

SENATE JUDICIARY COMMITTEE
Senator Thomas Umberg, Chair
2021-2022 Regular Session

SB 1142 (Caballero)
Version: April 7, 2022
Hearing Date: April 19, 2022
Fiscal: Yes
Urgency: No
AM

SUBJECT

Abortion services

DIGEST

The bill requires the California Health and Human Services Agency (CHHS) to establish an internet website where the public can find information on abortion services in this state, as provided. The bill requires the Commission on the Status of Women and Girls to provide grants to nonprofit organizations that assist pregnant people who are low income or face other financial barriers with direct practical support service to access and obtain an abortion, to nonprofits that provide abortion services to those persons, and to public research institutions in California that conduct research on reproductive health, law, and policy, as specified. The bill exempts applications for a grant and financial reporting of grantees from disclosure under the California Public Records Act (CPRA).

EXECUTIVE SUMMARY

Reproductive rights are under attack across the nation. Since 1973, the U.S. Supreme Court has continuously held that it is a constitutional right to access abortion before fetal viability; however, the Court is reviewing a case that directly challenges this precedent. Some legal scholars are predicting that due to the current conservative make-up of the Court these long-standing legal protections may be overturned or weakened. If this were to happen, people in roughly half the country may lose access to abortion services. New tactics to deny people access are also underway as evidenced by the recent legislation in Texas. This bill strives to ensure that those seeking abortion services in California will have the information and support needed to exercise their fundamental rights.

The bill is sponsored by NARAL Pro Choice and Planned Parenthood Affiliates of California. It is supported by reproductive health advocacy groups and associations representing health care practitioners. It is opposed by the California Catholic Conference and various other groups against the fundamental right to access abortion. The bill was voted out of the Senate Health Committee on a vote of 7-2.

PROPOSED CHANGES TO THE LAW

Existing federal law:

- 1) Holds that the federal constitution's implied right to privacy extends to an individual's decision about whether or not to have an abortion. (*Roe v. Wade* (1973) 410 U.S. 113.)
- 2) Authorizes the government to impose restrictions on abortion as long as those restrictions do not create an undue burden on an individual's right to choose to terminate a pregnancy. (*Planned Parenthood of Southeastern Pennsylvania v. Casey* (1992) 505 U.S. 833.)

Existing state law:

- 1) Holds that the state constitution's express right to privacy extends to an individual's decision about whether or not to have an abortion. (*People v. Belous* (1969) 71 Cal.2d 954.)
- 2) Establishes the Reproductive Privacy Act and provides that the Legislature finds and declares that every individual possesses a fundamental right of privacy with respect to personal reproductive decisions. (Health & Saf. Code §§ 123460 et. seq., § 123462.)
 - a) Prohibits the state from denying or interfering with an individual's fundamental right to choose to bear a child or to choose to obtain an abortion, with specified exceptions. (Health & Saf. Code § 123462(c).)
 - b) Provides that every person has the fundamental right to choose to bear a child or to choose to obtain an abortion, with specified exceptions. (Health & Saf. Code § 123462(b).)
- 3) Establishes the Commission on Women and Girls (Commission) and requires the Commission to, among other things, recommend, develop, prepare, or coordinate materials, projects, or other activities, and to give technical and consultative advice to public or private groups or persons concerned with preventing or minimizing problems brought about by the changing roles and responsibilities of women; and, developing programs to encourage and enable women to be fully contributing members of society. (Gov. Code §§ 8240, et seq.)
- 4) Provides, pursuant to the California Constitution, that the people have the right of access to information concerning the conduct of the people's business, and, therefore, the meetings of public bodies and the writings of public officials and agencies are required to be open to public scrutiny. (Cal. const. art. I, § 3(b)(1).)

