

Jake Almeida

From: Tina Seaton
Sent: Wednesday, February 21, 2024 13:20
To: House Judiciary
Subject: Do not even hear HB107

This bill should not even be heard by the Judiciary or any other committee. It is unconstitutional, trying to change the definition of 'person' and 'life'. It sure looks like you are trying to do what Alabama did and declare embryos as people. DO NOT insert yourself into the very personal decisions of families and their doctors. This brings up all sorts of unknown consequences! My son & daughter in law have been having trouble getting pregnant and have used IVF services, experienced miscarriages, etc. I understand an IVF service is considering closing down because of that law, closing the door to many families that have no other option.

Leave our constitution alone!

And tell your staff not to lie to callers about the true thrust of this bill.

Tina Seaton

Jake Almeida

From: michael Bavers
Sent: Friday, February 23, 2024 10:40
To: House Judiciary
Subject: 2024 HB107

I am totally opposed to this bill.

Keep your religious beliefs to yourselves. Women should have the right to their own bodies.

michael bavarsky

Jake Almeida

From: Emily Kane >
Sent: Friday, February 23, 2024 15:56
To: Rep. Kevin McCabe; House Judiciary; Rep. Sarah Vance; Rep. Jamie Allard; Rep. Ben Carpenter; Rep. Craig Johnson; Rep. Jesse Sumner; Rep. Cliff Groh; Rep. Andrew Gray
Subject: HB 107

Dear Alaska Representatives of the People (who have spoken to preserve our great Constitution)

I am strongly opposed to HB 107.

Excuse me, but what is the government doing in my pants? Reproductive health is a private medical arena and elected officials are bound to PRESERVE my right to privacy, not be thinking about my private parts.

Please! Do your job and reject this obnoxious bill today.

Sincerely
Dr. Emily Kane
Juneau AK

Jake Almeida

From: Angie Flickinge
Sent: Friday, February 23, 2024 16:20
To: House Judiciary
Subject: I strongly oppose HB 107

I am an Alaska resident and I strongly oppose the proposed House Bill 107.

This bill is not only unconstitutional under Alaska's constitution, it also flies in the face of the will of Alaska voters, who consistently voice their support for abortion rights. Abortion IS healthcare for women, often it is life saving healthcare for women.

Limiting access to abortion services in the state of Alaska is incredibly dangerous and could be deadly to women in our state. It is not our state government's place to dictate women's healthcare, and access to abortion is enshrined in our state constitution for good reason.

Personhood provisions open the door to the likelihood of prosecutions and investigations against pregnant people who experience bad pregnancy outcomes, like certain complications, miscarriage, or stillbirth. Worse still, it could subject those who experience these tremendous losses to **criminal convictions and prison sentences**.

A person experiencing a miscarriage or ectopic pregnancy may need emergency treatment to prevent serious damage to her health or to save their life. This legislation could effectively tie doctors' hands rather than allowing them to treat their patient without fear of prosecution.

The concepts and ideals introduced in this bill are not only completely unreflective of the views and opinions of Alaska's voter population, they are dangerously unfounded in modern science and medicine. I firmly believe that women's bodies and healthcare should remain between a woman and her doctor, and that no government body should have any authority to interfere or make laws about a woman's body.

Alaskan women deserve the basic human right to full bodily autonomy, as is protected under the Alaska constitution.

Angie Flickinger
Wrangell, Alaska

Jake Almeida

From: Karen Nogle · >
Sent: Friday, February 23, 2024 10:25
To: House Judiciary
Subject: HB 107

Alaska House Judiciary,

As a retired RN I'm very aware of how this bill would impact health care in Alaska. I've seen pregnant woman become critical care patients in a heart beat, literally. They have a right to quality care. When healthcare providers are afraid to provide the care patients require and deserve, due to laws, written by non healthcare providers, lives of all involved are at risk. It's difficult enough to recruit healthcare providers to small towns, such as the one I live in. Don't drive healthcare providers out of Alaska, as is happening in other states. Allow physicians and nurses to make decisions in the best interest of the whole patient. Don't pass HB 107 Respectfully, Karen Nogle Sent from my iPad

Jake Almeida

From: Karen Rode >
Sent: Friday, February 23, 2024 18:17
To: House Judiciary
Subject: HB 107

I am appalled that there is even the thought of considering a bill that defines life as beginning at conception. Have you learned nothing from the debacle happening in Alabama?

The definition of when life begins varies considerably within different faiths. Many faith traditions declare it begins with the first breath. Mandating the definition based on the beliefs of one particular faith, is mandating a belief in a religion that not all share, and is blatantly unconstitutional. People who choose to believe that life begins at conception are free to believe that. They are NOT free to mandate their belief onto others.

A frozen embryo is not a baby. Babies cannot be frozen and survive, but clumps of cells can be viable after defrosting and implantation. Those who believe otherwise are severely uninformed on the facts and the science.

Passing this into law, would make the practice of IVF illegal, which is the only way many people have to grow their families. This is the opposite of pro life.

Sincerely, Karen Rode

Jake Almeida

From: Jesse Gill
Sent: Friday, February 23, 2024 18:17
To: Reprentative.Kevin.McCabe@akleg.gov; House Judiciary; Rep. Sarah Vance; Rep. Jamie Allard; Rep. Ben Carpenter; Rep. Craig Johnson; Rep. Jesse Sumner; Rep. Cliff Groh; Rep. Andrew Gray
Subject: HB 107, Scientific Ignorance, and the Murder of the Alaskan Constitution

Hello various representatives,

My name is Jesse Gill, 31, and I was born and raised in Fairbanks for most of my life. I now reside in Airport Heights, Anchorage. My community and I would like to say, once again, that the right to an Abortion is Women's Rights, and Women's Rights are Peoples' Rights. To pass this bill would mean to strip the Alaskan people of their hard-earned rights, beginning the plunge into a future where the Equal Rights Amendment never took place; a future where the 40+ years that Susan B. Anthony, Lucy Stone, and Sojourner Truth fought and organized throughout the country for equal rights never happened.

