
	I understand that if I undergo metoidioplasty/phalloplasty I will need lifelong urological treatment.
	I understand that complications following metoidioplasty/phalloplasty include: • urinary tract strictures and fistulas • mucoceles due to vaginal remnant • hair growth within the neourethra • compromised sexual function including absent tactile and/or erogenous sensation, difficulties achieving orgasm • complications with penile prosthetics
	I understand that if I undergo vaginoplasty I will need lifelong treatment with my surgeon, primary care physician, and/or gynecologist.
	I understand that if I undergo vaginoplasty, complications can include: • the formation of granulation tissue • intravaginal hair growth • delayed wound healing and/or wound disruption • introital stenosis (closing, narrowing, or closure) • painful sex

	I understand that my surgeon may stop further treatment because the risks of treatment outweigh the benefits of treatment.
	I understand that this treatment will not prevent serious psychiatric events, including suicide.
	I agree to tell my surgeon if I have any problems or side effects or am unhappy with the surgery, including if I have worsening signs of depression or anxiety or want to harm myself or attempt suicide.
	I understand that my surgeon may be required to refer me to one or more specialists for surgery-related complications, and I agree to go to those specialists as recommended.
	I acknowledge that surgery to treat gender dysphoria is only part of my overall health and that a range of preventative health activities are recommended including: • cervical/prostrate screening tests at appropriate intervals as recommended by my doctor • regularly checking my breasts for lumps, even if I have had a mastectomy • regular mammograms from an appropriate age in consultation with my doctor • quitting smoking • immunizations • regular STI screening, depending on my level of risk • HIV prevention, depending on my level of risk • regular physical activity, including resistance exercise for bone health • healthy eating

CONSENT:

My signature below confirms that:

1. My surgeon has talked with me about:
    a. the benefits and risks of surgery to treat gender dysphoria;
    b. the possible or likely consequences of surgery to treat gender dysphoria;
    c. potential alternative treatments.

2. The information provided to me in this form and by the surgeon includes the known effects and risks of surgery to treat gender dysphoria. I know that there may be other unknown short-term and long-term effects or risks which may be irreversible

3. I have had sufficient time and opportunity to discuss relevant treatment options with my surgeon.

4. All my questions have been answered to my satisfaction by my surgeon.

5. I know enough to give informed consent to have, refuse, or postpone surgery to treat gender dysphoria.

6. The Florida Board of Medicine or the Florida Board of Osteopathic Medicine requires that your prescribing physician provide this form in accordance with section 456.52, F.S. This form contains information required to be disclosed to you by Florida law and does not necessarily reflect the views or opinions of your surgeon.

7. My signature below attests to my consent to surgery to treat gender dysphoria.

My signature below confirms the following:

_____ _____

Patient's signature (required) Date

_____ _____

Patient's signature (required) Date

SURGEON:

My signature below attests to my compliance with 456.52, Florida Statutes.

_____
Surgeon's printed name (required)

_____ _____
Surgeon's signature (required) Date

WITNESS:

_____
Witness' printed name (required)

_____ _____
Witness' signature (required) Date

FOR PATIENTS WHOSE PRIMARY LANGUAGE IS NOT ENGLISH:

I certify that I am fluent in English and in the native language of the person indicating consent on the above form. I certify that I have accurately and completely interpreted the contents of this form, and that the patient has indicated understanding of the contents of this form.

_____
Interpreter's printed name

_____ _____
Interpreter's Signature Date

DRAFT FOR JUNE 30, 2023 – JOINT FULL BOARD MEETING

64B8ER-XX/64B15ER-XX - Sex-reassignment Standards of Practice in Minors

The standards of practice in this rule do not supersede the level of care, skill, and treatment recognized in general law related to healthcare licensure.

(1) Pursuant to Section 456.52, Florida Statutes, sex-reassignment prescriptions and procedures are prohibited for patients younger than 18 years of age, except that a physician may continue to treat such patient with a prescription if such treatment for sex-reassignment was commenced before, and is still active on, May 17, 2023. The physician is required to obtain voluntary, informed consent while physically present in the same room as the patient. Consent is not required for renewal of such prescriptions if a physician and his or her patient have met the requirements for consent for the initial prescription or renewal; however, a separate consent is required for any new prescription for a pharmaceutical product not previously prescribed to the patient.

(2) Informed Consent. The Board has approved the following mandatory informed consent forms for the continued treatment of minors with sex-reassignment prescriptions:

(a) For patients prescribed puberty blocking medications, form DOH-MQA-XXXX, (06/23), entitled "Puberty Suppression Treatment for Patients with Gender Dysphoria, Patient Information and Informed Parental Consent and Assent for Minors," which is hereby incorporated by reference and available from http://www.flrules.org/Gateway/reference.asp?No=Ref- and from the Board's website at [DOH LINK].

(b) For patients prescribed sex-reassignment feminizing medications, form DOH-MQA-XXXX, (06/23), entitled "Feminizing Medications for Patients with Gender Dysphoria, Patient

Information and Informed Parental Consent and Assent for Minors," which is hereby incorporated by reference and available from http://www.flrules.org/Gateway/reference.asp?No=Ref- and from the Board's website at [DOH LINK].

(c) For patients prescribed sex-reassignment masculinizing medications, form DOH-MQA-XXXX, (06/23), entitled "Masculinizing Medications for Patients with Gender Dysphoria, Patient Information and Informed Parental Consent and Assent for Minors," which is hereby incorporated by reference and available from http://www.flrules.org/Gateway/reference.asp?No=Ref- and from the Board's website at [DOH LINK].

(3) A Board-approved informed consent form is not executed until:

(a) The physician issuing the prescription, while physically present in the same room as the patient, has informed the patient and the patient's parent or legal guardian of the nature and risks of the prescription, and has provided and received the written acknowledgement of the patient and the patient's legal guardian before the prescription is prescribed or administered. The physician is prohibited from delegating this responsibility to another person. The physician is also required to sign the informed consent form.

(b) The patient's parent or legal guardian is required to sign the informed consent form.

(c) The patient is required to assent to the informed consent form.

(d) A competent witness is also required to sign the informed consent form.

(4) Standards of Practice. The nature and extent of the requirements set forth below will vary depending on the practice setting and circumstances presented to the prescribing physician. A

prescribing physician who continues to treat a minor patient with sex-reassignment prescriptions pursuant to section 456.52(1)(a), Florida Statutes, shall comply with the following:

(a) Patient Evaluation. An in-person thorough medical history and physical examination of the patient conducted by the physician must be documented in the patient's medical record prior to prescribing any new sex-reassignment prescription.

(b) Clinical Determinations. Based on the patient evaluation, the following must be confirmed:

1. The patient meets the criteria for gender dysphoria in the current Diagnostic and Statistical Manual of Mental Disorders (DSM) or International Classification of Diseases (ICD);

2. The patient has pubertal changes resulting in an increase in gender dysphoria;

3. The patient does not suffer from a psychiatric comorbidity that interferes with the diagnostic work-up or treatment;

4. The patient will have psychological and social support during treatment;

5. The patient has experienced puberty to at least Tanner Stage 2; and

6. The patient demonstrates knowledge and understanding of the risks, benefits, and expected outcomes of puberty suppression, future cross-sex hormone treatment, as well as the medical and social risks and benefits of sex reassignment surgery based on the patient's current treatment status.

(c) Patient Visit. The physician or their designated covering physician must meet with the patient in-person every six (6) months for the purpose of monitoring the patient and must document each visit in the patient's medical records.

(d) Suicide Risk Assessment. A suicide risk assessment by a licensed mental health care professional must be performed every three (3) months.

(e) Laboratory Testing. Relevant laboratory testing must be performed every four (4) months.

(f) X-rays. X-rays of the hand must be performed each year to monitor and document the patient's bone age progression.

(g) Bone Density Scan. An annual bone density (DEXA) scan must be performed to monitor the patient's bone density during treatment.

(h) Mental Health Assessment. The physician must have the patient undergo an annual mental health assessment to be performed by a board-certified Florida licensed psychiatrist or psychologist.

(i) Counseling. The physician must refer the patient for counseling with a licensed mental health care professional during the treatment period, with a frequency as recommended by the licensed mental health care professional.

(j) Additional Consultations. The physician must refer the patient as necessary for additional evaluation and treatment in order to achieve treatment objectives.

Rulemaking Authority 456.52 FS. Law Implemented 456.52 FS. History – New____.

DRAFT FOR JUNE 30, 2023 – JOINT FULL BOARD MEETING

64B8ER-XX/64B15ER-XX - Mandatory Standardized Informed Consent for Sex-reassignment Prescriptions or Procedures in Adults

Pursuant to Section 456.52, Florida Statutes, when sex-reassignment prescriptions or procedures are prescribed for or administered or performed on patients 18 years of age or older, the physician is required to obtain voluntary, informed consent while physically present in the same room as the patient. Consent is not required for renewal of such prescriptions if a physician and the physician's patient have met the requirements for consent for the initial prescription or renewal; however, a separate consent is required for any new prescription for a pharmaceutical product not previously prescribed to the patient.

(1) Informed Consent. The Board has approved the following mandatory informed consent forms for sex-reassignment prescriptions or procedures for patients 18 years of age or older:

(a) For patients prescribed sex-reassignment feminizing medication, form DOH-MQA-XXXX, (06/23), entitled "Feminizing Medications for Patients with Gender Dysphoria, Patient Information and Informed Consent," which is hereby incorporated by reference and available from http://www.flrules.org/Gateway/reference.asp?No=Ref- and from the Board's website at [DOH LINK].

(b) For patients prescribed sex-reassignment masculinizing medications, form DOH-MQA-XXXX, (06/23), entitled "Masculinizing Medications for Patients with Gender Dysphoria, Patient Information and Informed Consent," which is hereby incorporated by reference and available from http://www.flrules.org/Gateway/reference.asp?No=Ref- and from the Board's website at [DOH LINK].

(c) For patients undergoing surgical treatment, form DOH-MQA-XXXX, (06/23), entitled "Surgical Treatment for Adults with Gender Dysphoria, Patient Information and Informed

Consent," which is hereby incorporated by reference and available from http://www.flrules.org/Gateway/reference.asp?No=Ref- and from the Board's website at [DOH LINK].

(2) A Board-approved informed consent form is not executed until:

(a) The physician issuing the prescription or performing the procedure, while physically present in the same room as the patient, has informed the patient of the nature and risks of the prescription or procedure and has provided and received the patient's written acknowledgement before the prescription is prescribed, administered, or performed. The physician is prohibited from delegating this responsibility to another person. The physician is also required to sign the informed consent form.

(b) The patient is required to sign the informed consent form.

(c) A competent witness is also required to sign the informed consent form.

Rulemaking Authority 456.52 FS. Law Implemented 456.52 FS. History – New____.

From: Paul Arons
To: BOM Public Comment
Subject: Testimony For June 30th Joint Boards Meeting
Date: Monday, June 26, 2023 2:30:15 PM
Attachments: Board of Medicine and Osteopathic Medicine Testimony Consent Rule Meetings 6-23 and 30-2003.docx

Please see attached. Some of this one-pager was testimony at the June 23d BOM meeting in Jacksonville. This is a more complete and updated version.

Thank you,
Paul Arons MD

Tallahassee FL
850-545-8997

Testimony To Florida Medical Boards Paul Arons MD June 23, 30, 2023

Good afternoon. My name is Paul Arons. I am a physician, retired from the Florida Department of Health (DOH), where I was Medical Director for the HIV/AIDS Program for 18 years, and from 2001-2005 was Chair of the DOH Institutional Review Board (the IRB). So I have evaluated a lot of consent forms. I wish to make 5 points;

1. **The forms state "I know enough to give informed consent to take, refuse, or postpone taking these medications." But there is no information if stopped, about whether medications need to be tapered, or what physical and mental changes are likely to occur. There needs to be added information about pros and cons of de-transitioning, and what is necessary for stopping safely.**
2. **The forms state that the medication is off-label, not approved for this use by the FDA. I think it's only fair to add; "…but has been used safely and effectively to treat gender dysphoria for decades by licensed, reputable clinicians who specialize in gender affirming care." Otherwise, this is not fully informed consent.**
3. **For a patient whose primary language is not English, the interpreter certifies they are "fluid in English". I believe the proper term is "fluent", and especially in this setting, "fluid" should be changed to "fluent". In addition, the interpreter should certify that they are also fluent in the patient's primary language, or more appropriately, the consent forms should be translated into that language, not by a computer, but by a bilingual human speaker, and vetted by native speakers to assure the translation is accurate and comprehensible.**
4. **I realize these are "emergency" consents, but they are just not ready for prime time. I ask you please urgently to workshop them further before publishing, with representative gender diverse individuals and their families, and with specialist providers -- technical and personal questions to witnesses at the June 23rd hearing illustrate that necessity -- and in consultation with the Florida Bioethics Network, whose MD-PhD Co-chairs are at the University of Miami and University of Florida.**
5. **Finally, since Florida statute and the medical boards now officially recognize the validity of full-spectrum gender dysphoria care for adults with informed consent, and at least continuing medication treatment for minors with parental consent and patient assent, I urge you by formal resolution to add your voice to that of the court in advocating for Medicaid reimbursement for such care for an estimated 9,000 Floridians who are otherwise losing coverage.**

Thank you for the opportunity to testify.

From: Sharon Conway
To: BOM Public Comment
Subject: Gender Care
Date: Friday, June 23, 2023 12:31:54 PM

[You don't often get email from dreamer@cfl.rr.com. Learn why this is important at https://aka.ms/LearnAboutSenderIdentification]

EXTERNAL EMAIL: DO NOT CLICK links or open attachments unless you recognize the sender and know the content is safe.

I am in support of physicians and counselors who clearly state “gender care” is “life saving care.” The desire to dispute factual information is dangerous. I know there are people who wish others harm, and this extreme form and guidelines does exactly that.

The more history I learn, the more I realize there is a large portion of people who push their biased views on others rather then move forward with compassion. We don’t usually celebrate those who try to move the world backwards ignoring the needs of others.

I apologize for my provocative letter, but I hate seeing people suffer as a result of ignorance and cruelty.

Sharon Conway

From: italiangirl02151968@gmail.com
To: BOM Public Comment
Subject: Affirming care
Date: Friday, June 23, 2023 11:09:49 AM

[You don't often get email from italiangirl02151968@gmail.com. Learn why this is important at https://aka.ms/LearnAboutSenderIdentification]

EXTERNAL EMAIL: DO NOT CLICK links or open attachments unless you recognize the sender and know the content is safe.

Hello, I am writing in support of people being able to receive gender affirming care. This is a basic equal human right that everyone should have. People have the right to make their own decisions. Please help protect this and make it easier not harder for them.

Thank you for your time in this matter.