- a) Requires a statute that limits the public's right of access to be adopted with findings demonstrating the interest protected by the limitation and the need for protecting that interest. (Cal. const. art. I, § 3(b)(1).)
- b) Governs the disclosure of information collected and maintained by public agencies pursuant to the CPRA. (Gov. Code §§ 7920.000 et seq.)
- c) States that, the Legislature, mindful of the right of individuals to privacy, finds and declares that access to information concerning the conduct of the people's business is a fundamental and necessary right of every person in this state. (Gov. Code § 7922.530.)
- d) Provides that all public records are accessible to the public upon request, unless the record requested is exempt from public disclosure. (Gov. Code § 6253.)

This bill:

- 1) Makes various findings and declarations of the Legislature, including, among others:
 - a) abortion care is a constitutional right and an integral part of comprehensive sexual and reproductive health care, and overall health and well-being;
 - b) if the United States Supreme Court overturns the protections under *Roe v. Wade*, people in over one-half of the states in the country, over 36,000,000 women and other people who may become pregnant, will lose access to abortion care; and
 - c) California is committed to building upon existing protections to the right to abortion and implementing innovative and bold programs and policies to truly be a reproductive freedom state.
- 2) Requires, on or before July 1, 2023, CHHS or an entity designated by CHHS to establish an internet website where the public can access information on abortion services in the state to ensure people have accurate and comprehensive information when accessing abortion services in California, as specified.
- 3) Requires CHHS to consult with subject matter experts when determining the information and resources on the internet website and review the information and resources at reasonable intervals to ensure that it is current and updated.
- 4) Requires CHHS to develop, implement, and update, as necessary, a statewide educational and outreach campaign to inform the public on how to access abortion services in the state on or before July 1, 2023.
- 5) Authorizes the Commission to allocate grants, upon appropriation by the Legislature, from the Abortion Practical Support Fund, which the bill establishes, as provided.

- a) Grants can be given to nonprofit organizations that are exempt from taxation under section 501(c) of the Internal Revenue Code to assist pregnant people who are low income or face other financial barriers with direct practical support services to access and obtain an abortion or to nonprofits that provide abortion services to those persons. Such grants are required to be used for activities that increase patient access to abortion.
 - b) Grants can also be given to public research institutions in California that conduct research on reproductive health, law, and policy, including research on abortion, contraception, and pregnancy. Such grants are to be used for research to support equitable access to abortion.
- 6) Requires the Commission to maintain a system of financial reporting on all aspects of the fund, including, but not limited to, information from the grantees on their expenditures and activities using grant funds as deemed necessary by the commission to ensure the use of the funds are consistent with the purposes of these provisions and the terms of any grant award.
 - 7) Prohibits the Commission from requiring the submission of any identifying personal information about individuals receiving practical support services as part of an application for a grant or reporting of expenditures and activities. Information required by the commission may only include information in summary, statistical, or other forms that do not identify particular individuals.
 - 8) Exempts applications for a grant from disclosure under the California Public Records Act (CPRA) because the public interest to protect the privacy of patients of abortion services outweighs the public's right of access to that information.

COMMENTS

1. Stated need for the bill

The author writes:

Abortion services clearly fall under the umbrella of health care, which any individual should have a right to access. Unfortunately, with the political climate in the United States continuing to question the rights women should have to abortion services, the instability of such care creates a safety issue for those who may need to seek abortion services. When abortion care is not readily available, a person's livelihood and future can be greatly affected, in the most significant ways. While other states seek to restrict abortion services more steadily and frequently, California has taken steps in the opposite direction to expand access and services for those who require abortion related care. Our state is already seeing a trend of individuals from other states coming to California to access an abortion, the totality of which is likely to continue to increase.

SB 1142 supports this expanded need by ensuring abortion support provider organizations who provide services to women seeking abortion, have the support necessary to account for patients coming in from out of state. SB 1142 establishes a grant fund for abortion support organizations, the purposes of which will provide funding to help individuals with the logistical needs surrounding abortion care—including transportation, child care, or financial assistance. Additionally, the bill creates a webpage under the Health and Human Services Agency that will serve as a resource to help those visiting the page gain information on where abortion providers are located in the state, the laws and protections surrounding abortion care, as well as links to assist with health insurance access or financial assistance.