Abortion, as you probably know, is guaranteed in Alaska's Constitution, which makes HB 107 unconstitutional. Breaking the Alaskan Constitution successfully may mean that future bills which also violate the State Constitution may be passed. If you're able to destroy the concept of Bodily Autonomy by taking it away from Women, then you open up a whole floodgate of other discriminatory bills which will ultimately destroy this great state. If we can't protect our people, then what kind of world do you think the unaborted fetus will live in? Likely one of struggle and strife.

A study by the Pew Research Center asked 310 Alaskans whether Abortion should be legal, to which the result was that 63% of those Alaskans believed that Abortion should be Legal, which means that according to this (admittedly small) sample of the Alaskan people, you would be undermining Democracy itself. (<https://www.pewresearch.org/religion/religious-landscape-study/state/alaska/views-about-abortion/>)

A fetus is not a person anymore than a microbe, or a plant, or an animal is. To say that life begins at conception is to say that the combination of an egg and a sperm is a person, which we all know intuitively is untrue. Likewise, when an embryo begins to develop a brain, nervous system, and heartbeat after six weeks, I would argue that this is still not a person, and as it is attached to its parent who supplies everything the embryo needs to continue developing inside them, it is fair to argue that the Embryo is instead a part of the Parent's body, which the Parent should have full autonomy over. Just as a living thing like a Germ or Parasite inside the body is not its own person, an embryo or fetus is not its own person. To refute this would be to refute the concept of Bodily Autonomy itself.

Finally, I'd just like to point out that not every parent is running head-over-heals to get pregnant and abort. An unexpected pregnancy can be a stressful and nerve-wracking event, and I'm quite certain that anyone who's had an abortion did so out of pure necessity. The abortion experience is probably not very pleasant, but we currently have very skilled and talented medical workers who can ease that stress and perform an abortion in a sterile, safe place. To remove Abortion Rights would mean to take away these safe spaces, and the accomplishment of such sensitive and technical procedures would ultimately fall into the hands of the unsafe & unqualified - or worse yet, seedy people who would exploit and leverage

Parents who have no other options. Remember: making something illegal does not make it stop, it just makes it quiet and dangerous.

If you've managed to read this far, I thank you a million times over. Please do not violate the state constitutional right to Abort by passing HB 107 on February 26th, lest you endanger the very people you hope to protect.

Thanks,

Jesse Gill

Jake Almeida

From: Elizabeth Figus
Sent: Friday, February 23, 2024 19:37
To: Rep. Andrew Gray; Rep. Cliff Groh; Rep. Jesse Sumner; Rep. Craig Johnson; Rep. Ben Carpenter; Rep. Jamie Allard; Rep. Sarah Vance; Rep. Kevin McCabe; House Judiciary
Subject: Oppose HB 107

Dear Legislators,

I am writing to express my strong opposition to HB 107. This bill goes against the Alaska Constitution, which protects every woman's right to privacy and choice in reproductive medical care.

HB 107 goes against sound medical science and freedom.

Please reject this bill.

With great concern,

Elizabeth Figus, PhD
Juneau, AK
99801

Jake Almeida

From: Melissa Wechter
Sent: Friday, February 23, 2024 20:30
To: Rep. Andrew Gray; Rep. Cliff Groh; Rep. Jesse Sumner; Rep. Craig Johnson; Rep. Ben Carpenter; Rep. Jamie Allard; Rep. Sarah Vance; Rep. Kevin McCabe; House Judiciary
Subject: Oppose HB107

Dear Legislators,

I am writing to express my strong opposition to HB 107. This bill goes against the Alaska Constitution, which protects every woman's right to privacy and choice in reproductive medical care.

HB 107 goes against sound medical science and freedom.

Please reject this bill.

With great concern,
Melissa Wechter,
Juneau, AK
99801

Jake Almeida

From: Melody Hawkins
Sent: Friday, February 23, 2024 21:29
To: House Judiciary
Subject: I OPPOSE HB 107

Hello,

I am a mother, woman, and a human being in the Anchorage community and I OPPOSE HB 107. I have lived in Anchorage for 34 years now - my whole life. Anchorage, and Alaska as a whole, has always been a place where people look out for one another, but also (more importantly) a place where we respect one another's privacy.

HB 107 is an extremist bill that attempts to assert personhood and legal rights beginning at conception - an idea with no basis in current scientific fact, and one that could have staggering impacts on the right to abortion, IVF, and some forms of contraception. This bill is not only unconstitutional under the privacy rights currently covered in Alaska's state constitution, it also flies in the face of Alaska's voters. These voters consistently voice their support for abortion and rights, and a person's right to privacy in their own body and medical health.

I oppose HB 107, and I urge the members to do so as well.

Thank you,
Mel Hawkins

Jake Almeida

From: Colin Campbell
Sent: Saturday, February 24, 2024 05:08
To: House Judiciary
Subject: Opposition to HB 107

My name is Colin Campbell and I live in Fairbanks at 2697 Black Sheep lane. I'm opposed to HB 107. Embryos are not people, and do not merit personhood. Women should have the right to choose if they want to continue a pregnancy.