Sincerely,

Roberta Edwards

Sent from my iPhone

Florida House of Representatives

Representative Anna V. Eskamani
District 42

District Office
1507 E. Concord Street
Orlando, Florida 32803
407-228-1451

Tallahassee Office
406 House Office Building
402 South Monroe Street
Tallahassee, FL 32399-1300
850-717-5047

Email: Anna.Eskamani@myfloridahouse.gov

June 23, 2023

Dear Board Members,

I am writing about your proposed rules and consent form that will impact patients seeking Gender Affirming Care (GAC) in the Sunshine State. These proposed forms are not only rife with violations of the Boards' delegated rulemaking authority, but they are based upon political misinformation about GAC, are filled with errors, and would make it nearly impossible for trans patients to receive the care they need to stay healthy and strong.

The proposed rules and form include multiple burdensome new requirements and stipulations that the Florida Legislature never improved. Just to name a few, this includes:

1. A physician cannot delegate responsibility for obtaining informed consent;
2. A physician must also sign the informed consent;
3. A competent witness must also sign the informed consent;
4. Patient monitoring by a physician must occur every three months;
5. Suicide risk assessment by a licensed mental healthcare professional must be performed every three months;
6. Laboratory testing must be performed every four months;
7. An x-ray must be taken annually;
8. A bone density scan must be performed annually;
9. A mental health assessment by a board-certified, Florida licensed psychiatrist or psychologist must be performed annually.

And these are just the provisions that impact adult patients. Can you provide me with any other medical service in Florida that mandates this kind of targeted regulation? The only other one that comes to mind for me is abortion care -- and abortion care is targeted not for safety reasons, but for political reasons.

Florida House of Representatives

Representative Anna V. Eskamani
District 42

District Office
1507 E. Concord Street
Orlando, Florida 32803
407-228-1451

Tallahassee Office
406 House Office Building
402 South Monroe Street
Tallahassee, FL 32399-1300
850-717-5047

Email: Anna.Eskamani@myfloridahouse.gov

If you move forward with these rules and informed consent, you are essentially banning GAC in Florida as these requirements are not only burdensome, but they are expensive and time consuming. These types of onerous requirements come with a price, especially for patients paying out of pocket. Many doctors will just stop providing care and/or move to other states, creating an environment where Florida patients will have nowhere to go.

We want to see expediency from the Boards to approve consent forms as right now Florida patients are being denied care due to the politicization of this safe medical treatment but this product being proposed today is insufficient, dangerous, and beneath you as medical professionals.

As Judge Hinkle wrote in both of his recent rulings tossing out different bans on gender affirming care: "gender identity is real. The record makes this clear." Please operate with that basic understanding and not restricting access to care.

Best,

Anna

Representative Anna V. Eskamani
Florida House of Representatives, District 42

From: difain27=gmail.com@mg.gospringboard.io on behalf of DJ Fain
To: BOM Public Comment
Subject: Reject rules to restrict access to gender affirming care
Date: Wednesday, June 28, 2023 8:01:54 PM

Dear

I am writing to you today to urge the Florida State Board of Medicine to reject rule 64B8-9.019 and the Florida State Board of Osteopathic Medicine to reject rule 64B15-14.014. Both proposed rules cover Standards of Practice for the Treatment of Gender Dysphoria in Minors, to restrict access to gender-affirming healthcare.

Care providers, doctors, and leading medical associations have been clear that gender-affirming care is safe, effective, evidence-based, and lifesaving.

The nation's leading health organizations support gender-affirming care for transgender and gender non-conforming people, including the American Academy of Pediatrics; the American Medical Association; The American College of Obstetricians and Gynecologists; The American College of Physicians; The American Psychiatric Association; The American Psychological Association; The American Academy of Family Physicians; The Endocrine Society; The Pediatric Endocrine Society; American Nurses Association; American Public Health Association; American Heart Association; National Association of Social Workers; World Medical Association; and The World Professional Association for Transgender Health, among others.

There is overwhelming evidence to support the positive mental health impacts of gender-affirming medical care for transgender adolescents - including in some of the very studies cited by the DOH and Board of Medicine. Prohibiting social transition is clear government intrusion on personal and parental decision-making. Numerous studies have found that after social transition, transgender youth report similar mental health levels to the general youth population, eliminating mental health disparities typically seen. When transgender youth are affirmed by people around them, reported rates of depression and suicidality drop significantly. This rule will deny them this life-saving treatment.

The Florida State Board of Medicine and the Florida Board of Osteopathic Medicine must reject proposed policies like these that are not grounded in science and research and are clearly based on prejudice and political agendas. The evidence is clear: denying transgender youth the ability to access critical healthcare is dangerous and life-threatening.

Not just youth. I appeal as well for transgender adults who are affected by these restrictions. I myself will be affected should the rumored guidelines requiring almost no mental health illness (which is impossible, everyone has anxiety) as I suffer from BPD, PTSD, ADHD, anxiety, depression, gender dysphoria treated by HRT, and am a victim of childhood sexual molestation by a parent.

And for the last year, on HRT, without any other good mental health support save for my

partner and best friend, I have managed to stay alive. Because the HRT lessened all of the other symptoms and strengthened my sense of self. I didn't know it until I was given the space to explore it.

I've been happy for more than a few minutes for the first time in my living memory. And I've been happy for 4 days. Then I learned the proposed guidelines, and they're trying to take away this happiness I've been fighting 34 years as of June 27. My birthday.

I refuse to give up now.

Representative, you are a human. I am a human. We both have emotions, desires, dreams of being in control of ourselves and our lives and hopes for ourselves for the future. We want for ourselves, we want for others.

You are no more or no less of a human than I. You have no more or no less emotions than I. We interpret it differently and we have different lives we've lived to gain the tools for us to this point.

What you think is true and what you know is true may be different.

I urge you to seek your truth: You deserve control of your lives, you deserve to be heard, you deserve to be understood. Because you are human. Because you feel.

So am I. So do I.

I'm not different than you. Just unique to me.

I urge you to reject these rules.

Sincerely,

DJ Fain

From: lissettevfernandez@me.com
To: BOM Public Comment
Subject: Gender Affirming Care Rules and conesnt forms
Date: Friday, June 23, 2023 12:52:33 PM

Dear Board Members,

I am writing about your proposed rules and consent form that will impact patients seeking Gender Affirming Care in Florida. These proposed forms are not only rife with violations of the Boards delegated rule making authority, but are based upon political misinformation about Gender Affirming Care, are filled with errors, and would make it nearly impossible for trans patients to receive the care they need to stay healthy and strong.

Everyone in the state of Florida deserves to have healthcare, and restricting peoples access to healthcare because you don't agree or support who they are is dangerous and discriminatory, and in violation of their rights as the Federal Supreme Courts have already declared.

Please stop trying to restrict trans peoples access to the healthcare they need.

Sincerely,

Lissette Fernandez

From: foxg9775=gmail.com@mg.gospringboard.io on behalf of Grace Fox
To: BOM Public Comment
Subject: Reject rules to restrict access to gender affirming care
Date: Wednesday, June 21, 2023 8:49:17 PM

Dear

I am writing to you today to urge the Florida State Board of Medicine to reject rule 64B8-9.019 and the Florida State Board of Osteopathic Medicine to reject rule 64B15-14.014. Both proposed rules cover Standards of Practice for the Treatment of Gender Dysphoria in Minors, to restrict access to gender-affirming healthcare.

Care providers, doctors, and leading medical associations have been clear that gender-affirming care is safe, effective, evidence-based, and lifesaving.

The nation's leading health organizations support gender-affirming care for transgender and gender non-conforming people, including the American Academy of Pediatrics; the American Medical Association; The American College of Obstetricians and Gynecologists; The American College of Physicians; The American Psychiatric Association; The American Psychological Association; The American Academy of Family Physicians; The Endocrine Society; The Pediatric Endocrine Society; American Nurses Association; American Public Health Association; American Heart Association; National Association of Social Workers; World Medical Association; and The World Professional Association for Transgender Health, among others.

There is overwhelming evidence to support the positive mental health impacts of gender-affirming medical care for transgender adolescents - including in some of the very studies cited by the DOH and Board of Medicine. Prohibiting social transition is clear government intrusion on personal and parental decision-making. Numerous studies have found that after social transition, transgender youth report similar mental health levels to the general youth population, eliminating mental health disparities typically seen. When transgender youth are affirmed by people around them, reported rates of depression and suicidality drop significantly. This rule will deny them this life-saving treatment.

The Florida State Board of Medicine and the Florida Board of Osteopathic Medicine must reject proposed policies like these that are not grounded in science and research and are clearly based on prejudice and political agendas. The evidence is clear: denying transgender youth the ability to access critical healthcare is dangerous and life-threatening.

I urge you to reject these rules.

Sincerely,

Grace Fox

From: Bryce Hackmeyer
To: BOM Public Comment
Subject: Dekker v. Weida - Relevant Court Case
Date: Thursday, June 22, 2023 9:20:37 PM
Attachments: DekkervWeida.pdf

To Whom It May Concern,

Please see the document attached to this email, as it is pertinent to the matters being discussed at the Joint Boards of Medicine and Osteopathic Medicine meeting on June 23, 2023. Although past the deadline to submit public comment, this is not meant to be a public comment but an addition to the public record for the Boards' information. Thank you for your understanding.

Regards,

Bryce S. Hackmeyer (they/them)
Health & Technology Director | Women's Voices of SWFL
bryce@wvswfl.com | www.wvswfl.com

IN THE UNITED STATES DISTRICT COURT FOR THE NORTHERN DISTRICT OF FLORIDA TALLAHASSEE DIVISION

AUGUST DEKKER et al.,

Plaintiffs,

v. CASE NO. 4:22cv325-RH-MAF

JASON WEIDA et al.,

Defendants.

_____/

FINDINGS OF FACT AND CONCLUSIONS OF LAW

For many years, Florida's Medicaid system paid for medically necessary treatments for gender dysphoria. Recently, for political reasons, Florida adopted a rule and then a statute prohibiting payment for some of the treatments: puberty blockers, cross-sex hormones, and surgeries. This case presents a challenge to the rule and statute. The controversy is live only for puberty blockers and cross-sex hormones; no plaintiff currently seeks surgery. This order sets out the court's findings of fact and conclusions of law following a bench trial.

I. Background: the parties and claims

The plaintiffs are two transgender adults, August Dekker and Brit Rothstein, and two transgender minors who are proceeding under pseudonyms, Susan Doe and K.F. The minors are suing through their parents, Jane and John Doe for Susan Doe and Jade Ladue for K.F. "Susan Doe" is the same pseudonym, but the plaintiff here is not the same person, as the plaintiff identified by that pseudonym in *Doe v. Ladapo*, No. 4:23cv114-RH-MAF (N.D. Fla. June 6, 2023).

The defendants are Jason Weida, in his official capacity as Secretary of the Florida Agency for Health Care Administration ("AHCA"), and AHCA itself.

In count I of the first amended complaint, all the plaintiffs assert a claim against Mr. Weida under 42 U.S.C. § 1983 and the Fourteenth Amendment's Equal Protection Clause. In count II, all the plaintiffs assert a claim against AHCA under the Affordable Care Act's prohibition of discrimination based on sex, 42 U.S.C. § 18116. In count III, the minor plaintiffs and Mr. Rothstein, who is over age 18 and thus an adult but under age 21, assert a claim against Mr. Weida under § 1983 and the Medicaid Act's requirement for early and periodic screening, diagnostic, and treatment services for beneficiaries under age 21, 42 U.S.C. §§ 1396a(a)(10)(A), 1396a(a)(43)(C), 1396d(a)(4)(B), and 1396d(r)(5). In count IV, all plaintiffs assert a claim against Mr. Weida under § 1983 and the Medicaid Act's comparability requirement, 42 U.S.C. § 1396a(a)(10)(B)(i), under which

assistance to an eligible individual cannot be less in "amount, duration, or scope" than assistance available to other Medicaid beneficiaries.

The order granting a preliminary injunction in *Doe* was based in large part on the record compiled in this case. The *Doe* parties had stipulated that this record would be considered there. Many of this order's findings and conclusions have been cut and pasted from the *Doe* order, with any appropriate modifications. Same record, same findings and conclusions.

II. Gender identity is real

With extraordinarily rare exceptions not at issue here, every person is born with external sex characteristics, male or female, and chromosomes that match. As the person goes through life, the person also has a gender identity—a deeply felt internal sense of being male or female.[1] For more than 99% of people, the external sex characteristics and chromosomes—the determinants of what this order calls the person's natal sex—match the person's gender identity.[2]

For less than 1%, the natal sex and gender identity are opposites: a natal male's gender identity is female, or vice versa.[3] This order refers to such a person who identifies as female as a transgender female and to such a person who

[1] Trial Tr., ECF No. 226 at 23–24; Trial Tr., ECF No. 238 at 72–73.
[2] Trial Tr., ECF No. 227 at 222.
[3] *Id.*; *see also* Trial Tr., ECF No. 226 at 23–24; Trial Tr., ECF No. 228 at 29–31.

identifies as male as a transgender male. This order refers to individuals whose gender identity matches their natal sex as cisgender.

The elephant in the room should be noted at the outset. Gender identity is real. The record makes this clear. The defendants, speaking through their attorney, have admitted it. At least one defense expert also has admitted it.[4] That expert is Dr. Stephen B. Levine, the only defense expert who has actually treated a significant number of transgender patients. He addressed the issues conscientiously, on the merits, rather than as a biased advocate.

Despite the defense admissions, there are those who believe that cisgender individuals properly adhere to their natal sex and that transgender individuals have inappropriately *chosen* a contrary gender identity, male or female, just as one might choose whether to read Shakespeare or Grisham. Many people with this view tend to disapprove all things transgender and so oppose medical care that supports a person's transgender existence.[5] In this litigation, the defendants have explicitly acknowledged that this view is wrong and that pushing individuals away from their transgender identity is not a legitimate state interest.[6]

Still, an unspoken suggestion running just below the surface in some of the proceedings that led to adoption of the rule and statute at issue—and just below the

---

[4] *See* Trial Tr., ECF No. 239 at 10–11, 31–32, 80–81.
[5] *See id.* at 129–31.
[6] Trial Tr., ECF No. 242 at 97–98.

surface in the testimony of some of the defense experts and AHCA consultants—is that transgender identity is not real, that it is made up.[7] And so, for example, one of the defendants' experts, Dr. Paul Hruz, joined an amicus brief in another proceeding asserting transgender individuals have only a "false belief" in their gender identity—that they are maintaining a "charade" or "delusion."[8] An AHCA consultant, Dr. Patrick Lappert—a surgeon who has never performed gender-affirming surgery—said in a radio interview that gender-affirming care is a "lie," a "moral violation," a "huge evil," and "diabolical."[9] State employees or consultants suggested treatment of transgender individuals is either a "woke idea" or profiteering by the pharmaceutical industry or doctors.[10]

Any proponent of the challenged rule and statute should put up or shut up: do you acknowledge that there are individuals with actual gender identities opposite their natal sex, or do you not? Dog whistles ought not be tolerated.