2. The ability to access abortion is under attack across the nation

a. *Access to abortion is a constitutional right under Roe v. Wade*

Roe v. Wade is the landmark U.S. Supreme Court decision holding that the implied constitutional right to privacy extends to a person's decision whether to terminate a pregnancy, while allowing that some state regulation of abortion access could be permissible. ((1973) 410 U.S. 113.) The plaintiff in the case was "Jane Roe," an unmarried woman who wanted to end her pregnancy under safe and clinical conditions but was unable to obtain a legal abortion in Texas because her life was not threatened by the continuation of the pregnancy. Unable to afford travel to another state to obtain an abortion, she challenged the statute making it a crime to perform an abortion unless a woman's life was at stake. She also claimed that the Texas law abridged her right of personal privacy.

The Court struck down the Texas law, finding for the first time that the constitutional right to privacy is "broad enough to encompass a woman's decision whether or not to terminate her pregnancy." At the same time, the high court also defined two compelling state interests that would satisfy restrictions on a person's right to choose to terminate a pregnancy: 1) states may regulate the abortion procedure after the first trimester of pregnancy in ways necessary to promote a woman's health; and 2) after the point of fetal viability outside of the womb, a state may, to protect the potential life of the fetus, prohibit abortions that are not necessary to preserve a person's life or health. In short, *Roe* held that bans on abortion before viability, which is generally agreed by experts to be around 24 weeks of pregnancy, are unconstitutional, and bans after viability are constitutional as long as there is an exception for preserving a pregnant person's life or health.

b. *Ongoing legal challenges to Roe v. Wade*

Roe has been one of the most debated Supreme Court decisions, and its application and continued validity have frequently been challenged in the courts. Most significantly, in *Planned Parenthood of Southeastern Pennsylvania v. Casey* (1992) 505 U.S. 833, the Court

reaffirmed the basic holding of *Roe v. Wade*, yet also permitted states to impose restrictions on abortion as long as those restrictions do not create an undue burden on a person's right to choose to terminate a pregnancy.

Exactly what constitutes an undue burden remains a point of frequent legal contention. For example, under the *Casey* standard, the U.S. Supreme Court upheld a federal statute that restricted so-called "partial birth abortions." (*Gonzales v. Carhart* (2007) 550 U.S. 124.) More recently, the Court applied the same standard to strike down a Texas law that required any facility performing abortions to meet the state requirements for an ambulatory surgical center and also required any doctor performing abortions to have admitting privileges at a hospital within 30 miles. (*Whole Woman's Health v. Hellerstedt* (2016) 579 U.S. 582; 136 S. Ct. 2292). Since, in practice, almost no abortion facility or provider could meet these mandates, the Texas law had the effect of dramatically restricting access to abortion services in the state. Although the Court reaffirmed that ruling last year in *June Medical Services, L.L.C. v. Russo* (2020) ___ U.S. ___ (140 S.Ct. 2103), the outcome in that case relied upon the vote of Justice Ruth Bader Ginsburg, who subsequently passed away, and the concurrence of Chief Justice John Roberts, who joined the majority solely on the basis of *stare decisis* – the doctrine that courts must ordinarily follow prior precedent.

Meanwhile, as the post-*Roe* jurisprudence has evolved, a minority of the U.S. Supreme Court's justices have at various times indicated their belief that *Roe v. Wade* should be overturned altogether. (See, e.g., *Webster v. Reprod. Health Servs.* (1989) 492 U.S. 490.) With President Donald Trump's appointment of Justices Neil Gorsuch, Brett Kavanaugh, and Amy Coney Barrett to the high court, it may be that a majority for that view now exists. Were the U.S. Supreme Court to overturn *Roe*, state governments or the federal government would then be free to impose additional restrictions on abortion or even outlaw it entirely.