Colin Campbell

Jake Almeida

From: Clare Hill
Sent: Saturday, February 24, 2024 07:03
To: Rep. Andrew Gray; Rep. Ben Carpenter; Rep. Cliff Groh; Rep. Craig Johnson; Rep. Jamie Allard; Rep. Jesse Sumner; Rep. Sarah Vance; House Judiciary; Rep. Kevin McCabe
Subject: HB 107

I have lived in Alaska since 1990. One of the things that I have always valued about this state is the respect for individual rights and beliefs. HB 107 is an egregious attempt to impose particular religious beliefs on our population. Laws like these in other states are already having shocking and unintended consequences. Women whose lives are in danger are struggling to find health care because doctors are so fearful of legal consequences. Personal, private health care decisions are NOT the business of government! I am deeply OPPOSED to HB 107!

Jake Almeida

From: Sherry Lewis
Sent: Saturday, February 24, 2024 08:23
To: HB107 Sponsor; House Judiciary; Rep. Sarah Vance; Rep. Jamie Allard; Rep. Ben Carpenter; Rep. Craig Johnson; Rep. Jesse Sumner; Rep. Cliff Groh; Rep. Andrew Gray
Subject: HB 107

I am against HB 107. I believe in the right of all people to have control over what happens in their bodies. Alaska's constitution protects the right to abortion and the state has paid an estimated \$4.1 million in legal fees defending its unconstitutional anti-abortion legislation that the courts repeatedly overturn.

Please do not pass HB107.

•

Sherry Lewis,
Fairbanks, Alaska

Jake Almeida

From: Dezarae Arrowsun
Sent: Saturday, February 24, 2024 09:18
To: Rep. Kevin McCabe; House Judiciary; Rep. Sarah Vance; Rep. Ben Carpenter; Rep. Craig Johnson; Rep. Cliff Groh; Rep. Jesse Sumner; Rep. Andrew Gray
Subject: Vote NO HB 107

Dear Alaska Representative,

I am a resident of Juneau, AK. I am a business owner and a mother of 3.

I strongly disagree with HB 107. This bill is not only anti-abortion nonsense, but it is anti-science, unconstitutional, and against the will of Alaskan voters. We citizens deserve the right to make medical decisions for ourselves, without government interference.

I ask you to vote no on HB 107.

Thank you

Dezarae Arrowsun

Jake Almeida

From: Greg Hill
Sent: Saturday, February 24, 2024 09:49
To: Rep. Andrew Gray; Rep. Ben Carpenter; Rep. Cliff Groh; Rep. Craig Johnson; Rep. Jamie Allard; Rep. Jesse Sumner; Rep. Sarah Vance; House Judiciary; Rep. Kevin McCabe
Subject: Against HB 107

How dare the sponsors of this filthy piece of legal intrusion bully their way into the private lives of Alaskans, force them to worship their perverted view of religion, and intrude in the personal health of us all with HB 107! Knowing this sort of fascist proposal is under consideration in Alaska's Legislature, where personal liberty has always been respected and enshrined in our state constitution, is deeply troubling. Hopefully the bill's short-sighted sponsors will feel the same political backlash at the ballot box that has resulted from similar proposals ticking off many more people than those who glory in this sort of grandstand bullying.

Ronald Gregory Hill

Jake Almeida

From: Trisha
Sent: Saturday, February 24, 2024 10:20
To: House Judiciary
Subject: Bill 107

HB 107 is a bill that attempts to assert personhood and legal rights beginning at conception – which could have staggering impacts on the right to abortion, IVF, and some forms of contraception. This bill could allow **prosecution of abortion providers for murder** – an extreme proposal that is out of line with mainstream science and medicine and out-of-touch with the will of the majority of people in our state. This bill is not only unconstitutional under Alaska's constitution, it also flies in the face of the will of Alaska voters, who consistently voice their support for abortion rights. Please oppose this bill.

Sincerely,
Patricia Stark
Fairbanks

Jake Almeida

From: Kira Brewer
Sent: Saturday, February 24, 2024 12:23
To: House Judiciary
Subject: OPPOSE HB 107

To the Alaska House Judiciary Committee,

My name is Kira Brewer and I live in Fairbanks Alaska. I STRONGLY OPPOSE HB 107 and all of the negative implications this bill will have on women's reproductive health. By deciding that personhood and legal rights begin at conception, this bill will undoubtably lead to denying women the right to privacy in their decisions about their own body. This includes, but is not limited to, a women's right to chose when and if they want to start a family and difficult medical and health decisions that impact their own safety during this process. These are the very rights to privacy that our own Alaska state constitution protects. In 2022 voters across the state overwhelmingly decided AGAINST holding a convention, much in part to protect any changes to women's rights.

This bill is terrifying to me on so many levels. As a woman who is currently trying to start a family, this bill is a certain step towards stripping me of my rights to a safe pregnancy, medical care related to potential miscarriages, as well as the possibility of using IVF to conceive a child. As the wife of a hospital emergency room provider, this bill is incredibly concerning because it will put my husband at risk of criminal prosecution for providing life-saving, necessary measures in emergency situations involving women's health.

Bills such as HB 107 are NOT the way to protect lives. I am asking you to PLEASE listen to your constituents and protect women's rights to safe and effective reproductive healthcare in our great state. As the founders of our great country believed, we must continue to keep a separation of church and state so that the religious beliefs of any elected officials do not impact the laws that protect the bodily autonomy of others. We are counting on you, our elected officials, to protect our rights as Alaskans and as women.