---

[7] *See, e.g.*, Pls.' Exs. 284 & 285, ECF Nos. 182-21 & 182-22; *see also* Pls.' Ex. 304, ECF No. 183-6.

[8] Trial Tr., ECF No. 238 at 194–95. Dr. Hruz fended and parried questions and generally testified as a deeply biased advocate, not as an expert sharing relevant evidence-based information and opinions. I do not credit his testimony. I credit other defense experts only to the extent consistent with this opinion.

[9] Trial Tr., ECF No. 239 at 129–31.

[10] Pls.' Ex. 304, ECF No. 183-6; Pls.' Exs. 284 & 285, ECF Nos. 182-21 & 182-22.

III. Medicaid

Medicaid is a jointly funded federal-state program that provides medical care for patients of limited economic means. *See Garrido v. Dudek*, 731 F.3d 1152, 1153–54 (11th Cir. 2013); *see also Harris v. James*, 127 F.3d 993, 996 (11th Cir. 1997) (quoting *Silver v. Baggiano*, 804 F.2d 1211, 1215 (11th Cir. 1986)). Federal law makes some services mandatory but allows states to "place appropriate limits" based on "such criteria as medical necessity or on utilization control procedures." 42 C.F.R. § 440.230(d); *see also Garrido*, 731 F.3d at 1154; *Moore ex rel. Moore v. Reese*, 637 F.3d 1220, 1232–33 (11th Cir. 2011); *Rush v. Parham*, 625 F.2d 1150, 1156 (5th Cir. 1980). States may "set reasonable standards" for "medical necessity." *Garrido*, 731 F.3d at 1154.

Exercising this authority, Florida has long limited Medicaid coverage to services that are "medically necessary." *See* Fla. Stat. § 409.905. Florida provides coverage for, among other things, "services and procedures" rendered "by, or under the personal supervision of," a licensed physician, when "medically necessary for the treatment of an injury, illness, or disease." Fla. Stat. § 409.905(9). This does not, however, extend to services that are "clinically unproven, experimental, or for purely cosmetic purposes." *Id.*

For Medicaid beneficiaries under age 21, Florida also covers "all services determined by [AHCA] to be medically necessary for the treatment, correction, or

amelioration of" any "physical and mental problems and conditions." *Id*. § 409.905(2). This provision does not explicitly exclude clinically unproven, experimental, or purely cosmetic services, but as both sides apparently agree, they are excluded here, just as in § 409.905(9). *See Moore*, 637 F.3d at 1234. This coverage tracks with 42 U.S.C. § 1396d(a)(4)(B) and (r), which require states to cover "early and periodic screening, diagnostic, and treatment services" for Medicaid beneficiaries under age 21. *See Moore*, 637 F.3d at 1233–35.

By rule, AHCA has said that to be "medically necessary," a treatment must be, among other things, "consistent with generally accepted professional medical standards as determined by the Medicaid program, and not experimental or investigational."[11] The rule says a drug is "experimental" or "investigational" in four circumstances.[12] The first is when any required approval has not been given by the Food and Drug Administration. The second is when the drug is undergoing phase I, II, or III clinical trials or is under study to determine safety or efficacy "as compared to the standard means of treatment or diagnosis." The third is when the consensus among experts is that further studies are needed to determine the drug's safety or efficacy. The fourth is when the drug is used for a purpose not approved

[11] Fla. Admin. Code r. 59G-1.01(2.83); Pls.' Ex. 22, ECF No. 175-22 at 8.
[12] Fla. Admin. Code r. 59G-1.01(2.46); Pls.' Ex. 22, ECF No. 175-22 at 5.

by the FDA, meaning the use is not listed in one of three compendia of off-label uses or supported by peer-reviewed literature. *Id.* r. 59G-1.01(2.46).[13]

IV. The challenged rule and statute

When AHCA considers Medicaid coverage for a type of medical treatment for the first time, it sometimes prepares a report on whether the treatment is consistent with generally accepted professional medical standards—a "GAPMS report."[14]

In 2016, AHCA prepared a GAPMS report on puberty blockers for transgender adolescents. The report concluded Medicaid payment should be available when appropriate based on an individualized assessment of medical necessity for the specific patient. The report noted that "the risks of not treating" an adolescent with puberty blockers "may be worse than" treatment.[15]

In 2017, AHCA staff prepared a GAPMS report, never formally adopted, on treatment of transgender individuals with cross-sex hormones. The report concluded the treatment was "consistent with generally accepted professional medical standards" and met the requirements for Medicaid coverage.[16]

---

[13] *Id.* at 5; *see also* AHCA 30(b)(6) Dep., ECF No. 235-1 at 53–55.
[14] *See* Pls.' Ex. 238, ECF No. 181-2; *see also* Trial Tr., ECF No. 227 at 165.
[15] Pls.' Ex. 240, ECF No. 181-4 at 9.
[16] Pls.' Ex. 243, ECF No. 181-7 at 1, 11.

Consistent with the 2016 and 2017 GAPMS reports, AHCA approved Medicaid payment for puberty blockers, including for Susan Doe and K.F., and cross-sex hormones, including for Mr. Dekker and Mr. Rothstein.[17]

In 2022, however, the Executive Office of the Governor directed AHCA to conduct a new analysis of Medicaid coverage of gender-affirming care.[18] AHCA's practice is to prepare a GAPMS report only when first considering a treatment, but here, apparently for the first time ever, AHCA elected to prepare another report for these already-approved treatments.[19] AHCA ordinarily prepares reports internally, without retaining consultants, but here, AHCA retained consultants.[20] AHCA retained only consultants known in advance for their staunch opposition to gender-affirming care.

The new GAPMS process was, from the outset, a biased effort to justify a predetermined outcome, not a fair analysis of the evidence.[21] The report concluded that gender-affirming medical care—puberty blockers, cross-sex hormones, and surgery—were not supported by generally accepted medical standards and were

---

[17] Trial Tr., ECF No. 228 at 106–08, 129, 161, 196–97.
[18] AHCA 30(b)(6) Dep., ECF No. 235-1 at 87.
[19] Trial Tr., ECF No. 227 at 171–74, 185–86; *see also* Pls.' Ex. 30, ECF No. 175-30.
[20] Trial Tr., ECF No. 227 at 178–79.
[21] The AHCA employee who drafted the report testified he did not know the preferred outcome. I do not credit the testimony.

instead experimental. The conclusion was not supported by the evidence and was contrary to generally accepted medical standards.

Based in part on the flawed GAPMS report, AHCA proposed a rule barring Medicaid payment for these procedures. AHCA conducted a well-choreographed public hearing that was an effort not to gather facts but to support the predetermined outcome. Afterward, AHCA adopted Florida Administrative Code rule 59G-1.050(7), barring Medicaid payment for gender-affirming puberty blockers, hormones, and surgery.

That was where things stood when the plaintiffs filed this action. Later, though, the Florida Legislature adopted Florida Statutes § 286.31(2). The statute prohibits expenditure of state funds—this includes Medicaid payments—for "sex reassignment prescriptions or procedures" as defined in Florida Statutes § 456.001(9). This includes "puberty blockers" to "stop or delay normal puberty," "hormones or hormone antagonists," and any "medical procedure, including a surgical procedure," "to affirm a person's perception of his or her sex if that perception is inconsistent with the person's [natal] sex." Fla. Stat. § 456.001(9)(a)1–3. There are narrow exceptions, but they do not apply here.

The plaintiffs amended their complaint to challenge the statute as well as the rule. The plaintiffs in *Doe* challenged another part of the same legislation—a part that made providing these services to minors a crime and grounds for terminating a

healthcare practitioner's license. *See id.* § 456.52(1) & (5). This followed the adoption of rules by the Florida Board of Medicine and the Florida Board of Osteopathic Medicine that prohibited the Boards' licensed practitioners from treating "gender dysphoria in minors" with "[p]uberty blocking, hormone, or hormone antagonist therapies." Fla. Admin. Code r. 64B8-9.019(1)(b); Fla. Admin Code r. 64B15-14.014(1)(b).

V. Standing

In *Lujan v. Defenders of Wildlife*, 504 U.S. 555, 560 (1992), the Supreme Court said the "irreducible constitutional minimum of standing contains three elements." First, the plaintiff "must have suffered an injury in fact—an invasion of a legally protected interest which is (a) concrete and particularized, and (b) actual or imminent, not conjectural or hypothetical." *Id*. (internal quotation marks and citations omitted). Second, "there must be a causal connection between the injury and the conduct complained of—the injury has to be fairly traceable to the challenged action of the defendant, and not the result of the independent action of some third party not before the court." *Id*. (internal quotation marks, ellipses, and brackets omitted). Third, "it must be likely, as opposed to merely speculative, that the injury will be redressed by a favorable decision." *Id*. (internal quotation marks omitted). A court must address standing even when not contested by the parties.

A. Puberty blockers and cross-sex hormones

The minor plaintiffs are currently treated with puberty blockers. They were on track to start cross-sex hormones soon. The adult plaintiffs are currently treated with cross-sex hormones.

The loss of Medicaid payment for the needed treatments is an injury in fact; it is concrete and particularized; and it is actual or imminent, not conjectural or hypothetical. The injury is traceable to the challenged rule and statute, either of which, standing alone, would require the plaintiffs to forgo or pay out-of-pocket for the needed treatment, or move out of Florida. The injury will be redressed by a favorable decision.

The plaintiffs thus have standing. This is so despite the statute and rules prohibiting physicians from providing these services to minors. First, the statute and rules do not apply to adults and thus do not affect the adult plaintiffs' standing. Second, at least as of now, Florida law allows minors to continue with treatments they are already receiving, so the statute and rules do not affect the minor plaintiffs' standing to challenge the ban on payment for puberty blockers.[22] Third, as *Doe* held, the statute and rules prohibiting the provision of these services to

[22] *See* Fla. Stat. § 456.52(1)(a); Fla. Admin. Code r. 64B8-9.019(2); Fla. Admin. Code r. 64B15-14.014(2).

minors are unconstitutional—the minor plaintiffs can receive the treatments, if only they can find a way to pay for them.

In sum, the minor plaintiffs have standing to challenge Florida's denial of Medicaid payment for puberty blockers, and all the plaintiffs have standing to challenge the denial of Medicaid payment for cross-sex hormones.

B. Surgery

The result is different for gender-affirming surgery. None of the plaintiffs are currently seeking surgery. The minor plaintiffs have never sought such surgery and are too young even to consider it. Each adult plaintiff has had a mastectomy, and neither seeks further surgery, at least at this time. No plaintiff faces an actual or imminent injury from the denial of Medicaid coverage for gender-affirming surgery.

This is so even though, when this action was filed, Mr. Rothstein was seeking a mastectomy. He had standing at that time to pursue the surgery claim. But he has since had the surgery, paid for through GoFundMe. Past exposure to illegal conduct, without more, does not give a plaintiff standing to pursue prospective relief against a repeat of the illegal conduct, absent a sufficient likelihood that the plaintiff will again be a victim of the illegal conduct. *See, e.g.*, *City of Los Angeles v. Lyons*, 461 U.S. 95, 102, 111 (1983) (holding that a person who had been subjected to a chokehold in the past had no standing to seek

injunctive relief against the city's practice of using chokeholds because there was not a "sufficient likelihood that he will again be wronged in a similar way"); *Malowney v. Fed. Collection Deposit Grp.*, 193 F.3d 1342, 1346 (11th Cir. 1999).

To be sure, Mr. Rothstein asserts a claim for nominal damages based in part on the denial of Medicaid coverage for the surgery he now has had. A nominal-damages claim can be sufficient to establish standing. *See Uzuegbunam v. Preczewski*, 141 S. Ct. 792 (2021). But the Eleventh Amendment bars retrospective relief under § 1983 that would be payable from the state treasury. *See, e.g.*, *Edelman v. Jordan*, 415 U.S. 651 (1974). This principle applies to nominal as well as actual damages. *See Simmons v. Conger*, 86 F.3d 1080, 1086 (11th Cir. 1996). The nominal-damages claim thus does not present a live controversy over Medicaid coverage of gender-affirming surgery.

The surgery claim cannot go forward on the merits.

VI. The Law of the Circuit: *Rush v. Parham*

In *Rush v. Parham*, 625 F.2d 1150 (5th Cir. 1980), a Medicaid beneficiary challenged Georgia's refusal to pay for gender-affirming surgery. The state said the surgery was experimental and thus not medically necessary. The district court ruled that the surgery was necessary because the plaintiff's physician said so—that the state was bound by the physician's opinion. Not surprisingly, the Fifth Circuit disagreed.

The Fifth Circuit remanded the case to the district court to determine two things: first, whether Georgia had a policy prohibiting payment for experimental services when it first rejected the plaintiff's application; and second, if it did, "whether its determination that transsexual surgery is experimental is reasonable." *Id*. at 1157. The court said this second question—whether the state's determination "is" reasonable, would be controlled on remand by "current medical opinion, regardless of the prevailing knowledge at the time of plaintiff's application." *Id*. at 1157 n.13; *see also Moore*, 637 F.3d at 1259 (stating that Congress could have but did not give the state the role of "final arbiter" over medical necessity).

Rush is binding authority in the Eleventh Circuit. *See Bonner v. City of Prichard*, 661 F.2d 1206, 1207 (11th Cir. 1981) (en banc). The remand instructions were the Fifth Circuit's square holding. The case dealt only with surgery, not puberty blockers or cross-sex hormones, but the same principles apply. The decision thus sets out a roadmap for deciding the issue now before this court—the same roadmap the district court was required to follow in *Rush*.

The first issue *Rush* directed the district court to address on remand is easily answered here. The State of Florida prohibited Medicaid payment for experimental services when the plaintiffs submitted their applications. The second question thus is controlling: whether, based on current medical knowledge, the State's determination that these treatments are experimental is reasonable. It is not.

VII. The standards of care

Transgender individuals suffer higher rates of anxiety, depression, suicidal ideation, and suicide than the population at large.[23] Some suffer gender dysphoria, a mental-health condition recognized in the Diagnostic and Statistical Manual of Mental Disorders, Fifth Edition ("DSM-5"). The diagnosis applies when specific criteria are met. Among other things, there must be a marked incongruence between one's experienced gender identity and natal sex for at least six months, manifested in specified ways, and clinically significant distress or impairment.[24]

There are well-established standards of care for treatment of gender dysphoria. These are set out in two publications: first, the Endocrine Society Clinical Practice Guidelines for the Treatment of Gender Dysphoria; and second, the World Professional Association for Transgender Health ("WPATH") Standards of Care, version 8.[25] I credit the abundant testimony in this record that these standards are widely followed by well-trained clinicians.[26] The standards are used

---

[23] Trial Tr., ECF No. 226 at 108.
[24] Pls.' Ex. 33, ECF No. 175-33 at 2–3; *see also* Trial Tr., ECF No. 226 at 25–26; Trial Tr., ECF No. 238 at 71.
[25] Defs.' Exs. 16 & 24, ECF Nos. 193-16 & 193-24.
[26] Trial Tr., ECF No. 226 at 31 (psychiatrist); *id.* at 198 (pediatric endocrinologist); Trial Tr., ECF No. 227 at 50–52 (surgeon); *id.* at 106, 112–14 (pediatrician, bioethicist, medical researcher); Trial Tr., ECF No. 228 at 15 (physician specializing in pediatrics and adolescent medicine).

by insurers[27] and have been endorsed by the United States Department of Health and Human Services.[28]

Under the standards, gender-dysphoria treatment begins with a comprehensive biopsychosocial assessment.[29] In addition to any appropriate mental-health therapy, there are three types of possible medical intervention, all available only to adolescents or adults, never younger children.[30]

First, for patients at or near the onset of puberty, medications known as GnRH agonists can delay the onset or continuation of puberty and thus can reduce the development of secondary sex characteristics inconsistent with the patient's gender identity—breasts for transgender males, whiskers for transgender females, changes in body shape, and other physical effects.[31] GnRH agonists are colloquially known as puberty blockers.

