Word Count: 2545

Figures: 0

Tables: 2

The Association Between State-Level Safe Haven Laws and Rates of Infant Mortality in the United States: A Legal Epidemiology Study

Kathryn A. Thomas[1,2] & Chloe J. Kaminsky[3]

[1] The Justice Collaboratory, Yale Law School

[2] SEICHE Center for Health and Justice, Yale School of Medicine

[3] University of Florida

Corresponding Author:

Kathryn A. Thomas

The Justice Collaboratory, Yale Law School

SEICHE Center for Health and Justice, Yale School of Medicine

Kathryn.thomas@yale.edu

Three-Question Summary Box:

1) What is the current understanding of this subject?

Although a goal of safe haven laws is to ensure the safety of infants and reduce infant mortality, few studies have analyzed the relationship between safe haven laws and infant mortality. Prior research revealed a reduction in infant homicide rates after the enactment of safe haven laws, but no studies have studied the association between specific elements of safe haven laws, including who may relinquish the infant, where the infant may be relinquished, and how old the infant is at the time of relinquishment, and state-level rates of infant mortality.

2) What does this report add to the literature?

This is the first study to use a legal epidemiological approach to examine the association between specific elements of safe haven laws and state-level rates of infant mortality in the United States, including who may relinquish the infant, where the infant may be relinquished, and how old the infant is at the time of relinquishment. After controlling for demographic variables including race, poverty, and education, safe haven laws regarding who is permitted to relinquish a child significantly predicted rates of infant mortality, with the total model accounting for 74.4% of variance in infant mortality.

3) What are the implications for public health practice?

Safe haven laws pertaining to who may relinquish infants significantly predicted infant mortality, specifically laws stating only the mother may relinquish the child and laws which do not specify who may relinquish the child. These results have important implications for policymakers considering the reform of the safe haven laws, which is especially important in the wake of the overturn of *Roe v. Wade*.

Abstract

Objective: Although the United States has safe haven laws, which allow mothers to safely relinquish their babies to designated safety points, rates of infant mortality remain significantly higher in the United States than other similarly developed countries. The current study is seeking

to explore the association between state-level safe haven laws and infant mortality in the United States utilizing a legal epidemiological approach.

Methods: Several sources of publicly available data were combined to examine the association between state-level safe haven laws and rates of infant mortality. A backward stepwise regression was used to determine whether certain safe haven laws significantly predicted rates of infant mortality, while controlling for demographic variables.

Results: After controlling for demographic variables including race, poverty, and education, safe haven laws regarding who is permitted to relinquish a child significantly predicted rates of infant mortality, with the total model accounting for 74.4% of variance in infant mortality.

Conclusion: Safe haven laws pertaining to who may relinquish infants significantly predicted infant mortality, specifically laws stating only the mother may relinquish the child and laws which do not specify who may relinquish the child. These results have important implications for policymakers considering the reform of the safe haven laws. It is especially important to evaluate the effectiveness and origins of safe haven laws in the wake of the overturn of *Roe v. Wade*. Future studies should longitudinally examine how changes in safe haven laws lead to changes in rates of infant mortality.

Introduction

Rates of infant mortality remains significantly higher in the United States than in other similarly developed countries.[1] In fact, infant mortality rates in the United States are three-to-four times higher than Hong Kong, Singapore, and Finland, and 31 to 51% higher than Canada and England.[2] Although rates of infant mortality have decreased in recent decades, the United States' decline in infant mortality has lagged behind other similarly developed countries, such that the United States ranked 12th lowest in infant mortality worldwide in 1960 and 31st in 2015.[2] Research has shown that racial disparities in infant mortality in the United States have persisted for over a century, such that mortality rates for Black, Latinx, and Native American/Alaska Native infants remain significantly higher than rates for White and Asian infants.[2] Rates of infant mortality in the first 27 days following birth were 151% higher for Black infants than their White counterparts in 2017.[2] Among the leading causes of infant mortality are congenital malformations, complications associated with low birthweight and short gestation periods, maternal complications, sudden infant death syndrome, and unintentional injuries.[3]