Kira Brewer
Fairbanks, Ak

Jake Almeida

From: Mary Schallert
Sent: Saturday, February 24, 2024 15:29
To: House Judiciary
Subject: House Bill 107

So I am just wondering where McCabe got his MD in women's reproductive health care? Why is it always an attack on women and gynecologists and never on the murder of sperm that most men do almost every day? And the same people who want to control uteruses are the same people who don't care a twit about what happens to the woman who dies from carrying a dead fetus, who has a still birth, who can't afford the baby that was raped into them, that wants a life for themselves before they get forced to give birth by McCabe who could care less for the birthed child once it's come out of your body.

Can the people of Alaska sue McCabe for medical malpractice? He obviously knows nothing about women's reproductive health except what his minister told him. If you think abortion is wrong, the answer is simple. Don't have one. If you were taught to "believe" life begins at conception, then don't get an abortion. Last I checked the founders of this country were very specific for a myriad of reasons to keep religion out of politics. This is a classic example and an opportunity to do just that. Maybe you could do the thoughts n prayers thing for the abortions you wished raped victims didnt do. and actually create some laws on automatic rifles that take out living breathing wanted children trying to learn in schools.

Do something for all the starving homeless people in this state. Do something so all living breathing wanted kids get healthy food at school, make sure public education is well funded, if you care about kids. Kids are the most precious resource we have. Do something about guns so that kids don't have to spend time practicing how to hide from a shooter in their school. If you care about kids. If our kids are properly educated and public schools are well funded they will stay. If teachers are paid a living wage and given health care and decent retirement benefits, they will stay in Alaska. If public education takes the time to teach boys

and girls basic body functions we could probably decrease the number of abortions needed. If you care about kids, if you care about the future. Republican focus on making sure everyone has a gun and all uteruses are owned by the government is not freedom and it's proof they don't really care about kids. So what is McCabe really trying to accomplish with this grandstanding?

Mary Schallert
Voter in Alaska since 1977

Jake Almeida

From: Gabby Anderson
Sent: Saturday, February 24, 2024 15:46
To: House Judiciary
Subject: Oppose HB 107

Abortion is health care. Please oppose HB 107, a bill that would criminalize doctors who provide abortion and reclassify a fetus as a person. This bill is unconstitutional and goes against the will of Alaska voters.

Gabrielle Anderson
Sent from my iPhone

Jake Almeida

From: Sharon Stockard
Sent: Saturday, February 24, 2024 17:14
To: House Judiciary
Subject: HB 107

I strongly oppose this proposed bill that would define life as beginning at the life of conception. When did legislators become medical doctors? This rush to criminalize what women can do with our bodies, and to criminalize the exercise of our reproductive freedom, is disgusting.

HB 107 a backdoor attempt to criminalize abortion in a state with a strong medical privacy law and a constitutional right to reproductive autonomy. It would not hold up to a constitutional challenge because it violates the Alaska constitution's reproductive rights right to privacy. This bill would lead to the criminal prosecution of abortion providers, and even women.

This bill does not represent the views of the majority of Alaskans, who value our privacy and support reproductive freedom.

If you want what they have in Alabama, move to Alabama. Leave Alaskans to live in a state that respects a woman's right to control her own body.

Sharon Stockard

Jake Almeida

From: Chelsea Sandt
Sent: Saturday, February 24, 2024 20:28
To: House Judiciary
Subject: HB 107

I am an Alaska resident of the Fairbanks North Star Borough and I OPPOSE bill HB 107.

This bill is harmful to the people with uterus's of our community.

This is not okay.

I oppose as many other Alaskans I'm sure do.

-Chelsea Sandt

Jake Almeida

From: Che Sandt
Sent: Saturday, February 24, 2024 20.29
To: House Judiciary
Subject: Oppose HB 107

I am an Alaska resident of the Fairbanks North Star Borough and I OPPOSE bill HB 107.

This bill is harmful to the people with uterus's of our community.

This is not okay.

I oppose as many other Alaskans I'm sure do.

-Che Sandt

Jake Almeida

From: che sandt
Sent: Saturday, February 24, 2024 20:30
To: House Judiciary
Subject: Oppose HB 107

As a trans person of Alaska this bill greatly affects me and my future wife and kids. This puts their lives at jeopardy, god forbid anything bad happen during pregnancy.

You would choose the life of a 10 week fetus over the person carrying your child? That you've possibly spent 10+ years of your life with? A fetus that could quite possibly not even make it to term. But a person carrying the child that could survive? I think not.

You would jail a mother that just lost her baby through a miscarriage?

You would jail a mother that had to abort their unborn baby that would kill them both?

What is wrong with you people running this state? We are not Texas. We are not Florida. We are ALASKA. we care about others rights and respect their wishes to chose what they want.

This is not your choice.

I strongly suggest OPPOSING HB 107!!!!!!!

I am a member of Fairbanks North Star Borough for the past 9 years. Don't make me regret my decision to live here.

Jake Almeida

From: Melissa Fellman >
Sent: Saturday, February 24, 2024 21:24
To: House Judiciary
Subject: Hb 107 testimonial

Hello my name is Melissa Fellman. My community is Anchorage, Alaska and I am a birth worker working during the hearing Monday/unable to call in. I OPPOSE HB 107.

Melissa

Jake Almeida

From: Erin W
Sent: Saturday, February 24, 2024 22:32
To: House Judiciary
Subject: HB 107

I am writing today in opposition of HB 107. The purpose of this bill is to restrict pregnant peoples' access to choice regarding their own bodies. In Rep McCabe's Sponsor Statement of this bill, he refers to the formation of zygotes and states that a zygote is a single-celled organism. A single cell is not a person. A human person consists of tens of trillions of cells. I don't understand why anyone would consider "evidence" from publications that are over 100 years old, as we know science and medicine have made extreme advances since then. How can the life of a "pre-born" child be independent of the mother if the life and development of said child is dependent on the mother?