Second, cross-sex hormones—testosterone for transgender males, estrogen for transgender females—can promote the development and maintenance of characteristics consistent with the patient's gender identity and can limit the development and maintenance of characteristics consistent with the patient's natal

---

[27] Trial Tr., ECF No. 227 at 243–44.
[28] *See* Defs.' Ex. 2, ECF No. 193-2.
[29] *See* Trial Tr., ECF No. 226 at 42–43.
[30] Trial Tr., ECF No. 238 at 72 & 74–75; *see also* Trial Tr., ECF No. 228 at 14; Trial Tr., ECF No. 226 at 36 & 176.
[31] *See* Trial Tr., ECF No. 226 at 194–97; Trial Tr., ECF No. 228 at 27–28.

sex.[32] For patients treated with GnRH agonists, use of cross-sex hormones typically begins when use of GnRH agonists ends.[33] Cross-sex hormones also can be used later in life, regardless of whether a patient was treated with GnRH agonists.

Third, for some patients, surgery can align physical characteristics with gender identity, to some extent.[34] The most common example: mastectomy can remove a transgender male's breasts. Perhaps 98% of all such surgeries are performed on adults, not minors.[35]

VIII. General acceptance of the standards of care

The overwhelming weight of medical authority supports treatment of transgender patients with GnRH agonists and cross-sex hormones in appropriate circumstances. Organizations who have formally recognized this include the American Academy of Pediatrics, American Academy of Child and Adolescent Psychiatry, American Academy of Family Physicians, American College of Obstetricians and Gynecologists, American College of Physicians, American Medical Association, American Psychiatric Association, and at least a dozen

---

[32] Trial Tr., ECF No. 226 at 217–26, 228.
[33] *See* Trial Tr., ECF No. 228 at 87–90.
[34] *See* Trial Tr., ECF No. 227 at 42.
[35] *See id.* at 43.

more.[36] The record also includes statements from hundreds of professionals supporting this care.[37] At least as shown by this record, not a single reputable medical association has taken a contrary position.

These medications—GnRH agonists, testosterone, and estrogen—have been used for decades to treat other conditions. Their safety records and overall effects are well known. The Food and Drug Administration has approved their use, though not specifically to treat gender dysphoria.[38]

GnRH agonists are routinely used to treat patients with central precocious puberty—children who have begun puberty prematurely—as well as, in some circumstances, endometriosis and prostate cancer.[39] Central precocious puberty presents substantial health risks and ordinarily should be treated. GnRH agonists are an appropriate treatment, even though GnRH agonists have attendant risks.[40] So, too, gender dysphoria presents substantial health risks and ordinarily should be treated.[41] For some patients, GnRH agonists are an appropriate treatment, even

---

[36] *See* Pls.' Exs. 36–43, 45–48, ECF Nos. 175-36 through 176-8 (omitting ECF No. 176-4); *see also* Amicus Brief of American Academies and Health Organizations, ECF No. 192-1.
[37] *See* Amicus Brief of American Academies and Health Organizations, ECF No. 192-1; Bruggeman et al., *We 300 Florida health care professionals say the state gets transgender guidance wrong* (Apr. 27, 2022), ECF No. 11-1 at 11–32.
[38] *See* Trial Tr., ECF No. 226 at 183; *see also* Trial Tr., ECF No. 239 at 54–56.
[39] Trial Tr., ECF No. 226 at 183–84, 200–02.
[40] *Id.*
[41] *Id.*

though, just as with their use to treat central precocious puberty and other conditions, GnRH agonists have attendant risks.[42]

The defendants say the risks attendant to use of GnRH agonists to treat central precocious puberty or to treat gender dysphoria are not identical, and that may be so. But it is still true that for gender dysphoria, just as for central precocious puberty, GnRH agonists are an effective treatment whose benefits can outweigh the risks.

The same is true for cross-sex hormones. Testosterone and estrogen are routinely used to treat cisgender patients in appropriate circumstances.[43] The medications are an effective treatment for conditions that should be treated, even though the medications have attendant risks.[44] That is so for cisgender and transgender patients alike. For some transgender patients, cross-sex hormones are an appropriate treatment.

Even the defendants' expert Dr. Levine testified that treatment with GnRH agonists and cross-sex hormones is sometimes appropriate.[45] He would demand appropriate safeguards, as discussed below, but he would not ban the treatments.[46] These plaintiffs qualify for treatment under Dr. Levine's proposed safeguards.

---

[42] *Id.* at 201–16.
[43] *Id.* at 216.
[44] *Id.* at 218–29.
[45] Trial Tr., ECF No. 239 at 81–83.
[46] *Id.* at 91–94.

IX. Clinical evidence supporting the standards of care

The record includes testimony of well-qualified doctors who have treated thousands of transgender patients with GnRH agonists and cross-sex hormones over their careers and have achieved excellent results. I credit the testimony of Dr. Dan Karasic (psychiatrist), Dr. Daniel Shumer (pediatric endocrinologist), Dr. Aron Janssen (child and adolescent psychiatrist), Dr. Johanna Olson-Kennedy (specialist in pediatrics and adolescent medicine), and Dr. Armand Antommaria (pediatrician and bioethicist). I credit their testimony that denial of this treatment will cause needless suffering for a substantial number of patients and will increase anxiety, depression, and the risk of suicide.

The clinical evidence would support, though certainly not mandate, a decision by a reasonable patient and parent, in consultation with properly trained practitioners, to use GnRH agonists at or near the onset of puberty and to use cross-sex hormones later, even when fully apprised of the current state of medical knowledge and all attendant risks. There is no rational basis for a state to categorically ban these treatments or to exclude them from the state's Medicaid coverage.

The record includes no evidence that these treatments have caused substantial adverse clinical results in properly screened and treated patients.

X. The plaintiffs' history and medical care

A. August Dekker

August Dekker is a Medicaid-eligible, 28-year-old transgender man.[47] He identified as male from a young age but suffered without disclosing the situation to his family or others. He repeatedly attempted suicide in high school.[48] He began cutting his hair short at age 18, began using a male name and pronouns at age 20, and came out to his family at age 22. He still experienced gender dysphoria. After eight months of therapy and evaluation by a multidisciplinary team, he began treatment with a cross-sex hormone, testosterone.[49] His mental health markedly improved.[50]

A romantic partner convinced him to discontinue testosterone. His mental health deteriorated. He resumed the treatment, and his mental health again improved.[51]

In 2022, with approval from his long-term treating psychiatrist, Mr. Dekker had a mastectomy at the University of Florida.[52] His mental health improved again.

---

[47] Trial Tr., ECF No. 228 at 142 & 145–46.
[48] *Id.* at 150.
[49] *Id.* at 154–55.
[50] *Id.* at 156–57.
[51] *Id.* at 159.
[52] *Id.* at 162. The defendants note that, after a single meeting, a mental-health intern wrote a letter supporting the surgery. Neither a single meeting nor an intern's opinion, standing alone, would support a decision to proceed with surgery.

Mr. Dekker believes that had he not received these treatments—cross-sex hormones and surgery—he would by now have died from suicide, substance abuse, or other self-destructive behavior.[53] Instead, he is thriving.

Medicaid paid for all his treatment, including the cross-sex hormones and surgery. But now, the challenged rule and statute, unless enjoined, will make it impossible for him to continue the hormone treatment, which is still medically necessary.

B. Brit Rothstein

Brit Rothstein is a Medicaid-eligible, 20-year-old transgender man. He is a full-time student at a major research university.[54] He began experiencing gender dysphoria as early as age 8 but did not begin to "put words to feelings" until about age 12.[55] He came out to his peers and family at age 13.

After extensive therapy and then evaluation by a pediatric endocrinologist at a major children's hospital, a recommendation was made for treatment with GnRH agonists and cross-sex hormones. Mr. Rothstein's mother objected. Mr. Rothstein's father obtained a court order giving him medical decisionmaking authority, and the

---

Here, though, the long-term treating psychiatrist recommended surgery, and the surgeon performed it. They were not interns. The surgery has been performed and is no longer at issue.

[53] *Id.* at 167.

[54] *Id.* at 113–15.

[55] *Id.* at 115.

treatments went forward.[56] Medicaid paid for the treatments. Mr. Rothstein's mental health improved.

Mr. Rothstein still bound his chest every day. He eventually consulted a surgeon at the University of Miami and decided to go forward with a mastectomy. The surgery was precleared for Medicaid payment, and a date was set.[57] But the challenged rule was adopted, Medicaid approval was withdrawn, and the surgery was canceled. While this lawsuit was pending, Mr. Rothstein obtained crowd funding through GoFundMe, and he had the surgery. He is very pleased with the results. He remains on cross-sex hormones, which are medically necessary.

C. Susan Doe

Susan Doe is a Medicaid-eligible 13-year-old transgender girl.[58] Her parents, John and Jane Doe, adopted her from medical foster care at age 2. Susan told her mother she was a girl at age 3, and she has consistently behaved that way. Her mother, who was previously unaware of transgender issues, attempted to react neutrally and sought professional advice on how best to care for Susan. Susan began seeing a therapist at age 6.[59] She has identified as a girl at school since second grade.[60]

---

[56] *Id.* at 122–23.
[57] *Id.* at 133–34.
[58] *Id.* at 94–96.
[59] *Id.* at 98.
[60] *Id.* at 100.

Susan began GnRH agonists three years ago at age 10.[61] She has had excellent results and is ready to begin hormone therapy. Her treatment has been paid for to this point by Medicaid, but that will stop unless the challenged rule and statute are enjoined.

D. K.F.

K.F. is a Medicaid-eligible 13-year-old transgender boy.[62] At age 7, he told his grandparents, and soon after his parents, that he was a boy.[63] This was consistent with how he had behaved.

K.F. received an extensive psychiatric evaluation followed by five years of therapy at Boston Children's Hospital.[64] He started on puberty blockers. He moved with his family to Florida and continued his treatment here. He had an appointment with a pediatric endocrinologist at the Johns Hopkins gender clinic in St. Petersburg to consider transition to cross-sex hormones, but the appointment was canceled when the State prohibited the treatment.[65]

He has achieved excellent results with his treatment to date. Medicaid paid for it, first in Massachusetts, then in Florida.

---

[61] *Id.* at 102.
[62] *Id.* at 174,176.
[63] *Id.* at 177.
[64] *See id.* at 184–91.
[65] *Id.* at 195–98.

E. Findings on appropriate treatment

I find, based on the record now before the court, that the plaintiffs have obtained appropriate medical care to this point, that qualified professionals have properly evaluated their medical conditions and needs in accordance with the well-established standards of care, and that the plaintiffs, in consultation with their treating professionals and, for the minors, their parents, have determined that the benefits of the treatment they seek—GnRH agonists or cross-sex hormones—will outweigh the risks. I find that the ability of the adult plaintiffs to evaluate the benefits and risks of the treatment far exceeds the ability of the State of Florida to do so. I find that the ability of the minor plaintiffs and their parents to evaluate the benefits and risks of the treatment far exceeds the ability of the State of Florida to do so. I find that the adult plaintiffs' motivation is their desire to achieve the best possible medical treatment for their gender dysphoria. I find that the minor plaintiffs' parents' motivation is love for their children. I find that the motivation of the minor plaintiffs and their parents is the desire to achieve the best possible medical treatment for the minor plaintiffs' gender dysphoria. This is not the State's motivation.

XI. Equal Protection

The ban on treating minors with puberty blockers and cross-sex hormones violates the Fourteenth Amendment's Equal Protection Clause. The only circuit

that has addressed the issue agrees. In *Brandt ex rel. Brandt v. Rutledge*, 47 F.4th 661 (8th Cir. 2022), the Eighth Circuit affirmed a preliminary injunction against enforcement of an Arkansas statute identical in relevant respects to the Florida statute banning these treatments. The decision is on point, well-reasoned, and should be followed. But as an Eighth Circuit decision, it is not binding.

District court opinions also are not binding. But they have consistently reached the same result. *See Brandt v. Rutledge*, No. 4:21-cv-450, 2023 WL 4073727 (E.D. Ark. June 20, 2023) (holding after an eight-day bench trial that a state law banning gender-affirming care was unconstitutional); *K.C. v. Individual Members of Med. Licensing Bd. of Ind.*, No. 1:23-cv-595, 2023 WL 4054086 (S.D. Ind. June 16, 2023) (granting preliminary injunction against Indiana statute banning puberty blockers and cross-sex hormones for minors); *Doe v. Ladapo*, No. 4:23-cv-114-RH-MAF, 2023 WL 3833848 (N.D. Fla. June 6, 2023) (granting preliminary injunction against Florida statute and rules banning puberty blockers and cross-sex hormones for minors); *Eknes-Tucker v. Marshall*, 603 F. Supp. 3d 1131 (M.D. Ala. 2022) (granting preliminary injunction against Alabama statute banning puberty blockers and cross-sex hormones for minors).

Florida's denial of Medicaid coverage for GnRH agonists and cross-sex hormones also violates the Equal Protection Clause. Other district courts have reached this same result. *See Fain v. Crouch*, 618 F. Supp. 3d 313 (S.D. W. Va.

2022) (holding state Medicaid plan's exclusion of gender-affirming care violated the Medicaid Act, Affordable Care Act, and Equal Protection Clause); *Flack v. Wis. Dep't of Health Servs.*, 395 F. Supp. 3d 1001 (W.D. Wis. 2019) (holding state Medicaid plan's exclusion of gender-affirming care violated the Medicaid Act, Affordable Care Act, and Equal Protection Clause); *see also Kadel v. Folwell*, 620 F. Supp. 3d 339 (M.D.N.C. 2022) (holding state employee insurance plan's categorical exclusion of gender-affirming care violated the Equal Protection Clause, Affordable Care Act, and Title VII); *Boyden v. Conlin*, 341 F. Supp. 3d 979 (W.D. Wis. 2018) (holding state employee insurance plan's exclusion of gender-affirming care violated Title VII, the Affordable Care Act, and the Equal Protection Clause).