This scenario may be closer than ever before, as currently pending at the U.S. Supreme Court is the case of *Dobbs v. Jackson Women's Health*, where the court is deciding whether all pre-viability prohibitions on elective abortions are unconstitutional. (*Dobbs v. Jackson Women's Health* (2021) ___ U.S. ___ (141 S.Ct. 2619).) Oral arguments were heard in December of 2021 and a decision is expected by the end of the Court's term in June 2022. Some legal experts are predicting that the conservative members of the U.S. Supreme Court will use this opportunity to weaken or completely overturn *Roe*. If this happens, as many as 21 states would certainly ban abortion and five likely would due to the political make-up of their governments and historical actions.¹ According to the Guttmacher Institute, nine states still have abortion bans in their statutes from before *Roe* was decided and 12 other states currently have trigger bans that would go into

¹ Elizabeth Nash, *26 States are Certain or Likely to Ban Abortion Without Roe: Here's Which Ones and Why*, Guttmacher Institute (Oct, 2021) available at <https://www.guttmacher.org/article/2021/10/26-states-are-certain-or-likely-ban-abortion-without-roe-heres-which-ones-and-why> (as of Apr. 8, 2022).

effect if is overturned.² Just this month, Oklahoma enacted Senate Bill 612, which makes it a felony to perform an abortion unless it is a medical emergency.³

c. New challenges to exercising one's constitutional right to an abortion

Recently, Texas perniciously enacted a law with an enforcement scheme that was designed to avoid judicial scrutiny of its clearly unconstitutional provisions.⁴ This law prohibits a physician from knowingly performing or inducing an abortion on a pregnant woman if the physician detected a fetal heartbeat for the unborn child, as specified, or failed to perform a test to detect a fetal heartbeat. (Tex. Health & Safety Code § 171.201 et seq. (enacted through Texas Senate Bill 8).) This law essentially places a near-categorical ban on abortions beginning six weeks after a person's last menstrual period, which is before many people even realize they are pregnant and occurs months before fetal viability.⁵ The law provides that any person, other than an officer or employee of a state or local governmental entity in Texas, may bring a civil action to enforce its provisions, which includes liability of \$10,000 plus costs and fees if a plaintiff prevails while a defendant is prohibited from recovering their own costs and fees if they prevail. (*Id.* at (subd. (b) & (i).)

Texas abortion providers, led by Whole Women's Health and others, filed a case in an attempt to stop the law before it took effect seeking pre-enforcement review of the law and an injunction barring its enforcement. On certiorari from the Fifth Circuit, the Supreme Court held that a pre-enforcement challenge to the law under the U.S. Constitution may only proceed against certain defendants but not others.⁶ The court did not address whether the law was constitutionally sound. However, the court's ruling essentially insulated the private enforcement of the law from challenge, allowing the law to remain in effect.

The inability to challenge the law pre-enforcement allows it to stand as an ominous threat to all persons seeking or performing an abortion and results in many Texans being denied the ability to exercise their constitutionally protected right under *Roe v. Wade* as evidenced by that fact abortions in Texas decreased by 60 percent in the first

² *Ibid.*

³ Sean Murphy, *Oklahoma Governor signs bill to make abortion illegal*, Los Angeles Times (Apr. 12, 2022) available at [Oklahoma governor signs bill to make abortion illegal - Los Angeles Times \(latimes.com\)](https://www.latimes.com/local/lanow/story/oklahoma-governor-signs-bill-to-make-abortion-illegal-2022-04-12/) (as of Apr. 13, 2022).

⁴ See *Whole Woman's Health v. Jackson* (2021) 142 S. Ct. 522, at 543 (conc. opn. Roberts, C.J., Breyer, Sotomayor, & Kagan) that states Texas has passed a law that is contrary to *Roe* and *Casey* because it has "the effect of denying the exercise of what we have held is a right protected under the Federal Constitution" and was "designed to shield its unconstitutional law from judicial review." (footnote omitted).

⁵ See *Whole Woman's Health v. Jackson* (2021) 141 S. Ct. 2494, at 24998 (dis. opn. Sotomayor, Breyer, & Kagan).