I oppose this bill. A person should have the right to choose what happens to their body. A person is made up of trillions of cells. The definition of personhood in this bill is not based in science or medicine. This bill is a way to control people by restricting bodily autonomy.

Erin Weekly
Sitka, AK

Jake Almeida

From: htenn117
Sent: Sunday, February 25, 2024 00:10
To: House Judiciary
Subject: I OPPOSE HB 107

I would like to testify on HB 107 in the House Judiciary committee.

My name is Hanna Tennesen, my community is Anchorage Alaska, and I oppose HB 107!
Thank you.

Jake Almeida

From: Sue Signor >
Sent: Sunday, February 25, 2024 11:01
To: House Judiciary
Subject: HB 107

My name is Susan Signor and I am a 45 year resident of Alaska; I currently live in Fairbanks. I am **opposed to HB107**. I have several reasons:

This bill is not only unconstitutional under Alaska's constitution, but it also flies in the face of the will of Alaska voters, who consistently voice their support for abortion rights.

A person experiencing a miscarriage or ectopic pregnancy may need emergency treatment to prevent serious damage to her health or to save their life. This legislation could effectively tie doctors' hands rather than allowing them to treat their patient without fear of prosecution. The people of Alaska believe in the right to make the medical decisions that are best for them, without government interference.

Thank you,
Susan Signor, Fairbanks, Alaska

Jake Almeida

From: Sue Signor >
Sent: Sunday, February 25, 2024 11:01
To: House Judiciary
Subject: HB 107

My name is Susan Signor and I am a 45 year resident of Alaska; I currently live in Fairbanks. **I am opposed to HB107.** I have several reasons:

This bill is not only unconstitutional under Alaska's constitution, but it also flies in the face of the will of Alaska voters, who consistently voice their support for abortion rights.

A person experiencing a miscarriage or ectopic pregnancy may need emergency treatment to prevent serious damage to her health or to save their life. This legislation could effectively tie doctors' hands rather than allowing them to treat their patient without fear of prosecution. The people of Alaska believe in the right to make the medical decisions that are best for them, without government interference.

Thank you,
Susan Signor, Fairbanks, Alaska

Jake Almeida

From: htnn117 <
Sent: Sunday, February 25, 2024 12:25
To: House Judiciary
Subject: I oppose HB 107!

I would like to testify on HB 107 in the House Judiciary committee.

My name is Hanna Tennesen. My community is Anchorage Alaska. I oppose HB 107! My body my choice!

The facts:

Personhood provisions open the door to the likelihood of prosecutions and investigations against pregnant people who experience bad pregnancy outcomes, like certain complications, miscarriage, or stillbirth. Worse still, it could subject those who experience these tremendous losses to **criminal convictions and prison sentences**.

- HB 107 adds “an entity that has the moral right to self-determination” to the definition of “person” in the state’s Criminal Law statute, a bizarre and anti-science attempt to establish personhood. It adds an expansive statutory definition of “life” that is vague, ambiguous, and divorced from the practice of medicine, and could be interpreted as encompassing **all living things, including animals and plants**.
- A person experiencing a miscarriage or ectopic pregnancy may need emergency treatment to prevent serious damage to her health or to save their life. This legislation could effectively tie doctors’ hands rather than allowing them to treat their patient without fear of prosecution.
- Alaska’s constitution protects the right to abortion and the state has paid an estimated \$4.1 million in legal fees defending its unconstitutional anti-abortion legislation that the courts repeatedly overturn.

Jake Almeida

From: Lindsay Monty <
Sent: Sunday, February 25, 2024 13:04
To: House Judiciary
Subject: Oppose HB107

Personhood begins at conception? Is that when godly men start getting docked for child support and medical bills? If you believe a fertilized egg equates to personhood, and that's your belief based on religion or anecdote, you're welcome to apply it to your own life. We adamantly oppose HB 107. How does this bill improve the lives of Alaskans? In a state with the highest rate of sexual assault, the wish is to further oppress victims by denying healthcare because the minority decided it's more righteous to support a fertilized egg? There's no moral high ground in supporting embryos ever, but especially when the state impedes the delivery of food, healthcare and educational funding to children and families. There are so many things that could be done to support healthy babies, education, family planning- encourage healthy families, but that's not as sexy and politically advantageous as taking up the mantle of the fertilized egg. It allows people to clutch pearls and advocate for something, whilst simultaneously punishing women for following their moral guidelines. No thank you. Without education, nutrition and sovereignty is the great reward for growing families ignorance, poverty and faux religiosity? Grand. Not to mention this bill could prohibit several methods of birth control, eliminating various forms of self determination. I oppose, we oppose this bill and everything it represents. Can't wait to hear what you're coming up with to support the children and families of Alaska.

Lindsay Monty
Fairbanks, Alaska

[Sent from Yahoo Mail on Android](#)

Jake Almeida

From: lilyan overland
Sent: Sunday, February 25, 2024 16:37
To: House Judiciary
Subject: HB 107

To whom it may concern,

This bill will have ripples and repercussions beyond measure for women.