A. Introduction to levels of scrutiny

Equal-protection analysis often starts with attention to the appropriate level of scrutiny: strict, intermediate, or rational-basis.

There was a time when the Supreme Court seemed to treat strict scrutiny and rational basis as exhaustive categories of equal-protection review. A leading commentator said that in some situations the first category was "'strict' in theory and fatal in fact" while the second called for "minimal scrutiny in theory and virtually none in fact." Gerald Gunther, *The Supreme Court, 1971 Term—*

Foreword: In Search of Evolving Doctrine on a Changing Court: A Model for a Newer Equal Protection, 86 Harv. L. Rev. 1, 8 (1972).

But in the decades since, the Supreme Court has applied *intermediate* scrutiny in many circumstances. And rational-basis review no longer means virtually no review. *See, e.g.*, *Romer v. Evans*, 517 U.S. 620, 632 (1996) (striking down, for lack of a legitimate rational basis, a state law restricting local ordinances protecting gays: "[E]ven in the ordinary equal protection case calling for the most deferential of standards, we insist on knowing the relation between the classification adopted and the object to be attained."); *City of Cleburne v. Cleburne Living Ctr.*, 473 U.S. 432, 447–50 (1985) (striking down, for lack of a legitimate rational basis, an ordinance requiring group-care facilities for the mentally handicapped, but not other facilities with multiple occupants, to obtain land-use permits); *Hooper v. Bernalillo Cnty. Assessor*, 472 U.S. 612, 623 (1985) (striking down, for lack of a legitimate rational basis, a tax exemption for Vietnam War veterans limited to those who resided in the state on May 8, 1976); *United States Dep't of Agric. v. Moreno*, 413 U.S. 528 (1973) (striking down, for lack of a legitimate rational basis, a statute denying food stamps to members of a household with unrelated members).

In short, regardless of the level of scrutiny, there is no substitute for careful, unbiased, intellectually honest analysis. Still, the level of scrutiny matters, so this order addresses it.

B. Intermediate scrutiny applies here

The plaintiffs say the challenged rule and statute discriminate on the basis of sex and transgender status and that either alone would be sufficient to trigger intermediate scrutiny. The defendants say only rational-basis scrutiny applies. The plaintiffs have the better of it.

1. Sex

It is well established that drawing lines based on sex triggers intermediate scrutiny. *See, e.g.*, *United States v. Virginia*, 518 U.S. 515, 533 (1996); *Adams v. St. Johns Cnty.*, 57 F.4th 791, 801 (11th Cir. 2022) (en banc). If one must know the sex of a person to know whether or how a provision applies to the person, the provision draws a line based on sex. *See, e.g.*, *Bostock v. Clayton Cnty.*, 140 S. Ct. 1731, 1737 (2020); *Adams*, 57 F.4th at 801. The defendants do not deny this; instead, they say the challenged statute does not draw a line based on sex.

But it does. Consider an adolescent Medicaid patient, perhaps age 16, that a physician wishes to treat with testosterone. Under the challenged rule and statute, is the treatment covered by Medicaid? To know the answer, one must know the adolescent's sex. If the adolescent is a natal male, the treatment is covered. If the

adolescent is a natal female, the treatment is not covered. This is a line drawn on the basis of sex, plain and simple. *See Brandt*, 47 F.4th at 669 ("Because the minor's sex at birth determines whether or not the minor can receive certain types of medical care under the law, [the law] discriminates on the basis of sex."); *Adams*, 57 F.4th at 801 (applying intermediate scrutiny to a policy under which entry into a designated bathroom was legal or not depending on the entrant's natal sex).

In asserting the contrary, the defendants note that the reason for the treatment—the diagnosis—is different for the natal male and natal female. Indeed it is. But this does not change the fact that this is differential treatment based on sex. The *reason* for sex-based differential treatment is the purported *justification* for treating the natal male and natal female differently—the justification that must survive intermediate scrutiny. One can survive—but cannot avoid—intermediate scrutiny by saying there is a good reason for treating a male and female differently.

2. Gender nonconformity

Drawing a line based on gender nonconformity—this includes transgender status—also triggers intermediate scrutiny. *See Glenn v. Brumby*, 663 F.3d 1313, 1316 (11th Cir. 2011). Although the defendants deny it, the rule and statute at issue draw lines based on transgender status. *See Eknes-Tucker v. Marshall*, 603 F. Supp. 3d 1131, 1147 (M.D. Ala. 2022) (citing *Glenn*, 663 F.3d at 1317).

To confirm this, consider a Medicaid-eligible child that a physician wishes to treat with GnRH agonists to delay the onset of puberty. Is the treatment covered? To know the answer, one must know whether the child is cisgender or transgender. The treatment is covered if the child is cisgender but not if the child is transgender, because the rule and statute exclude coverage of GnRH agonists only for transgender children, not for anyone else. The theoretical but remote-to-the-point-of-nonexistent possibility that a child will be identified as transgender before needing GnRH agonists for the treatment of central precocious puberty does not change the essential nature of the distinction.

Adverse treatment of transgender individuals should trigger intermediate scrutiny for another reason, too. In *United States v. Carolene Products Co.*, 304 U.S. 144, 152 n.4 (1938), the Court suggested heightened scrutiny might be appropriate for statutes showing "prejudice against discrete and insular minorities." Courts have continued to apply the discrete-and-insular-minority construct. *See, e.g.*, *Foley v. Connelie*, 435 U.S. 291, 294–95 (1978) (citing *Carolene Products* and noting that "close scrutiny" applies to equal-protection claims of resident aliens, who lack access to the political process); *Estrada v. Becker*, 917 F.3d 1298, 1310 (11th Cir. 2019) (citing *Carolene Products*; recognizing that, under *Foley*, heightened scrutiny applies to resident aliens; but declining to afford the same

treatment to illegal immigrants). Transgender individuals are a discrete and insular minority.

The Supreme Court further explained this basis for heightened scrutiny in *City of Cleburne v. Cleburne Living Center*, 473 U.S. 432 (1985). There the Court declined to extend strict or even intermediate scrutiny to intellectually disabled individuals—those with very limited mental ability. But the Court gave two explanations that support a different result for transgender individuals.

First, *City of Cleburne* noted that strict scrutiny applies when the characteristic at issue is almost never a legitimate reason for governmental action. Race is the paradigm—leaving aside affirmative action as a remedy for prior discrimination, it is almost never appropriate to parcel out government benefits or burdens based on race. Transgender status is much the same. Transgender status is rarely an appropriate basis on which to parcel out government benefits or burdens.

Second, *Carolene Products* and *Foley* both referred to a minority's lack of political voice as a basis for heightened scrutiny. *City of Cleburne* noted that the class of intellectually disabled individuals had garnered considerable public and political support—that this was not a class lacking political access. The same is not true of transgender individuals, who continue to suffer widespread private opprobrium and governmental discrimination, notably in the rule and statute now under review. This is precisely the kind of government action, targeted at a discrete

and insular minority, for which heightened scrutiny is appropriate. *See Grimm v. Gloucester Cnty. Sch. Bd.*, 972 F.3d 586, 607 (4th Cir. 2020) (holding transgenders are a quasi-suspect class); *Karnoski v. Trump*, 926 F.3d 1180, 1201 (9th Cir. 2019) (same). *But see Adams*, 57 F.4th at 803 n.5 (noting that whether transgender status is a quasi-suspect class was not at issue there but, in dictum, expressing "grave doubt").

In any event, *City of Cleburne* is important for another reason, too. The Court applied rational-basis scrutiny, but it was *meaningful* rational-basis scrutiny. The Court did not blindly accept a proffered reason for the city's action that did not withstand meaningful analysis. The defendants' proffered reasons here, like those in *City of Cleburne*, do not withstand meaningful analysis. *See Brandt ex rel. Brandt v. Rutledge*, 47 F.4th 661 (8th Cir. 2022) (affirming a preliminary injunction and holding the plaintiffs were likely to prevail on their equal-protection challenge to an Arkansas statute banning gender-affirming care for minors).

3. Cases involving identical, not different, treatment of classes

In opposing heightened scrutiny, the defendants cite *Geduldig v. Aiello*, 417 U.S. 484 (1974), for the proposition that heightened scrutiny does not apply when there are members of the allegedly disfavored class on both sides of the challenged classification. *Geduldig* held that exclusion of pregnancy from state employees' health coverage was not sex discrimination. Some women become pregnant, some

do not. The defendants say this is why the challenged provision did not discriminate based on sex—there were women on both sides. Note, though, that men and women were treated the same: nobody had health coverage for pregnancy. When men and women are treated the same, the Court reasoned, it is not intentional sex discrimination, even if the challenged provision has a disparate impact.

The situation is different here. Transgender and cisgender individuals are not treated the same. Cisgender individuals can be and routinely are treated with GnRH agonists, testosterone, or estrogen, when they and their doctors deem it appropriate, and the treatments are covered by Medicaid. Not so for transgender individuals—the challenged rule and statute prohibit it. To know whether treatment with any of these medications is covered, one must know whether the patient is transgender. And to know whether treatment with testosterone or estrogen is covered, one must know the patient's natal sex.

The defendants also invoke *Dobbs v. Jackson Women's Health Organization*, 142 S. Ct. 2228 (2022). There the Court rejected a due-process challenge to an abortion statute, but the Court also said that the statute did not deny equal protection: "The regulation of a medical procedure that only one sex can undergo does not trigger heightened constitutional scrutiny unless the regulation is a 'mere pretex[t] designed to effect an invidious discrimination against members of

one sex or the other.'" *Id*. at 2245–46 (quoting *Geduldig*, 417 U.S. at 496 n.20). The Court said abortion laws thus "are governed by the same standard of review as other health and safety measures." *Dobbs*, 142 S. Ct. at 2246.

The case at bar, in contrast, does not involve a medical treatment that only one sex can undergo, or that only cisgender or transgender patients can undergo. Instead, the case involves treatments that all individuals can undergo; the state has simply chosen to make the treatment legal for some and illegal for others, depending on sex or transgender status. The *Dobbs* statement about procedures only one sex can undergo is simply inapplicable—and would not help the defendants anyway, because this case involves invidious discrimination against transgenders.

In short, the challenged rule and statute impose differential treatment based on sex and transgender status. *Geduldig* and *Dobbs* are not to the contrary. Intermediate scrutiny applies.

C. Applying the proper level of scrutiny

To survive intermediate scrutiny, a state must show that its classification is substantially related to a sufficiently important interest. *Adams*, 57 F.4th at 801 (cleaned up); *see also Glenn*, 663 F.3d at 1316. To survive rational-basis scrutiny, a state must show a rational relationship to a legitimate state interest. *Romer*, 517 U.S. at 631. The challenged rule and statute survive neither level of scrutiny.

The record establishes that for some minors, including Susan Doe and K.F., a treatment regimen of mental-health therapy followed by GnRH agonists and eventually by cross-sex hormones is the best available treatment. They and their parents, in consultation with their doctors and multidisciplinary teams, have rationally chosen this treatment. The State of Florida's decision to ban payment for GnRH agonists and cross-sex hormones for transgender individuals is not rationally related to a legitimate state interest.

Dissuading a person from conforming to the person's gender identity rather than to the person's natal sex is not a legitimate state interest. The defendants apparently acknowledge this.[66] But the State's disapproval of transgender status—of a person's gender identity when it does not match the person's natal sex—was a substantial motivating factor in enactment of the challenged rule and statute.

Discouraging individuals from pursuing their gender identities, when different from their natal sex, was also a substantial motivating factor. In a "fact sheet," the Florida Department of Health asserted social transitioning, which involves no medical intervention at all, should not be a treatment option for children or adolescents.[67] Nothing could have motivated this remarkable intrusion into parental prerogatives other than opposition to transgender status itself.

---

[66] Trial Tr., ECF No. 242 at 97–98.
[67] Defs.' Ex. 5, ECF No. 193-5 at 1; *see also* Pls.' Ex. 19, ECF No. 175-19 at 2.

State action motivated by purposeful discrimination, even if otherwise lawful, violates the Equal Protection Clause. *See Adams*, 57 F.4th at 810 (recognizing that an otherwise neutral law still violates the Equal Protection Clause when it is "motivated by 'purposeful discrimination'") (citing *Pers. Adm'r of Mass. v. Feeney*, 442 U.S. 256, 274 (1979)); *see also Greater Birmingham Ministries v. Sec'y of State for Ala.*, 992 F.3d 1299, 1321–22 (11th Cir. 2021). The rule and statute at issue were motivated in substantial part by the plainly illegitimate purposes of disapproving transgender status and discouraging individuals from pursuing their honest gender identities. This was purposeful discrimination against transgenders.

XII. The pretextual justifications for the rule and statute

In support of their position, the defendants have proffered a laundry list of purported justifications for the rule and statute. The purported justifications are largely pretextual and, in any event, do not call for a different result.

A. "Low quality" evidence

A methodology often used for evaluating medical studies—for evaluating research-generated evidence on the safety and efficacy of any given course of treatment—is known as Grading of Recommendations, Assessment, Development, and Evaluation ("GRADE"). The defendants stridently assert that the evidence supporting the treatments at issue is "low" or "very low" quality as those terms are

used in the GRADE system. But the evidence on the other side—the evidence purportedly showing these treatments are ineffective or unsafe—is far weaker, not just of "low" or "very low" quality. Indeed, evidence suggesting these treatments are ineffective is nonexistent.

The choice these plaintiffs face is binary: to use GnRH agonists and cross-sex hormones, or not. It is no answer to say the evidence on the yes side is weak when the evidence on the no side is weaker or nonexistent. There is substantial and persuasive, though not conclusive, research showing favorable results from these treatments.[68] A decision for the patients at issue cannot wait for further or better research; the treatment decision must be made now.

Moreover, the fact that research-generated evidence supporting these treatments gets classified as "low" or "very low" quality on the GRADE scale does not mean the evidence is not persuasive, or that it is not the best available research-generated evidence on the question of how to treat gender dysphoria, or that medical treatments should not be provided consistent with the research results and clinical evidence.

It is commonplace for medical treatments to be provided even when supported only by research producing evidence classified as "low" or "very low"

[68] *See, e.g.*, Trial Tr., ECF No. 228 at 41–42.

on this scale.[69] The record includes unrebutted testimony that only about 13.5% of accepted medical treatments across all disciplines are supported by "high" quality evidence on the GRADE scale.[70] The defendants' assertion that treatment should be banned based on the supporting research's GRADE score is a misuse of the GRADE system.

We put band-aids on cuts to keep dirt out not because there is "high" quality research-generated evidence supporting the practice but because we know, from clinical experience, that cuts come with a risk of infection and band-aids can reduce the risk.

Gender dysphoria is far more complicated, and one cannot know, with the same level of confidence, how to treat it. But there is now extensive clinical experience showing excellent results from treatment with GnRH agonists and cross-sex hormones. If these treatments are prohibited or Medicaid payment is unavailable, many patients will suffer needlessly.[71] The extensive clinical evidence is important and indeed persuasive evidence, even if the supporting research has produced only "low" or "very low" quality evidence on the GRADE scale.