⁶ *Whole Woman's Health v. Jackson* (2021) 142 S. Ct. 522, 530.

month after Texas Senate Bill 8 took effect.⁷ Clinics in states such as Louisiana, Oklahoma, New Mexico, Kansas, and Colorado are reporting that large numbers of patients from Texas coming into their clinics.⁸ Other states are already copying Texas. Idaho enacted a similar law via Idaho Senate Bill 1309; however, the implementation of that bill has been stayed by the Idaho Supreme Court pending further action of the court and to allow the parties to the case to file their respective briefs.⁹ Missouri has gone even further than Texas, seeking to allow civil suits to punish those who would help a person obtain an abortion out of state.¹⁰ Similar legislation has been introduced in Arizona, Florida, Minnesota, and Wisconsin as well, but these bills are less likely to be enacted.¹¹

3. California is a Reproductive Freedom State

The California Supreme Court has found the state constitution's express right to privacy extends to an individual's decision about whether or not to have an abortion. (*People v. Belous* (1969) 71 Cal.2d 954.) Further, California statutory law provides under the state Reproductive Privacy Act that every individual possesses a fundamental right of privacy with respect to personal reproductive decisions and that the state is prohibited from denying or interfering with a person's fundamental right to choose to bear a child or to choose to obtain an abortion, with certain limited exceptions. (Health & Saf. Code § 123462.) In response to the numerous attacks on reproductive rights across the nation, Governor Newsom issued a proclamation in May 2019 reaffirming California's commitment to making reproductive freedom a fundamental right.¹² In September 2021, more than 40 organizations came together to form the California Future Abortion Council (CA FAB) to identify barriers to accessing abortion services and to recommend policy proposals to support equitable and affordable access for not only Californians but all who seek care in the state. If the U.S. Supreme Court overturns or fundamentally weakens *Roe v. Wade* California may become a safe haven for people seeking abortion services. The Guttmacher Institute estimates that if all the 21 states expected to enact a total ban on abortion actually do, the number of patients who would find their nearest

⁷ Shafkat Anwar, *Abortions in Texas fell 60% in the first month after its new law took effect*, NPR (Feb. 10, 2022) available at <https://www.npr.org/2022/02/10/1079963293/abortions-in-texas-fell-60-in-the-first-month-after-its-new-law-took-effect> (as of Apr. 8, 2022).

⁸ Elenor Klibanoff, *Six months in, "no end in sight" for Texas' new abortion law*, The Texas Tribune (Mar. 1, 2022) available at <https://www.texastribune.org/2022/03/01/texas-abortion-law-supreme-court/> (as of Apr. 8, 2022).

⁹ Order Granting Motion to Reconsider, Idaho Supreme Court, Docket No. 49615-2022, Apr. 8, 2022 available at <https://coi.isc.idaho.gov/docs/Supreme/49615-2022/040822%20Order%20Granting%20Motion%20to%20Reconsider.pdf>.

¹⁰ Alison Durkee, *Idaho Enacts Law Copying Texas' Abortion Ban – And These States Might Be Next*, Forbes (Mar. 23, 2022) available at <https://www.forbes.com/sites/alisondurkee/2022/03/23/idaho-enacts-law-copying-texas-abortion-ban---and-these-states-might-be-next/?sh=340dc49425c0> (as of Apr. 8, 2022).

¹¹ *Ibid.*

¹² California Proclamation on Reproductive Freedom (May 31, 2019) available at [CAP16-20190531083736](https://www.sos.ca.gov/press-releases/2019/05/31/california-proclamation-reproductive-freedom).

clinic in California would increase by 2,923 percent from 46,000 to 1.4 million.¹³ According to CA FAB, in order for California to live up to its proclamation of being a reproductive freedom state it must be prepared and ready to serve anyone who comes to California seeking abortion services.¹⁴

This bill seeks to address some of the policy proposals recommended by CA FAB and to ensure abortion support provider organizations have the support they need to assist Californians, and those coming to California, in accessing their fundamental right to abortion services. First the bill requires CHHS, or an entity designated by CHHS, to establish an internet website where the public can access information on abortion services in the state. It is important that the website is run by a governmental entity, especially one that handles policy for healthcare services, as it will ensure people have accurate, comprehensive, and trustworthy information on accessing abortion services in California. It also requires CHHS to develop, implement, and update, as necessary, a statewide educational and outreach campaign to inform the public on how to access abortion services in the state.