1. Women who want their babies, could be criminalized for losing them. Would a miscarriage be murder? Is a woman's period, shedding eggs, murder?
2. Girls and women will be forced to carry what will now be defined as "human beings", as the result of rape, or incest. Protecting that woman's right to life, and autonomy and providing her healthcare, would be considered 'murder'.
3. We have seen what is happening to women, many republican and Christian women in Texas and other states are knocking on death's door forced to carry an unviable fetus. Causing sepsis, damaging their right and desire to carry children in the future, ending in hysterectomies, etc. Doctor's are forced to plead to a judge, to save a woman's life. They have to prove a woman is dying, or they face jail time. Does an egg's potential mean more than an adult, alive, human being? Than a woman.

I would like to add that the texts this bill cite are incredibly outdated. One quote is from 1868. Why do we want to go back in time? Against the strides women have made for their freedoms and rights. This is despicable, and blatantly ignorant. This bill is laughable in terms of women's health during pregnancy. You will put all of Alaska's women's lives in danger with this bill. Especially marginalized women of color.

There is a hefty life of more ways we could protect a human being's right to life rather than change definitions for fetus'.

-Lily Overland

A woman who wants a family and may be too scared to do it in fear of becoming a potential criminal. Thank you.

Jake Almeida

From: karen jensen
Sent: Sunday, February 25, 2024 16:51
To: Reprentative.Kevin.McCabe@akleg.gov; House Judiciary; Rep. Sarah Vance; Rep. Jamie Allard; Rep. Ben Carpenter; Rep. Craig Johnson; Rep. Jesse Sumner; Rep. Cliff Groh; Rep. Andrew Gray; Rep. Frank Tomaszewski
Subject: No no and no to HB 107

Dear Members, Alaska House of Representatives:

I'd like to express my disappointment that elected officials are wasting time and effort on bills that are in blatant violation of our State's Constitution, e.g., HB107. We are one of the few states that actually has a strong Constitution for the people, that protects our privacy against the far-right attempts at tyranny over women. For that I'm grateful to those wise Alaskans who put this into place so long ago. If we didn't have this strong protection for the individual against an overbearing government, I would be even more vehement in my objection to this bill. As it is, it just generates excess government waste at a time we cannot afford to be tossing public dollars down the toilet.

I have recently learned how incredibly easy it is to obtain both mifepristone and misoprostol without a prescription, and I've made sure every young person I know is aware of how to do this, so that they can help each other in times of need. There is no turning back the clock to a time when men had full control over women's lives, even if the far right wants the U.S. to look like Afghanistan - just a different religion. You cannot impose narrow-minded religious views on all of us; we won't stand for it.

Please shred this bill before it takes up any more of your valuable time.

Thank you,
Karen Jensen
Fairbanks Alaska

Jake Almeida

From: Christine Ashenbrenner
Sent: Sunday, February 25, 2024 17:50
To: HB107 Sponsor; House Judiciary; Rep. Sarah Vance; Rep. Jamie Allard; Rep. Ben Carpenter; Rep. Craig Johnson; Rep. Jesse Sumner; Rep. Cliff Groh; Rep. Andrew Gray
Cc: Rep. Andi Story; Rep. Sara Hannan
Subject: HB 107

Dear Judiciary Committee Representatives,

As a lifelong Alaska resident I strongly oppose HB 107 and ask that it not be passed out of your committee.

I completely disagree that a fetus is a a person. If this fringe theory is accepted, it brings a plethora of constitutional and other legal issues and will be mired in litigation as stated by the Dept. of Law's fiscal note attached to this bill. What about child support? PFD eligibility? Will they be eligible for benefits at higher rates because the fetus is counted as a family member. I'm sure there are many, many more ramifications if this Pandora's Box is open.

The most important to me is that you must know that you cannot have both a fetus's right and a pregnant women's rights exist at the same time. This legislation seems it would take away the rights of a pregnant women to control her own body. That is wrong to me and the majority of Alaskans who believe abortion in Alaska should be legal. (<https://www.pewresearch.org/religion/religious-landscape-study/state/alaska/views-about-abortion/>)

Ina Christine Ashenbrenner
Juneau

Jake Almeida

From: Kathryn Russ
Sent: Sunday, February 25, 2024 20:44
To: Judiciary
Subject: HB 107

To whom it may concern,

I trust that despite our differing opinions, our common goal is to better humanity.

Someone is proposing to ban abortion in this state.

If a woman were to be responsible and use birth control they would still have an 8% chance of getting pregnant. There is an 8% chance you could have a mouth to feed for the next 18 years of your life.

You could wait until you're married and only sleep with a man you trust, and still be let down. Then you find yourself a single mother. (I don't think this is the demographic of people who would want an abortion. I just think this is a common scenario that shows you could play by all the rules and still find yourself struggling.)

This state still statistically holds the biggest number of reported rapes. Rape victims do not have the opportunity to plan for a child's future. What are the chances that child will be resentful? What kind of individual could they grow up to be?

"We need more people in Alaska"- Governor Dunleavy

Do we want able bodied individuals that are prepared to serve this community? Do we want cashiers, and doctors, and bus drivers? People who make money and spend it in this economy? Or, do we want to raise more children on the system? Do we want to raise that oppressed, starved, abused child whose parents made it clear they were never wanted? Do we want the kind of child that takes out several more children in a school shooting. The adult who decides to take their own life later down the road?

A child is a human life, and they do matter. That is why they should be reserved for people who actually want them. Who have the patience and the means to provide them with guidance and necessities.

If someone has "been loose" or careless, is it really to the benefit of anyone to make them bring a child into this world? Does it benefit the child? The taxpayers? The other children who are exposed to them? Do we create more accountable individuals by punishing people and forcing them to do things? Or would it make sense to look to the future, and raise well rounded individuals, who were wanted, and loved?