When facing a binary decision to use or not use GnRH agonists or hormones, a reasonable decisionmaker would consider the evidence on the yes

---

[69] *See* Trial Tr., ECF No. 227 at 98–101.
[70] Trial Tr., ECF No. 226 at 68–69.
[71] Trial Tr., ECF No. 226 at 64; Trial Tr., ECF No. 238 at 97–98.

side, as well as the weaker evidence on the no side. Calling the evidence on the yes side "low" or "very low" quality would not rationally control the decision.

B. Risks attendant to treatment

The defendants assert there are risks attendant to treatment with GnRH agonists and cross-sex hormones. Indeed there are. There are legitimate concerns about the effect on bone density; this calls for appropriate monitoring. There are legitimate concerns about fertility and sexuality that a child entering puberty is not well-equipped to evaluate and for which parents may be less-than-perfect decisionmakers. There is a risk of misdiagnosis, though the requirement in the standards of care for careful analysis by a multidisciplinary team should minimize the risk. There is a risk that a child later confronted with the bias that is part of our world will come to believe it would have been better to try to pass as cisgender.

There also are studies suggesting not that there *are* but that there *may be* additional medical risks. An unreplicated study found that sheep who took GnRH agonists became worse at negotiating a maze, at least for a time. Another study showed a not-statistically-significant but nonetheless-concerning decrease in IQ among cisgender children treated for central precocious puberty with GnRH agonists. These and other studies cited by the defendants would surely be rated low or very-low quality on the GRADE scale and, more importantly, are not very persuasive. The latter study has not led to a ban on the use of GnRH agonists to

treat central precocious puberty. One cannot know from these studies whether treating transgender adolescents with GnRH agonists will cause comparable adverse results in some patients. But the risk that they will is a risk a decisionmaker should reasonably consider.

That there are risks does not end the inquiry. There are also substantial benefits for the overwhelming majority of patients treated with GnRH agonists and cross-sex hormones. And there are risks attendant to *not* using these treatments, including the risk—in some instances, the near certainty—of anxiety and depression and even suicidal ideation. The challenged rule and statute ignore the benefits that many patients realize from these treatments and the substantial risk posed by foregoing the treatments—the risk from failing to pursue what is, for many, the most effective available treatment of gender dysphoria. Mr. Dekker attempted suicide four times before beginning successful treatment with cross-sex hormones; he is now thriving.[72]

If the plaintiffs do not continue appropriate treatments, the likelihood is very high that they will suffer attendant adverse mental-health consequences. If, on the other hand, they *do* continue appropriate treatments, they will avoid some of the adverse consequences. They also will face attendant risks.

---

[72] Trial Tr., ECF No. 228 at 150 & 166–67.

Risks attend many kinds of medical treatment, perhaps most. Ordinarily it is the patient, in consultation with the doctor, who weighs the risks and benefits and chooses a course of treatment. Florida's Medicaid program routinely covers treatments with greater risks than those involved here. What is remarkable about the challenged rule and statute is not that they address medical treatments with both risks and benefits but that they arrogate to the State the right to make the decision. And worse, the rule and statute make the same decision for everybody, without considering any patient's individual circumstances. The rule and statute do this in contravention of widely accepted standards of care.

That there are risks of the kind presented here is not a rational basis for denying patients the option to choose this treatment and to have Medicaid cover the cost.

C. Bias in medical organizations

The defendants say the many professional organizations that have endorsed treatment of gender dysphoria with GnRH agonists and hormones all have it wrong. The defendants say, in effect, that the organizations were dominated by individuals who pursued good politics, not good medicine.

If ever a pot called a kettle black, it is here. The statute and the rule were an exercise in politics, not good medicine.

This is a politically fraught area. There has long been, and still is, substantial bigotry directed at transgender individuals. Common experience confirms this, as does a Florida legislator's remarkable reference to transgender witnesses at a committee hearing as "mutants" and "demons."[73] And even when not based on bigotry, there are those who incorrectly but sincerely believe that gender identity is not real but instead just a choice. This is, as noted above, the elephant in the room.

Where there is bigotry, there are usually—one hopes, always—opponents of bigotry. It is hardly surprising that doctors who understand that transgender identity can be real, not made up—doctors who are willing to provide supportive medical care—oppose anti-transgender bigotry.

It sometimes happens that opponents of bigotry deem opposing viewpoints bigoted even when they are not. And it sometimes happens that those with opposing viewpoints are slow to speak up, lest they be accused of bigotry. These dynamics could affect a medical association's consideration of transgender

---

[73] *Hearing on Facility Requirements Based on Sex*, CS/HB 1521 2023 Session (Fla. Apr. 10, 2023), https://www.myfloridahouse.gov/VideoPlayer.aspx?eventID=8804 (time stamp 2:30:35 to 2:34:10). Representative Webster Barnaby said to transgender Florida citizens who spoke at the hearing that they were "mutants living among us on Planet Earth." He raised his voice and said, "[T]his is Planet Earth, where God created men, male and women, female!" He continued: "[T]he Lord rebuke you Satan and all of your demons and imps that come parade before us. That's right I called you demons and imps who come and parade before us and pretend that you are part of this world." Finally, he said, you can "take [him] on" but he "promises [he] will win every time."

treatment. The record suggests these dynamics *have* affected the tone and quality of debate within WPATH. It is entirely possible that the same dynamics could have affected the tone and quality of debate within other associations.

Even so, it is fanciful to believe that all the many medical associations who have endorsed gender-affirming care, or who have spoken out or joined an amicus brief supporting the plaintiffs in this litigation, have so readily sold their patients down the river. The great weight of medical authority supports these treatments. The widely accepted standards of care require competent therapy and careful evaluation by a multidisciplinary team before use of GnRH agonists and cross-sex hormones for treatment of gender dysphoria. But the widely accepted standards of care support their use in appropriate circumstances. The standards have been unanimously endorsed by reputable medical associations, even though not unanimously endorsed by all the members of the associations.

The overwhelming majority of doctors are dedicated professionals whose first goal is the safe and effective treatment of their patients. There is no reason to believe the doctors who adopted these standards were motivated by anything else.

D. International views

The defendants have asserted time and again that Florida now treats GnRH agonists and cross-sex hormones the same as European countries. The assertion is false. And no matter how many times the defendants say it, it will still be false. No

country in Europe—or so far as shown by this record, anywhere in the world—entirely bans these treatments or refuses to pay for them. *See also Brandt v. Rutledge*, No. 4:21-cv-450, 2023 WL 4073727, at *30 (E.D. Ark. June 20, 2023) (rejecting the apparently identical assertion that a ban on gender-affirming care for minors was consistent with "nations around the world" and finding the evidence showed no other identified nation took that position).

To be sure, there are countries that ban gays and lesbians and probably transgender individuals, too. One doubts these treatments are available in Iran or other similarly repressive regimes. But the treatments are available in appropriate circumstances in all the countries cited by the defendants, including Finland, Sweden, Norway, Great Britain, France, Australia, and New Zealand.[74] Some or all of these insist on appropriate preconditions and allow care only in approved facilities—just as the Endocrine Society and WPATH standards insist on appropriate preconditions, and just as care in the United States is ordinarily provided through capable facilities. Had Florida truly joined the international consensus—making these treatments available in appropriate circumstances or in approved facilities—these plaintiffs would qualify, and this lawsuit would not be necessary.

---

[74] *See* Trial Tr., ECF No. 226 at 78–79; *see also* Trial Tr., ECF No. 227 at 134; Trial Tr., ECF No. 228 at 61–62.

E. Malpractice

The defendants assert, with no real evidentiary support, that GnRH agonists and cross-sex hormones have sometimes been provided in Florida without the appropriate mental-health therapy and evaluation by a multidisciplinary team.

If that were true, the solution would be to appropriately regulate these treatments, not to ban them. And there are, of course, remedies already in place in Florida for deficient medical care. AHCA is entitled to review any individual Medicaid claim and to pay only for medically necessary treatment. There is no evidence that this kind of care is routinely provided so badly that it should be banned outright.

Along the same lines, the defendants say gender dysphoria is difficult to diagnose accurately—that gender identity can be fluid, that there is no objective test to confirm gender identity or gender dysphoria, and that patients treated with GnRH agonists or cross-sex hormones have sometimes come to regret it. But the defendants ignore facts that do not support their narrative. Fluidity is common prior to puberty but not thereafter. Regret is rare; indeed, the defendants have offered no evidence of any Florida resident who regrets being treated with GnRH agonists or cross-sex hormones. And the absence of objective tests to confirm gender dysphoria does not set it apart from many other Medicaid-covered mental-

health conditions that are routinely diagnosed without objective tests and treated with powerful medications.

The difficulty diagnosing a patient calls for caution. It does not call for a one-size-fits-all refusal to cover widely accepted medical treatment.[75] It does not call for the State to make a binary decision not to cover the treatment even for a properly diagnosed patient.

F. Continuation of treatment

The defendants note that 98% or more of adolescents treated with GnRH agonists progress to cross-sex hormones. That is hardly an indictment of the treatment; it is instead consistent with the view that in 98% or more of the cases, the patient's gender identity did not align with natal sex, this was accurately determined, and the patient was appropriately treated first with GnRH agonists and later with cross-sex hormones. An advocate who denies the existence of genuine transgender identity or who wishes to make everyone cisgender might well fear progression to cross-sex hormones, but the defendants have denied that this is a basis for their current reference to this progression.

The defendants say, instead, that the high rate of progression rebuts an argument in support of GnRH agonists: that GnRH agonists give a patient time to

---

[75] *See* Trial Tr., ECF No. 239 at 91–94 (defense expert Dr. Levine explaining that medical intervention such as puberty blockers and hormones should be carefully prescribed and monitored but not banned).

reflect on the patient's gender identity and, if still convinced of a gender identity opposite the natal sex, to reflect on whether to go forward socially in the gender identity or natal sex. But if that is a goal of treatment with GnRH agonists, it is certainly not the treatment's *primary* goal. The primary goal is to delay and eventually avoid development of secondary sex characteristics inconsistent with the patient's gender identity—and thus to avoid or reduce the attendant anxiety, depression, and possible suicidal ideation.

The high rate of progression from GnRH agonists to cross-sex hormones is not a reason to ban or refuse to cover the treatments.

G. Off-label use of FDA-approved drugs

The defendants note that while the Food and Drug Administration has approved GnRH agonists and the hormones at issue as safe and effective, the agency has not addressed their use to treat gender dysphoria. Quite so. Use of these drugs to treat gender dysphoria is "off label."

That the FDA has not approved these drugs for treatment of gender dysphoria says precisely nothing about whether the drugs are safe and effective when used for that purpose. Off-label use of drugs is commonplace and widely

accepted across the medical profession.[76] Florida Medicaid routinely covers such use.[77] The defendants' contrary implication is divorced from reality.

Obtaining FDA approval of a drug is a burdensome, expensive process.[78] A pharmaceutical provider who wishes to market a new drug must incur the burden and expense because the drug cannot be distributed without FDA approval. Once a drug has been approved, however, the drug can be distributed not just for the approved use but for any other use as well. There ordinarily is little reason to incur the burden and expense of seeking additional FDA approval.

That the FDA approved these drugs at all confirms that, at least for one use, they are safe and effective.[79] This provides some support for the view that they are safe when properly administered and that they effectively produce the intended results—that GnRH agonists delay puberty and that testosterone and estrogen have masculinizing or feminizing effects as expected. The FDA approval goes no further—it does not address one way or the other the question whether using these drugs to treat gender dysphoria is as safe and effective as on-label uses.

---

[76] Trial Tr., ECF No. 227 at 121–23.
[77] *See* AHCA 30(b)(6) Dep., ECF No. 235-1 at 35, 53–56.
[78] Trial Tr., ECF No. 226 at 182–84; Trial Tr., ECF No. 227 at 120–23; Trial Tr., ECF No. 239 at 54–55.
[79] Trial Tr., ECF No. 226 at 182–84; Trial Tr., ECF No. 227 at 120–23.

That use of GnRH agonists and cross-sex hormones to treat gender dysphoria is "off-label" is not a reason to ban or refuse to cover their use for that purpose.

XIII. Ruling on the claims

What remains is to match the findings of fact and conclusions of law as set out above to the specific claims asserted in the first amended complaint.

Count I asserts a claim against Mr. Weida under 42 U.S.C. § 1983 and the Fourteenth Amendment's Equal Protection Clause. The plaintiffs are entitled to prevail because the denial of Medicaid coverage for transgender patients for the same drugs covered for others survives neither intermediate nor rational-basis scrutiny.

Count II asserts a claim against AHCA under the Affordable Care Act's prohibition of discrimination based on sex, 42 U.S.C. § 18116. The plaintiffs are entitled to prevail on this claim, just as on the Equal Protection claim.

Count III asserts a § 1983 claim for Mr. Rothstein, Susan Doe, and K.F. against Mr. Weida based on the Medicaid Act's requirement for early and periodic screening, diagnostic, and treatment services for beneficiaries under age 21, 42 U.S.C. §§ 1396a(a)(10)(A), 1396a(a)(43)(C),1396d(a)(4)(B), and 1396d(r)(5). The plaintiffs are entitled to prevail because the treatments at issue comport with the

standards of care for their medical conditions and there are no alternative, equally effective treatments.

Count IV asserts a § 1983 claim against Mr. Weida based on the Medicaid Act's comparability requirement, 42 U.S.C. § 1396a(a)(10)(B)(i), under which assistance to an eligible individual cannot be less in "amount, duration, or scope" than assistance available to other Medicaid beneficiaries. The plaintiffs are entitled to prevail because cisgender Medicaid beneficiaries are covered for the same puberty blockers and hormones at issue. That cisgender patients receive the drugs for a different diagnosis does not make the different treatment permissible. Quite the contrary: federal law prohibits a state from denying or reducing a Medicaid-eligible patient's required services "solely because of the diagnosis, type of illness, or condition." 42 C.F.R. § 440.230(c); *see also Rush*, 625 F.2d at 1156 n.12. Indeed, denying coverage for an illness suffered only or primarily by a disfavored group is the very paradigm of prohibited discrimination based on diagnosis.

XIV. Conclusion

Gender identity is real. Those whose gender identity does not match their natal sex often suffer gender dysphoria. The widely accepted standard of care calls for evaluation and treatment by a multidisciplinary team. Proper treatment begins with mental-health therapy and is followed in appropriate cases by GnRH agonists and cross-sex hormones. Florida has adopted a rule and statute that prohibit

Medicaid payment for these treatments even when medically appropriate. The rule and statute violate the federal Medicaid statute, the Equal Protection Clause, and the Affordable Care Act's prohibition of sex discrimination.

These plaintiffs are Medicaid beneficiaries who are entitled to payment, as a matter of medical necessity, for puberty blockers or cross-sex hormones as appropriately determined by their multidisciplinary teams of providers.

