



Taylor Morton, Kansas Lobbyist and Policy Analyst  
Planned Parenthood Great Plains Votes  
4401 W. 109th Street, Suite 200, Overland Park, KS 66211  
Regarding HB 2062 (Opponent Written and Oral Testimony)  
Senate Committee on Judiciary  
February 27, 2025

Chair Warren and Committee Members,

Planned Parenthood Great Plains Votes (“PPGPV”) is the advocacy and political arm of Comprehensive Health of Planned Parenthood Great Plains and Planned Parenthood Great Plains (“PPGP”), which offer compassionate sexual and reproductive health care to patients at four health center locations in Kansas. PPGPV is dedicated to supporting pregnant people and ensuring the reproductive rights of Kansans are protected through evidence-based policy. PPGPV submits this testimony in opposition to House Bill 2062.

HB 2062 would provide for child support for “unborn children” from the date of conception. While on the surface, HB 2062 appears to be a means of supporting pregnant people and families, a closer look reveals this bill is nothing more than an attempt to further an anti-abortion agenda. This bill seeks to further establish fetal “personhood,” a disingenuous tactic used by those who oppose comprehensive sexual and reproductive health care by elevating the rights of a fetus to be equivalent or superior to those of a pregnant person. Laws that grant fetal personhood can deter pregnant people from seeking care during a pregnancy loss and promote mistrust between patients and providers.<sup>1</sup> By establishing fetal “personhood,” anti-abortion lawmakers could make it easier for laws to be enacted that criminalize or restrict health care during pregnancy. HB 2062 is in direct opposition to broad public support for abortion access in Kansas.

Additionally, this legislation does nothing to address the issues facing pregnant people in Kansas, and the implementation of HB 2062 raises serious bureaucratic and financial questions. There is a lack of clarity in this bill, including what constitutes a “pregnancy-related expense” and when a pregnant person could seek child support. Determining the exact “date of conception” would be nearly impossible, and this bill raises significant concerns about the potential for surveillance of pregnant people. Determining the exact date of conception could subject pregnant people to oversight of their menstrual cycles and the frequency with which they are having sexual intercourse.

A positive pregnancy test does not in itself indicate the birth of a child. This bill sets forth no meaningful structure for child support payments for a pregnancy that ends in miscarriage, stillbirth, or abortion. Nor does HB 2062 set forth protocols for child support payments for a pregnancy that ends with the birth of a child who is then adopted. HB 2062 states that “direct medical and pregnancy-related expenses” shall not include costs related to “elective abortion,” which is defined as “abortion for any reason other than to prevent the death of the mother.” If a pregnant person is forced to decide whether to terminate a pregnancy because of risk to their health, it is unclear who shall determine whether the abortion is

---

<sup>1</sup> <https://www.kff.org/womens-health-policy/issue-brief/dobbs-era-abortion-bans-and-restrictions-early-insights-about-implications-for-pregnancy-loss/#:~:text=While%20all%20state%20bans%20have,risking%20criminalization%20for%20pregnancy%20loss.>



considered “elective.” Furthermore, such exemptions leave medical providers in a legal gray area that can be dangerous for pregnant people.<sup>2</sup>

Additionally, determining paternity is another challenge to implementation of this bill. These challenges, among others, would be costly for the state of Kansas. For example, the state would have to identify a means of contracting for in-utero genetic testing and the administering of in-utero genetic testing. The fiscal note for HB 2062 outlines these financial and bureaucratic challenges.<sup>3</sup> State General Fund appropriation would be needed to allow for parentage establishment prior to birth because current federal regulations do not provide or allow for such.<sup>4</sup> The Department for Children and Families (DCF) would likely have to contract for in-utero genetic testing, which averages \$1,750 per instance.<sup>5</sup> The implementation of HB 2062 would put undue strain on the state’s budget and resources, and it is not an effective means of supporting pregnant Kansans.

Kansas is experiencing a maternal health crisis, and Kansans need policy solutions that provide real support to pregnant people and families, such as the following: <sup>6 7 8</sup>

- Expanding access to the full range of comprehensive sexual and reproductive health care for pregnant people
- Expanding eligibility for safety net programs like SNAP, WIC, and TANF
- Increasing the benefit levels of safety net programs
- Improving the application process for safety net programs
- Advancing policies that address the social determinants of health, like housing and food insecurity
- Funding for community-based organizations that work to improve Black maternal health and address racial disparities in pregnancy and birth outcomes
- Funding for VA health systems to support pregnant and parenting veterans
- Improving research on maternal health, including data collection and quality measures, to inform our health care systems
- Investing in mental health and substance use disorder treatment for pregnant and parenting people

This is not an exhaustive list, and there is a need in Kansas for meaningful policy that supports pregnant people and families. This bill purports to address the financial burdens of pregnancy and parenthood, but all it would accomplish is further codifying fetal personhood language into Kansas law. Granting legal rights to a fetus or embryo—whether directly or through backdoor policies like enforcing child support before birth—would have immense and harmful consequences. Kansans have said loud and clear they do not want their rights to reproductive health care restricted and this bill could pave the way for laws that would punish a pregnant person for seeking essential care.

PPGPV strongly urges the Committee to oppose HB 2062.

---

<sup>2</sup> <https://www.kff.org/womens-health-policy/issue-brief/a-review-of-exceptions-in-state-abortion-bans-implications-for-the-provision-of-abortion-services/>

<sup>3</sup> [https://www.kslegislature.gov/li/b2025\\_26/measures/documents/fisc\\_note\\_hb2062\\_00\\_0000.pdf](https://www.kslegislature.gov/li/b2025_26/measures/documents/fisc_note_hb2062_00_0000.pdf)

<sup>4</sup> *Id*

<sup>5</sup> *Id*

<sup>6</sup> <https://www.commonwealthfund.org/publications/fund-reports/2021/nov/policies-reducing-maternal-morbidity-mortality-enhancing-equity>

<sup>7</sup> <https://ucsjoco.org/wp-content/uploads/2022/12/Safety-Net-Fact-Sheet-Updated-FINAL-Final.pdf>

<sup>8</sup> <https://www.cbpp.org/research/poverty-and-inequality/governments-pandemic-response-turned-a-would-be-poverty-surge-into>