Would keeping abortions legal stop all children from growing up with issues? Certainly not. Could it be significant enough to change the course for Alaska? Most certainly.

If you should decide to make abortion legal, please package it with a plan to make food, shelter and therapy free and accessible to all the lives you decided to "save".

Please take my words, and the future of our community into consideration when you discuss House Bill 107 tomorrow.

Sincerely,
Kathryn Russ

Jake Almeida

From: Marcy Melville
Sent: Sunday, February 25, 2024 21:08
To: House Judiciary
Subject: Constituents Oppose HB 107

Hello,

I am an Alaska resident and am writing to let you know I stand in firm opposition to the proposed bill HB 107 which defines life beginning at conception.

Marilyn Melville
Cooper Landing, Alaska

Jake Almeida

From: Matt Hawn
Sent: Sunday, February 25, 2024 22:01
To: House Judiciary
Subject: HB 107

I will speak in the simplest terms necessary. HB 107 directly violates the constitution of our fine state. This state has and should always be a symbol of freedom and small government. Do not legislate easily the single piece of big government legislation I have seen in my 35 years living in this state.

Sent from my iPhone

Jake Almeida

From: John & Jo Ann Gruber
Sent: Sunday, February 25, 2024 22:39
To: House Judiciary
Subject: HB 107 (Criminal Law Definitions Person/Life)

Dear House Judiciary Members,

I do **not** support this bill.

HB 107 is a cowardly attempt to circumvent the Alaska Constitution and outlaw abortion in our state.

Alaska voters have consistently voiced support for abortion rights, and this bill would have significant and harmful impacts on a woman's right to abortion, in-vitro fertilization, and perhaps even some contraception.

This bill's supporters are not "pro-life"; they are only anti-abortion and anti-choice. They apparently want to deny rights that currently exist to all Alaskans. They are welcome to impose their personal views on themselves, but they shouldn't be allowed to force them on others. If they truly want to be considered "pro-life", perhaps they should walk their talk and place their efforts towards making sure that all Alaskans are adequately fed, housed, educated, and provided with basic medical care.

Please do not allow those with extreme views to take away the rights of others.

Respectfully,

Jo Ann Gruber
Eagle River, AK

Jake Almeida

From: Peter Casey ·
Sent: Sunday, February 25, 2024 22:48
To: House Judiciary
Subject: Opposition to HB 107

Dear members of the house judiciary,

I am writing to express my deep oppression to house bill 107. As it is currently written, it would restrict access to IVF, the morning after pill, and abortion in the state. The Alaska Constitution has a right to privacy, meaning these restrictions are completely unacceptable. So trying to take away women's rights to access abortion or to have children through IVF.

-Peter

Jake Almeida

From: marie h
Sent: Monday, February 26, 2024 00:55
To: House Judiciary
Subject: hb 107

hi,

my name is Marie and i live in Homer. i 100% OPPOSE HB 107!!

please do not allow this to go through!
for the sake of humanity.

thank you,
-marie

Jake Almeida

From: Danika Ulrich ·
Sent: Monday, February 26, 2024 02:12
To: House Judiciary
Subject: House bill 107

To our elected board of officials;

I am writing to inform you of our strong opposition to House Bill 107, currently under consideration by the Alaska House Judiciary. This bill, which defines life as beginning at conception, has the potential to severely impact medical access to contraception and restrict the rights of healthcare providers to provide essential care to their patients.

As a constituent, I urge you to consider the repercussions of House Bill 107 and the detrimental effects it could have on reproductive rights and healthcare access in our state. It is essential to prioritize the protection of these critical rights and ensure that individuals have access to the healthcare services they need.

I respectfully request that you oppose House Bill 107 and advocate for policies that safeguard reproductive rights and uphold the ability of healthcare providers to offer comprehensive care to their patients.

Thank you for your attention to this matter. Your leadership and commitment to protecting the rights of Alaskan residents are deeply appreciated. I trust that you will consider the voices and concerns of your constituents in this important decision.

Sincerely,

Danika Sanders

Jake Almeida

From: B.R. Swenson
Sent: Monday, February 26, 2024 03:36
To: House Judiciary
Subject: Public Testimony HB 107 February 26, 2024 House Judiciary Hearing

Chair Vance, Vice Chair Allard, and Members Carpenter, Johnson, Sumner, Gray, and Groh of the House Judiciary Committee,

HB 107 puts forth a definition for (human) life that appears biological and exact, but with the simplest of scrutiny shows lack of scientific spirit. By simply googling “organism” and reading the New World Encyclopedia entry on it, I find essentially the same definition as in this bill but with more context and nuance: “Life” is a “difficult term to define” and “Although universal consensus on a definition is lacking, biological properties common to the known organisms found on Earth (plants, animals, fungi, protists, archaea, and bacteria) are that they are carbon-and-water-based, are cellular with complex organization, use energy and undergo metabolism, possess a capacity to grow, maintain homeostasis, respond to stimuli, reproduce, and have various adaptations to the environment.” “Not every definition of life considers all of these properties to be essential. For example, the capacity for descent with modification is often taken as the essential property of life. This definition notably includes viruses, which do not qualify under narrower definitions as they are acellular and do not metabolize. Broader definitions of life may also include theoretical non-carbon-based life” (<https://www.newworldencyclopedia.org/entry/Organism>). Science is an ongoing exploration and discussion, often about complex areas of study. Maybe we should not be legally defining what life is, even for humans in our criminal code.