IT IS ORDERED:

1. It is declared that Florida Statutes § 286.31(2) and Florida Administrative Code rule 59G-1.050(7) are invalid to the extent they categorically ban Medicaid payment for puberty blockers and cross-sex hormones for the treatment of gender dysphoria.

2. The defendants Jason Weida, in his official capacity, and the Florida Agency for Health Care Administration (a) must approve Medicaid payment for services rendered from this date forward for the evaluation, diagnosis, and treatment of the plaintiffs August Dekker, Brit Rothstein, Susan Doe, and K.F. for gender dysphoria, including with puberty blockers and cross-sex hormones, as recommended by their multidisciplinary teams, and (b) must not take any steps to prevent the administration of cross-sex hormones to August Dekker or Brit Rothstein or to prevent the administration of puberty blockers or cross-sex hormones to Susan Doe or K.F. But this injunction does not preclude the

defendants from applying the professional standards that would apply to use of the same substances to treat patients with other medical conditions.

3. This injunction binds the defendants and their officers, agents, servants, employees, and attorneys—and others in active concert or participation with any of them—who receive actual notice of this injunction by personal service or otherwise.

4. The clerk must enter judgment and close the file.

5. Jurisdiction is retained to award costs and attorney's fees.

SO ORDERED on June 21, 2023.

s/Robert L. Hinkle
United States District Judge

From: Robin
To: BOM Public Comment
Subject: Transgender Rights
Date: Wednesday, June 21, 2023 3:07:42 PM

Dear board members,

My name is Robin, and I'm a 16 year old teenager transitioning from female to male. I've been taking testosterone through an injection format for 4 months, and wanted to voice my dissent against SB 254. Hundreds of trans people are being affected by SB 254, including adults. According to Plume, which is the largest telehealth service for trans and nonbinary people and operates in 45 states, about 80% of transgender adults receive care from a nurse practitioner. The law now mandates physicians can only provide gender affirming care, which forces trans adults to seek out new providers. Additionally, SB 254 makes it mandatory for the signing of the currently nonexistent informed consent form to occur in person. This directly targets transgender Floridians who live in rural areas and need access to transportation. I know this bill was created to harm people like me. It was created under the assumption that trans youth don't know what's best for them, that being trans is a "choice" and is something that must be eradicated. I can not stress enough how false this idea is. Prior to coming out, I struggled with severe depression and self hatred. I looked in the mirror and saw a stranger. But the first time I heard someone call me by my true name, the one that doesn't match my legal records, I cried tears of joy and recognition. I am so much happier now that I am on HRT. It was life saving for me, just like it is for the estimated 94,900 transgender adults living in Florida. How can people want to ban such a beautiful act of self-discovery, of transformation? I know the people pushing this bill aren't trans and most likely view transitioning with confusion, even disgust. Cis people are born feeling comfortable in their gender identities and bodies, and have trouble understanding the importance of HRT. But please listen to trans people, listen to the scientists who back us up with data, listen like the judges in other states who put a halt to these sex reassignment treatment bans. I'm a teenager like anyone else, and I just want to have the right to be myself and succeed like any other teen. Don't I deserve that right?

Sincerely,
Robin (they/them or he/him pronouns)

From: Tony Cooper
To: BOM Public Comment
Subject: Proposed Gender Affirming Care Rule
Date: Friday, June 23, 2023 10:07:53 AM

Hello Florida BOM,

I am writing to ask that at today's meeting in Jacksonville, you vote against the proposed rule concerning gender affirming care for trans folks. It is disrespectful towards both them and this week's court ruling on the matter.

With All Due Regard,

T.C.

From: Strickland, Bettye C
To: BOM Public Comment
Subject: FW: 64B15ER23-4 Sex-reassignment Prescriptions
Date: Wednesday, June 28, 2023 9:00:59 AM

From: info@parrislaw.org <info@parrislaw.org>
Sent: Tuesday, June 27, 2023 6:15 PM
To: Terrell, Danielle <Danielle.Terrell@flhealth.gov>
Subject: 64B15ER23-4 Sex-reassignment Prescriptions

Good afternoon Ms. Terrell,

Is there another hearing coming up soon on the informed consent form element of SB 254?

I'd like to make a comment under Chapter 120 regardless:

The form should be one page, very cursory, and should leave it to the physician to write what s/he discussed about the specific treatment. This would appear to comply with the plain language of the law.

The form should not contain specifics on the risks, hazards, and alternatives to any specific sex reassignment treatment(s) or procedure(s) but just blank lines for the date of consent, proposed treatment, date and location of proposed treatment, signatures, and blank lines for the doctor to fill in describing what s/he provided to the patient in terms of informed consent information.

Or if you wanted just a bit more detail, you could break it down to the following sections with blank lines for the doctor to complete:

1. Nature of treatment or procedure
2. Risks/hazards of the treatment of procedure
3. Alternatives

Otherwise the Boards would be in the position of having to constantly update the form to include new research or findings, and it could even create liability on the state if specific elements of informed consent are determined to be absent or insufficient.

Thanks,

Kendra Parris

From: WILLIAMS Madison
To: zzzz Feedback, MQA_Medicine
Subject: Regarding june 30th meeting
Date: Tuesday, June 27, 2023 10:15:40 AM

Dear Board of Medicine:

I am writing to inquire about the new business scheduled on this coming Friday's agenda: Rule for informed consent for treatment of gender dysphoria in adults (64B8-9, 64B15-14). I am requesting a copy of the full draft guidelines and proposed informed consent form which are to be raised for vote at the upcoming meeting. Would you be able to provide a copy of these materials, including any supplemental guidance around comorbid conditions and well-managed psychiatric conditions, including how that impacts adult transgender patients' access to informed consent hormone replacement therapy? Specifically, I would like to understand what type of documentation from a board-certified therapist is required to indicate that any other condition is well-managed and thus would not prevent a patient from accessing informed-consent care.

Respectfully yours,

Madison WILLIAMS
Technical Operations Manager
Tel.: : +1 (321) 361.8720

THALES
7415 Emerald Dunes Drive
Suite 2000
Orlando, FL, 32822
United States of America

www.thalesgroup.com

Florida Boards of Medicine and Osteopathic Medicine
Joint Rules/Legislative Committee Meeting

Aloft Jacksonville Tapestry Park
4812 Deer Lake Drive West
Jacksonville, FL 32246
904-998-4448

MEETING MINUTES

The meeting was called to order at 1:01 p.m. on June 23, 2023, by Mr. Nicholas Romanello. Roll call was conducted by Cherise Strickland, Program Operations Administrator.

Members Present:
Nicholas Romanello, Esq., Consumer Member, Acting Chair
Scot Ackerman, M.D.
Matthew Benson, M.D.
Amy Derick, M.D.
Tiffany Sizemore DiPietro, D.O.
William Kirsh, D.O.
Monica Mortensen, D.O.

Members Absent:
David Diamond, M.D.
Maria Garcia, Esq., Consumer Member
Patrick Hunter, M.D.
Luz Marina Pages, M.D.
Zachariah Zachariah, M.D.

Staff Present:
Paul Vazquez, J.D., Executive Director BOM
Danielle Terrell, Executive Director BOOM
Christopher Dierlam, Board Counsel
Cassandra Fullove, Certified Paralegal
Cherise Strickland, Program Operations Administrator
Cyra Williams, Regulatory Specialist III
Michelle DeVeas, Administrative Assistant II
Brad Dalton, Public Information Officer

Court Reporter:
Cynthia Green
Magnolia Court Reporting
407-896-1813

Mr. Vazquez provided opening remarks and instructions on the conduct of the meeting. Mr. Vazquez reminded everyone that this is a publicly noticed meeting, the proceedings are being recorded, and an audio file of the meeting will be posted to both Boards' websites.

Mr. Vazquez summarized SB 254, which was signed into law and became effective upon Governor DeSantis' signing on May 17, 2023. The law enacted requires the Board of Medicine and the Board of Osteopathic Medicine to adopt rules within 60 days establishing practice standards for the continuing treatment of minors already receiving treatment prior to the signing of the law, including the development of any necessary informed consent forms. The law also requires the Boards to adopt emergency rules establishing informed consent forms for adults; however, the 60-day time frame is not a requirement for the adult informed consent forms.

Mr. Vazquez advised today we will work on finalizing the practice standards for the treatment of gender dysphoria in minors, and on finalizing draft versions of the informed consent forms for the treatment of gender dysphoria in both minors and adults. Mr. Vazquez advised there will be a subsequent joint full board meeting on June 30, 2023, at 1:00 p.m.

Ms. Terrell did not provide any comments.

Old Business

There was no old business to discuss.

Action taken:

No action taken.

New Business

Mr. Romanello provided an overview of the related meetings already held on prior dates, noting the impressive number of public comments received to date. The next meeting being held will be a virtual joint board meeting on June 30, 2023. Mr. Romanello advised today, the committee has six different draft informed consent forms and two emergency rule drafts to review, the committee will take up discussion of the consent forms first and then discuss the two draft emergency rules. Mr. Romanello advised public comments will be taken until 4:30 p.m. and we will close the meeting at 5:00 p.m.

Dr. Ackerman provided welcoming remarks to the public in attendance, thanking them for being present today. Dr. Ackerman asked the public for constructive feedback and comments.

Mr. Romanello advised at the June 23, 2023, Joint Rules/Legislative Committee Meeting, the committee approved and delegated Drs. Benson and Mortensen to help develop informed consent drafts and present to the committee.

Discussion began on Bates page 264 reviewing draft consent form, Puberty Suppression Treatment for Patients with Gender Dysphoria in Minors. Dr. Derick asked will these forms be the mandatory minimum forms? Ms. McNulty answered, yes, a physician may have additional forms, if desired, but a physician must have our forms, as a minimum. Mr. Romanello, Drs. Benson, Derick, and DiPietro suggested amendments to the form, discussion continued. Motion was made, seconded, and approved unanimously to amend the form with changes as discussed on record.

Discussion began on Bates page 272 reviewing draft consent form, Feminizing Medications for Patients with Gender Dysphoria in Minors. Drs. DiPietro, Benson, and Mr. Romanello suggested amendments to the form, discussion continued. A motion was made, seconded, and approved unanimously to amend the form with all changes as discussed on record.

Discussion began on Bates page 284 reviewing draft consent form, Masculinizing Medications for Patients with Gender Dysphoria in Minors. Dr. Benson made comments and suggested amendments to the form, discussion continued. Ms. Terrell suggested a change to remove, requirement #2, from Bates page 285, it is a duplicate of requirement #1. A motion was made, seconded, and approved unanimously to amend the form with changes as discussed on record.

Discussion began on Bates page 298 reviewing draft consent form, Feminizing Medications for Patients with Gender Dysphoria in Adults. Dr. Derick made comments and suggested amendments

to the form. Discussion on this draft form will continue after public comments.

Discussion began on Bates page 308 reviewing draft consent form, Testosterone Treatment for Patients with Gender Dysphoria in Adults. Drs. DiPietro and Benson made comments and suggested amendments to the form, discussion continued. Mr. Vazquez suggested a change in the name of the form to mirror the other forms. The current name of the form reads Testosterone Treatment for Patients with Gender Dysphoria. The suggested amended name of the form would read Masculine Medications for Patients with Gender Dysphoria. A motion was made, seconded, and approved unanimously to amend the form with all changes as discussed on record.

Discussion began on Bates page 317 reviewing draft consent form, Surgical Treatment for Adults with Gender Dysphoria. Dr. Benson made comments and suggested amendments to the form, discussion continued. A motion was made, seconded, and approved unanimously to amend the form with all changes as discussed on record.

Mr. Romanello called a short break at 3:00 p.m. After the break, the draft emergency rules will be addressed, and we will take public comments until 4:30 p.m. Mr. Romanello reconvened and called the meeting back to order at 3:11p.m.

Mr. Romanello began discussion of the draft emergency rule for minors on Bates page 295, titled Sex-reassignment Standards in Minors. Ms. McNulty suggested a modification on Bates page 295 under subsection (4) Standards of Practice, to strike “Clinical determinations” from subsection (4) entirely, it is redundant. A motion to strike was made, seconded, and approved unanimously to amend as discussed on record.

Ms. McNulty suggested a modification on Bates page 296, subsection (4)(b) item #4, strike “adequate” from the sentence. A motion to strike was made, seconded, and approved unanimously to amend as discussed on record.

Ms. McNulty suggested a modification on Bates page 296 subsection (4)(g) currently reads “Bone (DEXA) Scan”, strike and replace with “Bone Density Scan (DEXA)”.

Dr. Derick suggested a modification of subsection (4)(c) Patient Visit. on Bates page 296 regarding the “physician or covering physician” verbiage addition. A motion to carry over the approved language from the informed consent forms was made, seconded, and approved unanimously to amend as discussed on record.

Dr. Benson asked questions regarding Bates 295 subsection (3)(a-d). What does assent to the informed consent form mean? Dr. Benson asked if this assent is the minor child signing to give permission? Ms. McNulty answered, yes that is correct.

Dr. Benson asked if it is standard to have a witness on the consent forms? Ms. McNulty answered, it is consistent with other types of consent forms. Dr. DiPietro indicated every consent form she has seen in the hospital has a witness signature.

Mr. Romanello began discussion of the draft emergency rule for adults on Bates page 323, titled Mandatory Standardized Informed Consent for Sex-reassignment Procedures in Adults. Mr. Dierlam indicated board counsel does not have any technical change amendments to request.

Mr. Romanello began the public comment portion of the meeting by inviting any public attendee to form a line who has any comments to provide on relevant scope issues related to the informed consent forms or the rules. Each speaker was given three minutes to speak. Mr. Romanello asked Dr. Ackerman to assist with the pronunciation of the drug names and four questions the public is being asked to comment on. Dr. Ackerman stated the four questions the committee would like addressed are:

1. Is there widespread use or any use of testosterone in any form?
2. Is there use of Bicalutamide (brand name Casodex) in the pediatric population?
3. Is there use of Finasteride (also more commonly known as Proscar) for hair loss for male pattern baldness in the pediatric population?
4. Is Cyproterone acetate available in the United States? Is it being prescribed by physicians? Is it being recommended by physicians?

Mr. Romanello recognized the first public speaker; a line was formed, and the public continued to make comments in that format. A total of twenty-three individuals spoke and provided public comment. Public comments continued until 4:30 p.m.

Mr. Romanello advised we will move towards consideration and vote on informed consent forms and the emergency rules.

Mr. Romanello asked the committee if they had any changes or responses to the public comments we have heard this afternoon. No comments were provided, or amendments requested by the committee.

A motion was made, seconded, and approved unanimously to adopt the informed consent forms for minors and emergency rule language as amended on record.

SERC

Will the proposed rule amendments have an adverse impact on small business? Is the proposed rule amendment likely to directly or indirectly increase regulatory costs to any entity, including government, in excess of $200,000 in the aggregate in Florida within one year after implementation?