The high rates of infant mortality may be reflective of a larger policy problem regarding maternal and infant welfare in the United States. In reaction to the high rates of infant mortality and highly publicized cases of infanticide, all 50 states have passed various versions of safe haven laws, which provide a place for infants to be relinquished safely. In 1999, Texas passed the first safe haven law, with 15 states adopting safe haven laws in 2000 and all 50 states by 2008.[4] Safe haven laws were originally enacted to address infant abandonment and provide mothers with a safe method of relinquishing their infants, with the ultimate objective of preserving infant health and preventing infanticide.[5] Safe haven laws vary by state in terms of who may relinquish the infant, where the infant may be relinquished, and how old the infant is at the time of relinquishment. Beyond these policies, certain states place liability upon different parties, such as provider(s) and/or parent(s), thereby criminalizing certain parties if relinquishment is not conducted according to the statutory requirements.[5]

Although a goal of safe haven laws is to ensure the safety of infants and reduce infant mortality, few studies have analyzed the relationship between safe haven laws and infant mortality. There are no national datasets aimed at understanding the use of safe havens in the United States, as most states do not mandate data collection on the number of infants surrendered

to safe havens[4]. Worldwide, there has been a call for more robust, long term data collection to understand the use of safe haven laws and the impact of safe haven laws on rates of infant mortality[4]. In one of the few studies examining the effectiveness of safe haven laws, Wilson and colleagues compared infant homicide rates in the United States from 1989-1998 and 2008-2017 to determine whether rates had changed after the enactment of safe haven laws across the United States; results revealed a 66.7% decrease in infant homicides from 1989-1998 to 2008-2017.[6] The authors also examined whether the age limit of legal relinquishment predicted rates of infant homicide, and found that there was not a significant association between age limit of legal relinquishment and rates of infant homicide.[6] The Centers for Disease Control and Prevention encouraged states to evaluate the effectiveness of safe haven laws in preventing infant homicides, and to consider other programs and policies that could reduce rates of infant homicides by providing economic support, affordable childcare, and skill-building for young parents.[6]

Further, legal scholars have argued that safe haven laws were an emotional response to high-profile cases of infanticide and were not properly researched before being enacted, and, therefore, do not address the root problems of infant abandonment and infant mortality.[7] It has been suggested that safe haven laws may make citizens feel like crime and infant harm is being prevented, rather than offering concrete, evidence-based solutions.[8] Moreover, safe haven laws have been criticized for ignoring racial, cultural, and socioeconomic issues that impact women's reasons for relinquishment, as well as the complex needs of mothers during their pregnancy.[9]

As these laws vary significantly by state, research is needed to understand what elements of safe haven laws, if any, predict infant mortality, including who may relinquish the infant, where the infant may be relinquished, and how old the infant is at the time of relinquishment. We utilize a legal epidemiological approach to examine the association between specific elements of state-level safe haven laws and rates of infant mortality in the United States, adding to the literature by including elements of safe haven laws beyond just those that establish age limits.

Methods

Procedure

Publicly available state-level data was combined from several data sources including: 1) Children Welfare Information Gateway's List of State Statutes of Infant Safe Haven Laws as of 2016;[5] 2) Center for Disease Control and Prevention state-level data on infant mortality rates per 100,000 live births in the United States in 2016;[10] and 3) U.S. Census state-level estimates of race, poverty levels, percent of state that is rural, and health insurance rates from 2010 to 2019.[11] Elements of safe haven laws included in the initial analyses were: 1) whether there is a right to reclaim the infant; 2) whether the provider must provide legal information and referrals; 3) the number of days after birth that a infant can be relinquished; 4) whether either parents may relinquish the infant; 5) whether only the mother may relinquish the infant; 6) whether an agent of the parent may relinquish the infant; 7) whether someone with legal custody can relinquish the infant; 8) whether the law specifies who can relinquish the infant; 9) whether the infant can be relinquished to a hospital; 10) whether the infant can be relinquished to a fire department; 11) whether the infant can be relinquished to law enforcement; 12) whether the infant can be relinquished to a church; 13) whether it's the responsibility of the safe haven provider to accept emergency protective custody; 14) whether there is immunity from liability for providers; 15) whether parents can remain anonymous; 16) whether parents are protected from criminal liability 17) whether a provider can be called if there is no transportation to a safe haven; 18) whether the provider must ask for medical information when an infant is relinquished. Data from all 50 states were included in the analyses. All variables were continuous, with the exception of the state-level coding of safe haven laws, which were coded 1 for the presence of the law and 0 for the lack of the law.

