

State Family Planning Funding Restrictions

BACKGROUND: Beginning in the 1990s, a small number of states imposed abortion-related restrictions on state family planning funds. Some ban the use of state family planning funds to provide abortion counseling and referrals to women who have unintended pregnancies. (However, in order to prevent the loss of federal funds, all but one specifically allow organizations receiving funding under the federal Title X family planning program to provide the nondirective pregnancy-options counseling and requested referrals required by the program.) Additionally, these restrictions often require strict separation between organizations providing state-funded family planning services and organizations providing abortion-related services. This separation may entail making the organizations entirely separate legal entities, as well as place restrictions on sharing employees, medical supplies and physical facilities.

HIGHLIGHTS:

- 4 states prohibit the use of state family planning funds for abortion counseling and referral.
- 4 states require separation between organizations that provide family planning and organizations that provide abortion-related services.
 - 3 states require physical and financial separation between family planning providers and abortion providers.
 - 1 state gives priority in the allocation of state family planning funds to agencies that do not provide abortion services.



Advancing sexual and reproductive health worldwide through research, policy analysis and public education.

125 Maiden Lane
New York, NY 10038
212.248.1111
www.guttmacher.org
info@guttmacher.org

1301 Connecticut Avenue, N.W.
Washington, DC 20036
202.296.4012
www.guttmacher.org
policyworks@guttmacher.org

© 2010, Guttmacher Institute

CONTINUED

ABORTION-RELATED RESTRICTIONS ON STATE FAMILY PLANNING FUNDS

STATE	PROHIBITIONS ON USE OF STATE FUNDS FOR ABORTION COUNSELING OR REFERRAL*	PROVISIONS REGARDING PHYSICAL AND FINANCIAL SEPARATION FROM ABORTION SERVICES†	
		Separation Required as a Condition of Funding	Separate Entities Given Priority in Funding
Colorado	X	X	
Michigan	X		X
Ohio	X	X	
Texas		X	
Wisconsin	X†		
TOTAL	4	3	1

* All states except Colorado affirmatively permit projects to provide nondirective counseling when required by Title X.

† Hospitals and private physicians participating in Medicaid are exempt.

FOR MORE INFORMATION:

For information on state legislative and policy activity click on Guttmacher's [Monthly State Update](#) and for state level information and data on reproductive health issues, click on Guttmacher's [State Center](#).

Guttmacher Institute, [A Real-Time Look at the Impact of the Recession on Publicly Funded Family Planning Centers](#), New York: Guttmacher Institute, 2009.

Guttmacher Institute, [A Real-Time Look at the Impact of the Recession on Women's Family Planning and Pregnancy Decisions](#), New York: Guttmacher Institute, 2009.

Frost JJ, Finer LB and Tapales A, "[The impact of publicly funded family planning clinic services on unintended pregnancy and government cost savings](#)," *Journal of Health Care for the Poor and Underserved*, 2008, 19:778–796.

Sonfield A and Gold RB, [Conservatives' agenda threatens public funding for family planning](#), *The Guttmacher Report on Public Policy*, 2005, 8(1):4–7.

Sonfield A and Nash E, [Michigan breaks new ground in restricting family planning funds](#), *The Guttmacher Report on Public Policy*, 2002, 5(3):13–14.

Gold RB, [Efforts renew to deny family planning funds to agencies that offer abortions](#), *The Guttmacher Report on Public Policy*, 2002, 5(1):4–6.

The State Policy in Brief series is made possible in part by support from The John Merck Fund.