A motion was made in the negative, seconded, and carried unanimously.

Will this rule amendment create an offense that would constitute a minor violation under the rule?

A motion was made in the negative, seconded, and carried unanimously.

Does the Board/Committee want to impose a sunset provision for this rule or rule amendment?

A motion was made in the negative, seconded, and carried unanimously not to impose a sunset provision.

Action taken:

Approved the informed consent forms for minors and the emergency rule language as amended on record.

Mr. Romanello asked the committee for any changes or responses to the public comments we have heard this afternoon.

Dr. Derick spoke on the informed consent forms for adults, she believes the audience had a lot of compelling comments. Beginning on Bates page 309 there are some items to address on both the Masculinizing Medication for Patients with Gender Dysphoria in Adults form and the Feminizing Medications for Patients with Gender Dysphoria in Adults form regarding HRT, #1 - #14. Dr. Derick indicates she thinks we should consider removing some of the requirements on the consent forms for adults. Discussion continued among the committee.

Dr. DiPietro provided a suggestion to add a recommendation statement for #9 - #14. Dr. Derick agreed this is a great compromise to separate the items and add a recommendation statement for

items #9 - #14. Dr. Derick stated it is important for us to not lose our transgender patients for lack of follow-up.

Mr. Romanello asked the committee to consider a new section that reads, “the following may also be recommended by the prescribing physician for an individual to receive or continue to receive HRT treatment”. This will apply to #9 - #14 and would be placed in its own subsection. This will apply to both the masculinizing and feminizing adult informed consent forms.

A motion was made, seconded, and approved unanimously to add an additional section after #8, the following may also be recommended by the prescribing physician for an individual to receive or continue to receive HRT treatment.

A motion was made, seconded, and approved unanimously to adopt the informed consent forms as amended and the emergency rule as amended.

Action taken:

Approved the informed consent forms for adults and the emergency rule language as amended on record.

SERC

Will the proposed rule amendments have an adverse impact on small business? Is the proposed rule amendment likely to directly or indirectly increase regulatory costs to any entity, including government, in excess of $200,000 in the aggregate in Florida within one year after implementation?

A motion was made in the negative, seconded, and carried unanimously.

Will this rule amendment create an offense that would constitute a minor violation under the rule?

A motion was made in the negative, seconded, and carried unanimously.

Does the Board/Committee want to impose a sunset provision for this rule or rule amendment?

A motion was made in the negative, seconded, and carried unanimously not to impose a sunset provision.

The meeting adjourned at 4:54 p.m.

64B8-9.019 Standards of Practice for the Treatment of Gender Dysphoria in Minors.

(1) The following therapies and procedures performed for the treatment of gender dysphoria in minors are prohibited.

(a) Sex reassignment surgeries, or any other surgical procedures, that alter primary or secondary sexual characteristics.

(b) Puberty blocking, hormone, and hormone antagonist therapies.

(2) Minors being treated with puberty blocking, hormone, or hormone antagonist therapies prior to the effective date of this rule may continue with such therapies.

Rulemaking Authority 458.331(1)(v) FS. Law Implemented 458.331(1)(v) FS. History–New 3-16-23.

64B15-14.014 Standards of Practice for the Treatment of Gender Dysphoria in Minors.

(1) The following therapies and procedures performed for the treatment of gender dysphoria in minors are prohibited.

(a) Sex reassignment surgeries, or any other surgical procedures, that alter primary or secondary sexual characteristics.

(b) Puberty blocking, hormone, and hormone antagonist therapies.

(2) Minors being treated with puberty blocking, hormone, or hormone antagonist therapies prior to the effective date of this rule may continue with such therapies.

Rulemaking Authority 459.015(1)(z) FS. Law Implemented 459.015(1)(z) FS. History–New 3-28-23.

CHAPTER 2023-90

Committee Substitute for Senate Bill No. 254

An act relating to treatments for sex reassignment; amending s. 61.517, F.S.; granting courts of this state temporary emergency jurisdiction over a child present in this state if the child has been subjected to or is threatened with being subjected to sex-reassignment prescriptions or procedures; amending s. 61.534, F.S.; providing that, for purposes of warrants to take physical custody of a child in certain child custody enforcement proceedings, serious physical harm to the child includes, but is not limited to, being subjected to sex-reassignment prescriptions or procedures; creating s. 286.31, F.S.; defining the term "governmental entity"; prohibiting certain public entities from expending state funds for the provision of sex-reassignment prescriptions or procedures; amending s. 456.001, F.S.; defining the terms "sex" and "sex-reassignment prescriptions or procedures"; creating s. 456.52, F.S.; prohibiting sex-reassignment prescriptions and procedures for patients younger than 18 years of age; providing an exception; requiring the Board of Medicine and the Board of Osteopathic Medicine to adopt certain emergency rules within a specified timeframe; requiring the boards to consider specified factors in developing such rules; requiring that such prescriptions and procedures for patients older than 18 years of age be prescribed, administered, or performed only with the voluntary and informed consent of the patient; providing criteria for what constitutes voluntary and informed consent; providing that only a physician may prescribe, administer, or perform such prescriptions and procedures; defining the term "physician"; providing applicability; providing for disciplinary action; providing criminal penalties; requiring the Board of Medicine and the Board of Osteopathic Medicine to adopt certain emergency rules; providing that such emergency rules remain in effect until they are replaced by nonemergency rules; amending s. 456.074, F.S.; requiring the department to immediately suspend the license of a health care practitioner who is arrested for committing or attempting, soliciting, or conspiring to commit specified violations related to sex-reassignment prescriptions or procedures for a patient younger than 18 years of age; creating s. 766.318, F.S.; creating a cause of action to recover damages for personal injury or death resulting from the provision of sex-reassignment prescriptions or procedures to a minor; providing that certain limitations on punitive damages do not apply to such actions; specifying the timeframe within which such actions may be commenced; providing construction and applicability; providing severability; providing a directive to the Division of Law Revision; providing an effective date.

Be It Enacted by the Legislature of the State of Florida:

Section 1. Subsection (1) of section 61.517, Florida Statutes, is amended to read:

61.517 Temporary emergency jurisdiction.—

CODING: Words ~~stricken~~ are deletions; words underlined are additions.

(1) A court of this state has temporary emergency jurisdiction if the child is present in this state and:

(a) The child has been abandoned; ~~or~~

(b) It is necessary in an emergency to protect the child because the child, or a sibling or parent of the child, is subjected to or threatened with mistreatment or abuse; or

(c) It is necessary in an emergency to protect the child because the child has been subjected to or is threatened with being subjected to sex-reassignment prescriptions or procedures, as defined in s. 456.001.

Section 2. Subsection (1) of section 61.534, Florida Statutes, is amended to read:

61.534 Warrant to take physical custody of child.—

(1) Upon the filing of a petition seeking enforcement of a child custody determination, the petitioner may file a verified application for the issuance of a warrant to take physical custody of the child if the child is likely to imminently suffer serious physical harm or removal from this state. Serious physical harm includes, but is not limited to, being subjected to sex-reassignment prescriptions or procedures as defined in s. 456.001.

Section 3. Section 286.31, Florida Statutes, is created to read:

286.31 Prohibited use of state funds.—

(1) As used in this section, the term "governmental entity" means the state or any political subdivision thereof, including the executive, legislative, and judicial branches of government; the independent establishments of the state, counties, municipalities, districts, authorities, boards, or commissions; and any agencies that are subject to chapter 286.

(2) A governmental entity, a public postsecondary educational institution as described in s. 1000.04, the state group health insurance program, a managing entity as defined in s. 394.9082, or a managed care plan providing services under part IV of chapter 409 may not expend state funds as described in s. 215.31 for sex-reassignment prescriptions or procedures as defined in s. 456.001.

Section 4. Subsections (8) and (9) are added to section 456.001, Florida Statutes, to read:

456.001 Definitions.—As used in this chapter, the term:

(8) "Sex" means the classification of a person as either male or female based on the organization of the human body of such person for a specific reproductive role, as indicated by the person's sex chromosomes, naturally

occurring sex hormones, and internal and external genitalia present at birth.

(9)(a) "Sex-reassignment prescriptions or procedures" means:

1. The prescription or administration of puberty blockers for the purpose of attempting to stop or delay normal puberty in order to affirm a person's perception of his or her sex if that perception is inconsistent with the person's sex as defined in subsection (8).

2. The prescription or administration of hormones or hormone antagonists to affirm a person's perception of his or her sex if that perception is inconsistent with the person's sex as defined in subsection (8).

3. Any medical procedure, including a surgical procedure, to affirm a person's perception of his or her sex if that perception is inconsistent with the person's sex as defined in subsection (8).

(b) The term does not include:

1. Treatment provided by a physician who, in his or her good faith clinical judgment, performs procedures upon or provides therapies to a minor born with a medically verifiable genetic disorder of sexual development, including any of the following:

a. External biological sex characteristics that are unresolvably ambiguous.

b. A disorder of sexual development in which the physician has determined through genetic or biochemical testing that the patient does not have a normal sex chromosome structure, sex steroid hormone production, or sex steroid hormone action for a male or female, as applicable.

2. Prescriptions or procedures to treat an infection, an injury, a disease, or a disorder that has been caused or exacerbated by the performance of any sex-reassignment prescription or procedure, regardless of whether such prescription or procedure was performed in accordance with state or federal law.

3. Prescriptions or procedures provided to a patient for the treatment of a physical disorder, physical injury, or physical illness that would, as certified by a physician licensed under chapter 458 or chapter 459, place the individual in imminent danger of death or impairment of a major bodily function without the prescription or procedure.

Section 5. Section 456.52, Florida Statutes, is created to read:

456.52 Sex-reassignment prescriptions and procedures; prohibitions; informed consent.—

(1) Sex-reassignment prescriptions and procedures are prohibited for patients younger than 18 years of age, except that:

(a) The Board of Medicine and the Board of Osteopathic Medicine shall, within 60 days after the effective date of this act, adopt emergency rules pertaining to standards of practice under which a patient younger than 18 years of age may continue to be treated with a prescription consistent with those referenced under s. 456.001(9)(a)1. or 2. if such treatment for sex reassignment was commenced before, and is still active on, the effective date of this act. In developing rules under this paragraph, the boards shall consider requirements for physicians to obtain informed consent from such patient's parent or legal guardian, consistent with the parameters of informed consent under subsections (2) and (4), for such prescription treatment, and shall consider the provision of professional counseling services for such patient by a board-certified psychiatrist licensed under chapter 458 or chapter 459 or a psychologist licensed under chapter 490 in conjunction with such prescription treatment.

(b) A patient meeting the criteria of paragraph (a) may continue to be treated by a physician with such prescriptions according to rules adopted under paragraph (a) or nonemergency rules adopted under paragraph (6)(b).

(2) If sex-reassignment prescriptions or procedures are prescribed for or administered or performed on patients 18 years of age or older, consent must be voluntary, informed, and in writing on forms adopted in rule by the Board of Medicine and the Board of Osteopathic Medicine. Consent to sex-reassignment prescriptions or procedures is voluntary and informed only if the physician who is to prescribe or administer the pharmaceutical product or perform the procedure has, at a minimum, while physically present in the same room:

(a) Informed the patient of the nature and risks of the prescription or procedure in order for the patient to make a prudent decision;

(b) Provided the informed consent form, as adopted in rule by the Board of Medicine and the Board of Osteopathic Medicine, to the patient; and

(c) Received the patient's written acknowledgment, before the prescription or procedure is prescribed, administered, or performed, that the information required to be provided under this subsection has been provided.

(3) Sex-reassignment prescriptions or procedures may not be prescribed, administered, or performed except by a physician. For the purposes of this section, the term "physician" is defined as a physician licensed under chapter 458 or chapter 459 or a physician practicing medicine or osteopathic medicine in the employment of the Federal Government.

(4) Consent required under subsection (2) does not apply to renewals of prescriptions consistent with those referenced under s. 456.001(9)(a)1. and

2. if a physician and his or her patient have met the requirements for consent for the initial prescription or renewal. However, separate consent is required for any new prescription for a pharmaceutical product not previously prescribed to the patient.

(5)(a) Violation of this section constitutes grounds for disciplinary action under this chapter and chapter 458 or chapter 459, as applicable.

(b) Any health care practitioner who willfully or actively participates in a violation of subsection (1) commits a felony of the third degree, punishable as provided in s. 775.082, s. 775.083, or s. 775.084.

(c) Any health care practitioner who violates subsection (2), subsection (3), or subsection (4) commits a misdemeanor of the first degree, punishable as provided in s. 775.082 or s. 775.083.

(6)(a) The Board of Medicine and the Board of Osteopathic Medicine shall adopt emergency rules to implement this section.

(b) Any emergency rules adopted under this section are exempt from s. 120.54(4)(c) and shall remain in effect until replaced by rules adopted under the nonemergency rulemaking procedures of the Administrative Procedure Act.

Section 6. Present paragraphs (c) through (gg) of subsection (5) of section 456.074, Florida Statutes, are redesignated as paragraphs (d) through (hh), respectively, and a new paragraph (c) is added to that subsection, to read:

456.074 Certain health care practitioners; immediate suspension of license.—

(5) The department shall issue an emergency order suspending the license of any health care practitioner who is arrested for committing or attempting, soliciting, or conspiring to commit any act that would constitute a violation of any of the following criminal offenses in this state or similar offenses in another jurisdiction:

(c) Section 456.52(5)(b), relating to prescribing, administering, or performing sex-reassignment prescriptions or procedures for a patient younger than 18 years of age.

Section 7. Section 766.318, Florida Statutes, is created to read:

766.318 Civil liability for provision of sex-reassignment prescriptions or procedures to minors.—

(1) A cause of action exists to recover damages for personal injury or death resulting from the provision of sex-reassignment prescriptions or procedures, as defined in s. 456.001, to a person younger than 18 years of age which are prohibited by s. 456.52(1).

(2) The limitations on punitive damages in s. 768.73(1) do not apply to actions brought under this section.

(3) An action brought under this section:

(a) May be commenced within 20 years after the cessation or completion of the sex-reassignment prescription or procedure.

(b) Is in addition to any other remedy authorized by law.

(4) The cause of action created by this section does not apply to:

(a) Treatment with sex-reassignment prescriptions if such treatment is consistent with s. 456.001(9)(a)1. or 2. and was commenced on or before, and is still active on, the effective date of this act.

(b) Sex-reassignment prescriptions or procedures that were ceased or completed on or before the effective date of this act.

Section 8. If any provision of this act or its application to any person or circumstance is held invalid, the invalidity does not affect other provisions or applications of this act which can be given effect without the invalid provision or application, and to this end the provisions of this act are severable.

Section 9. The Division of Law Revision is directed to replace the phrase "the effective date of this act" wherever it occurs in this act with the date this act becomes a law.

Section 10. This act shall take effect upon becoming a law.

Approved by the Governor May 17, 2023.

Filed in Office Secretary of State May 17, 2023.