Second, the bill authorizes the Commission to allocate grants, upon appropriation of funds by the Legislature, into the Abortion Practical Support Fund which the bill establishes. The bill requires grants to be given to nonprofit organizations that are exempt from taxation under section 501(c) of the Internal Revenue Code to assist pregnant people who are low income or face other financial barriers with direct practical support service to access and obtain an abortion or to nonprofits that provide abortion services to those persons, specifying that these grants are required to be used to increase patient access to abortion. Practical support services means services that provide direct assistance, such as airfare, lodging, ground transportation, gas money, meals, dependent childcare, doula support, and translation services, to help a person access and obtain an abortion. According to CA FAB, individuals seeking care often experience hurdles, such as distance to the nearest available provider, transportation needs, lodging, child care, language barriers, and other necessities such as food.¹⁵ They state that “as more patients come from out of state, abortion fund organizations and providers that offer practical support will strain more than ever to meet the demand of people needing care.”¹⁶

The bill requires the Commission to maintain a system of financial reporting on all aspects of the fund, including, but not limited to, information from the grantees on their expenditures and activities using grant funds. In order to ensure the privacy of persons receiving services from any grantee, the bill prohibits the Commission from requiring

¹³ *If Roe v. Wade Falls: Travel Distance for People Seeking Abortion*, Guttmacher Institute, available at [If Roe v. Wade Falls: Travel Distance for People Seeking Abortion | Guttmacher Institute](#) (as of Apr. 9, 2022).

¹⁴ *Recommendations to Protect, Strengthen, and Expand Abortion Care in California*, Cal. Future Abortion Council (Dec. 2021) at 2.

¹⁵ *Id.* at 5.

¹⁶ *Ibid.*

the submission of any identifying personal information about individuals receiving practical support services as part of an application for a grant or reporting of expenditures and activities. To further ensure the privacy of persons receiving services from grantees, the bill exempts applications for a grant and financial reporting by grantees from disclosure under the CPRA. The bill provides that the public interest to protect the privacy of patients of services from grantees outweighs the public's right of access to that information. By exempting these records from disclosure, the bill balances the right of access to public records while ensuring that the fundamental right of privacy with respect to personal reproductive decisions is protected.

4. Amendments

The Author has proposed the following amendments to fix a typographical error in the bill and address privacy concerns with the information CHHS is required to post on the internet website with respect to information about individuals who are abortion providers.¹⁷ In order to ensure the privacy and safety of individuals who are abortion providers, the amendment will specify that the internet website shall not include the name or location of any such individual.

Amendment 1

On page 3, in line 4, strike out "implement" and insert: implementing

Amendment 2

On page 5, between line 9 and 10 insert:

(d) Notwithstanding subdivision (a), the internet website established pursuant to this section shall not include the name or location of any individual who is an abortion provider.

5. Statements in support

NARAL Pro Choice, one of the sponsors of the bill, writes:

[...] In 2022, there have been over 500 abortion restrictions introduced across 41 states. Also this year, the U.S. Supreme Court will decide on a case that directly challenges the constitutional right to abortion established under *Roe v. Wade*. If the Court upholds Mississippi's abortion ban, thereby overturning *Roe*, people in over half of the states across the country – over 36 million women and other people who may become pregnant – will lose access to abortion. In fact, millions of Texans are already experiencing this lack of access. Since Texas' S.B. 8 went into effect last fall, Texans needing abortion have been denied. The ban in Texas disproportionately

¹⁷ The amendments may also include the addition of co-authors and technical, nonsubstantive changes recommended by the Office of Legislative Counsel.

impacts Black, Brown, Indigenous and other people of color, people with low-income, people living in rural areas, and other historically marginalized communities who are most likely to be forced to continue pregnancies against their will, rather than be able to travel to already overburdened clinics in neighboring states [...]