Data Analysis

A hierarchical multiple regression was performed to examine the association between safe haven laws and infant mortality. A backward stepwise approach was utilized to select the most salient correlate variables to control for in the first step of the regressions while reducing the likelihood of overfitting the model with variables not contributing to the variance in infant mortality. The backwards stepwise regression began with a full, saturated model that included all potential demographic variables informed by extant literature. Next, variables that contributed the least amount of variance were removed one-by-one to find a reduced model that best explained the data. The threshold for removing variables was $p = .15$.

Results

The backwards stepwise approach revealed a final regression model which controlled for state-level percent of population that identifies as Black, percent of population that identifies as Asian American, percent of population that identified as multiracial, percent of the population that falls below the poverty line, and percent of population that graduated high school, which accounted for 69.1% of variance in infant mortality. See Table 1. In order to determine which legal variables to include in the second step of the model, another backwards stepwise approach was used, which revealed a final regression model which included presence of a law in which either parent may relinquish a child (p = .068), presence of a law in which only the mother may relinquish the child (p = .028), and presence of a law in which it is unspecified who may relinquish the child (p = .016). Thus, the second step of the model (including the percent of population that identifies as Black (β = 4.905), percent of population that identifies as Asian American (β = -20.028), percent of population that identified as multiracial (β = 34.457), percent of the population that falls below the poverty line (β = .173), percent of population that graduated high school (β = .055), presence of a law in which either parent may relinquish a child (β = 1.196), presence of a law in which only the mother may relinquish the child (β = 1.675)), and presence of a law in which it is unspecified who may relinquish the child (β = 1.449)) predicted 74.4% of variance in infant mortality. See Table 2 for a list of states with each safe haven law. The addition of the legal variables in the second step of the model led to a significant change in R^2, ($F(8,41) = 14.91$, $p < .001$).

Discussion

Rates of infant mortality are significantly higher in the United States than in other similarly developed countries. In fact, the United States ranks 33 out of 36 Organization of Economic Cooperation and Development (OECD) nations for rates of infant mortality.[12] While safe haven laws were created to reduce cases of infanticide and other infant deaths,[4] there has been no research that has examined that association between specific elements of safe haven laws (i.e., who may relinquish the infant, where the infant may be relinquished, and how old the infant is at the time of relinquishment) and rates of infant mortality to our knowledge. Thus, the goal of our study was to examine the association between specific elements of safe haven laws and rates of infant mortality.

Results revealed that when controlling for race (specifically the percentage of the state that identifies as Black, Asian American, and multiracial), poverty rate, and percent of the state's population that graduated high school, the presence of two elements of state safe haven laws (only the mother may relinquish the child, and it is unspecified who may relinquish the child) were significant predictors of infant mortality, with the full model predicting 74.4% of the variance in infant mortality. Utilizing a backwards stepwise approach allowed for the inclusion of 18 elements of state-level safe haven laws in the analysis, and revealed that the element of the safe haven law that most significantly predicted infant mortality was who can relinquish the child, rather than where the infant may be relinquished, or how old the infant is at the time of relinquishment. Specifically, results revealed that states with laws stating that only the mother may relinquish the infant or laws that do not specify who may relinquish the infant had higher rates of infant mortality.

Further research is needed to understand the mechanism by which these elements of safe haven laws are related to higher rates of infant mortality. One possible explanation is that laws limiting who may relinquish a child may deter parents from relinquishing their infants. In the states that do not specify who can relinquish an infant, parents might be unsure of their rights to utilize safe havens. Future research should explore the mechanism by which laws regarding who may relinquish an infant may be barriers to access to safe haven laws. Not only do researchers need to explore these barriers in the law, but also policymakers. There is a need for more systematic data collection about the use of safe havens, and policymakers can advocate for laws requiring the collection of data concerning how often safe havens are used and by whom. The systematic collection of data would also allow researchers to examine potential disparities in the use of safe havens, as well as barriers that might hinder their use.

Legal scholars have identified the lack of education and resources to promote awareness of safe haven laws as a key issue in the effectiveness of safe haven laws in the United States.[4] Mothers may be more likely to relinquish infants if they knew that these laws existed, but public education has been practically nonexistent and women are often unaware of the laws or how to use a safe haven[13,14] Research has revealed that mothers are most likely to seek information from health professionals and online health resources, and that 90% of expectant mothers preferred to consult more than one information resource before making a decision.[15] Future studies can

examine the role of education and promoting awareness of safe haven laws on the use of safe havens and the effectiveness of safe haven laws in reducing rates of infant mortality and infant homicide. It is especially important to consider who is utilizing safe haven laws in order to more effectively disseminate information about these laws. Additionally, other studies have suggested that mothers who illegally abandon or kill babies are on average 19 years old, single, no longer involved with the baby's father, and concealed their pregnancy.[14] Policies can then focus on disseminating information about safe havens to these populations who are most vulnerable to infant mortality.

Understanding the impact of state haven laws and their policy implications are especially important in recent months, as safe havens have been suggested, by Supreme Court Justice Amy Coney Barrett in the oral arguments in *Dobbs v. Jackson Women's Health Organization*, as a way of alleviating the "burdens of parenting" and "obligations of motherhood" that will likely increase in wake of *Roe v. Wade* being overturned. It is evident that the connection between safe haven laws and abortion has been used in the conversation surrounding reproductive rights, making it even more important that safe haven laws are understood by researchers and policymakers alike. Safe haven laws were originally adopted with the purpose of reducing infant abandonment and infant homicide; they were not adopted to replace abortions or serve as an alternate option for women who cannot access abortion.[16] In fact, women who are unable to get an abortion usually will not utilize safe havens or elect to place their infants up for adoption.[17] While there is a need for future research that examines the effectiveness of safe haven laws, it is important to note that safe haven laws are only one piece of a larger puzzle that must be considered when considering women's choices and reproductive justice.

While these results provide an important preliminary look at the association between state-level safe haven laws and rates of infant mortality, there are limitations to the study's cross-sectional design. Future studies should utilize a longitudinal approach to determine how changes in safe haven laws lead to changes in infant mortality. Additionally, this study examines state-level trends rather than the individual impact of safe haven laws on parents' decisions to utilize safe haven services. Future studies can examine individuals' experiences utilizing safe havens and the barriers which may prevent their use on an individual level. The use of state-level data

also limits the statistical power for analyses, and thus results may not capture the full association between safe haven laws and infant mortality, especially for laws that are enacted in few states.