To meet the need of Californians and those coming to California for abortion services, SB 1142 will create a grant program for California-based organizations who provide people with procedural and practical support when accessing abortion. [...] These grants will be critical to ensuring abortion funds and abortion support organizations, already operating on slim margins, can meet the needs of patients in the coming years, as abortion access is being restricted in states around the nation. [...] SB 1142 is necessary to ensure California is holding to its commitment as a Reproductive Freedom State and can serve the needs of all patients seeking abortion care in California.

6. Statements in opposition

The California Catholic Conference writes in opposition:

We are, as always, opposed to abortion since it always takes the life of an innocent human being, more than 132,000 lives lost each year in our state. Women deserve to be empowered with nonviolent solutions to the challenges they face during pregnancy. Indeed, a majority of Americans oppose using tax dollars to pay for abortions (Marist). [...]

There is no lack of access to abortion in California. The state already funds abortions through tax dollars, with over 400 facilities performing abortions, and abortions offered by nurse practitioners, nurse midwives, physician assistants, via telehealth, on college campuses, and through a dozen sources by mail.

What California needs is equity for the choices of pregnant and parenting women as they pursue motherhood. California women face critical issues including maternal mortality, infant mortality, lack of prenatal and postpartum care, housing, nutrition, transportation, childcare, immigration services, intimate partner violence, and unemployment. Rather than prejudicing the choice of abortion over birth and parenting, we encourage the members to provide equitable responses to the real and unmet needs of California families.[...] (hyperlinks omitted)

SUPPORT

NARAL Pro Choice (Sponsor)

Planned Parenthood Affiliates of California (Sponsor)

ACCESS Reproductive Justice
American College of Obstetricians and Gynecologists District IX
California Health + Advocates
California Latinas for Reproductive Justice
California Medical Association
California Nurse Midwives Association
California Women's Law Center
Essential Access Health
Having Our Say Coalition
National Center for Youth Law
National Health Law Program
Nevada County Citizens for Choice
Women's Foundation California

OPPOSITION

California Catholic Conference
Californians for Life
Capitol Resource Institute
Life Legal Defense Foundation
Right to Life League of Southern California

RELATED LEGISLATION

Pending Legislation:

SB 1245 (Kamlager, 2022) establishes the Los Angeles County Abortion Access Safe Haven Pilot Program for the purpose of expanding and improving access to the full spectrum of sexual and reproductive health care, including abortion, in Los Angeles County, as provided. This bill is set to be heard in this Committee on April 26, 2022.

SB 1375 (Atkins, 2022), among other things, authorizes nurse practitioners (NPs) who are qualified to independently practice to provide abortion services by aspiration techniques in the first trimester without having to work under existing prescribed standardized procedures and makes conforming changes. This bill is set to be heard in this Committee on April 19, 2022.

AB 1666 (Bauer-Kahan, 2022) prohibits the enforcement of out-of-state fetal heartbeat abortion restriction laws in California. AB 1666 currently on the Assembly Floor.

AB 2134 (Weber, 2022), among other things, permits Medi-Cal providers to apply for grant funding to provide abortion and contraception at no cost to certain uninsured or underinsured individuals, as provided. AB 2134 is currently pending in the Assembly Health Committee.

Prior Legislation:

SB 245 (Gonzalez, Ch. 11, Stats. 2022) prohibits cost-sharing, restrictions, delays, prior authorization and annual or lifetime limits on all abortion services, including follow-up services.

SB 24 (Leyva, Ch. 740, Stats. 2019) requires student health centers located on a University of California or California State University campus that provide primary health care services to students to offer abortion by medication onsite, as provided.

PRIOR VOTES:

Senate Health Committee (Ayes 7, Noes 2)