247 References

248 1. MacDorman MF, Mathews T, Mohangoo AD, Zeitlin J. International comparisons of
249 infant mortality and related factors: United States and Europe, 2010. 2014;
250 2. Singh GK, Stella MY. Infant mortality in the United States, 1915-2017: large social
251 inequalities have persisted for over a century. *International Journal of Maternal and Child*
252 *Health and AIDS*. 2019;8(1):19.
253 3. Driscoll AK, Ely DM. Effects of changes in maternal age distribution and maternal age-
254 specific infant mortality rates on infant mortality trends: United States, 2000–2017. 2020;
255 4. Bartels L. Safe haven laws, baby hatches and anonymous hospital birth: Examining infant
256 abandonment, neonaticide and infanticide in Australia. *Criminal Law Journal*. 2012;36:19-37.
257 5. Infant Safe Haven Laws.
258 https://www.childwelfare.gov/topics/systemwide/lawspolicies/statutes/safehaven/
259 6. Wilson RF, Klevens J, Williams D, Xu L. Infant homicides within the context of safe
260 haven laws—United States, 2008–2017. *Morbidity and Mortality Weekly Report*.
261 2020;69(39):1385.
262 7. Racine JR. A dangerous place for society and its troubled young women: A call for an
263 end to newborn Safe Haven laws in Wisconsin and beyond. *Wis Women's LJ*. 2005;20:243.
264 8. Hammond M, Miller MK, Griffin T. Safe haven laws as crime control theater. *Child*
265 *abuse & neglect*. 2010;34(7):545-552.
266 9. Biehl S. Validating Oppression: Safe Haven Laws as Perpetuation of Society's
267 Demonization of Bad Mothers. *Child Legal Rts J*. 2002;22:17.
268 10. Infant Mortality Rates by State. Centers for Disease Control and Prevention. 2021.
269 https://www.cdc.gov/nchs/pressroom/sosmap/infant_mortality_rates/infant_mortality.htm
270 11. Explore Census Data. U.S. Census Bureau. Accessed 2021,
271 https://data.census.gov/cedsci/
272 12. Infant Mortality.
273 https://www.cdc.gov/reproductivehealth/maternalinfanthealth/infantmortality.htm
274 13. Trossman S. Keeping Newborns and Children Safe: Resolutions on safe haven laws and
275 injury prevention around vehicles. *AJN The American Journal of Nursing*. 2006;106(3):35-36.
276 14. Lacci LK. Statistically Speaking: Can Safe Haven Legislation succeed without education.
277 *Child Legal Rts J*. 2006;26:88.

15. Mahony C, Heavin C, Sammon D. Health-related information resource use: an exploratory study of expectant mothers. *Journal of Decision Systems*. 2022;31(3):234-257.

16. Sanger C. Infant safe haven laws: Legislating in the culture of life. *Colum L Rev*. 2006;106:753.

17. Foster DG. *The turnaway study: ten years, a thousand women, and the consequences of having—or being denied—an abortion*. Simon and Schuster; 2020.

Table 1. Regression analyses examining the association between safe haven laws and infant mortality.

Predictors	*B*	R^2
Step 1:		
Percent of Population Identifying as Black	5.659***	.691***
Percent of Population Identifying as Asian American	-18.502***	
Percent of Population Identifying as Multiracial	37.624***	
Percent Below Poverty Line	.161***	
Percent of Population Who Graduated High School	.060**	
Step 2:		
Percent of Population Identifying as Black	4.905***	.744***
Percent of Population Identifying as Asian American	-20.028***	
Percent of Population Identifying as Multiracial	34.457***	
Percent Below Poverty Line	.173***	
Percent of Population Who Graduated High School	.055*	
Safe Haven Law – Either Parent May Relinquish Child	1.196	
Safe Haven Law – Only Mother May Relinquish Child	1.675*	
Safe Haven Law – Not Specified Who May Relinquish Child	1.449*	

***p < .001, ** p < .01, * p < .05, N = 50.

Table 1. Safe Haven Laws by State

Type of Law	States with that Law
Law that Either Parent May Relinquish Child	AL, AK, AZ, AR, CA, CO, CT, DC, FL, HI, ID, IL, IN, IA, KS, KY, LA, MA, MI, MS, MO, MT, NV, NH, NJ, NY, NC, ND, OH, OK, OR, PA, RI, SD, TX, UT, VA, WA, WV, WI, WY
Law that Only Mother May Relinquish Child	GA, MD, MN, TN
Law Does Not Specify Who May Relinquish Child	DE, HI, IL, ME, NE, NM, RI, VT