More that I read, about what an “organism” is, from that same source:

- ‘The word “organism” usually describes an independent collections of systems (for example circulatory, digestive or reproductive) themselves collections of organs; these are, in turn, collections of tissues, which are themselves made of cells.’
- ‘Organisms are classified as unicellular and multicellular. Multicellular organisms “such as whales or trees have trillions of cells” and life cycles in which they develop by metabolizing and growing into those many cells. “Many multicelled organisms comprise of several organ systems, which coordinate to allow for life.”

I repeat: to allow for life.

A human is a multicellular organism obviously. The human zygote, embryo or fetus (the medical and biological terminology) are the earliest stages of the human life cycle. A zygote, embryo or fetus (ZEF) cannot live outside the body of the pregnant person because the organ systems are not fully developed and it is still very dependent on the body of the pregnant person (inclusive term). A human fetus at 24 weeks gestation, as of now, with intensive care and increased risk of disability, may survive.

Obviously, from the sponsor statement, Rep. Kevin McCabe does not care about the unviability of ZEFs even though it seems contradictory to an understanding of what “life” or even living, surviving, or thriving is. To legally define human life is not to simultaneously define “person,” in my opinion.

My greatest concern is how Alaskan persons who can become pregnant will live, will survive, will thrive, if this bill is passed and made into law. Because no thought is given to the consequences of this bill on us nor is a framework proposed for how to manage the conflict of perceived/assumed interests by ZEFs.

What I find most alarming is not even the language of the bill but the sponsor statement. Rep. Kevin McCabe claims to be science-focused, but his bias is clear. He repeatedly used the word "mother." He never once referred to a pregnant person as that or a woman, girl, person, or individual, only as a "mother." He only quoted from sources in which pregnant persons were quoted as mothers. He seems to only perceive persons who can become pregnant as potential, inevitable, or default mothers, when this is not reality. We have autonomy, liberty, privacy, lives and identities of our own, families and our own health and reproduction to manage, the economy and communities to contribute to however we decide, educations to pursue to whatever extent we decide, AKA the pursuit of happiness, and we should always have full legal options available to manage our reproductive health. We are persons. Do not forget us. Do not ignore us. Do not dismiss us. We are here right now, thinking, feeling, speaking, living.

In the sponsor statement, Rep. McCabe argued that ZEFs are separate and distinct from pregnant persons. They are inside pregnant persons' bodies, attached to their bodies, the pregnancy affecting their bodies often in permanent ways. Pregnancy and delivery, even the postpartum period, can result in serious harm to pregnant persons, even death. In the US we have a very high maternal mortality for a high-income country (<https://www.commonwealthfund.org/blog/2022/us-maternal-mortality-crisis-continues-worsen-international-comparison>) and truly Black women are the most affected and White women least affected. With such a connection, the pregnant person and the hypothetical other party cannot be treated equally with regard to protection and right to life. It is impossible.

The sponsor statement makes clear that ZEFs would be favored and pregnant persons would be imposed upon if this bill is made into law. That we would be made less than as persons from the moment a zygote is a zygote (a single-celled fertilized egg not implanted). We would be imposed upon against contraception that blocks implantation. Abortion, medication or surgical, would be illegal. Likely more ways I am not thinking of late at night. That would greatly detriment our reproductive management, our health, our relationships, our lives.

Should there be a framework to judge which party is to be favored in these situations? I don't think so, because pregnancy is complicated and complex and we should not be trying to legislate it, including eliminating choices. Pregnant persons should continue to consult with their healthcare professionals.

Have any of you been paying attention to what has been happening in the Lower 48 since Roe and Casey were overturned? Kate Cox fleeing Texas for healthcare after her fetus was discovered at 20 weeks to have a medical condition that results in stillbirth or death shortly after birth (<https://www.cbsnews.com/texas/news/texas-woman-with-a-fatal-fetal-diagnosis-asks-judge-to-grant-her-abortion/>) as well as a high-risk pregnancy for her, a mother of two already because of a ban. A 10-year-old little girl fleeing Ohio to receive a healthcare in Indiana, raped by a 27-year-old man, because of a 6-week ban (<https://www.npr.org/2022/07/13/1111285143/abortion-10-year-old-raped-ohio>).

What would happen in Alaska with this proposed law when a pregnant person is discovered to have an ectopic pregnancy? The usual treatment is abortion, by the way. Must she be forced to wait until the fallopian tube ruptures, she is hemorrhaging to death and the "unborn child" died a natural death before she receives healthcare? If the location is abdominal will she be forced to wait and see if the pregnancy survives? See a recent account involving Tennessee's ban and Mayron Hollis (<https://www.propublica.org/article/tennessee-abortion-ban-doctors-ectopic-pregnancy>).

Will every miscarriage be reported and investigated as a suspected murder or punished as some other obscene crime? Will hospitals and clinics refuse to help miscarrying women for fear that they are breaking the law if they do? See the Brittany Watts account (<https://www.theguardian.com/world/2024/jan/11/ohio-woman-miscarriage-not-indicted-abuse-corpse-brittany-watts>).

Maybe some of you do know of these accounts and want punishment for Alaskan persons you believe deserve it.

As we live right now, we cannot force anyone living their lives to surrender their organs or tissues to someone else waiting on a transplant list or anyone needing a blood transfusion. We cannot force anyone to donate their bodies after they are dead – even then we must consent. In healthcare, we have the medical ethics of autonomy, privacy and confidentiality.

I ask: What is suffering to you? Not just pain such as from an injury or medical condition, but the total experience of suffering that includes that most physical pain, emotions and mood (also felt in the body), associated memories, the thoughts that are firing through a person's brain, the context of the situation, and anything else that may influence the experience, such as other people's reactions. That, as I understand, is suffering.

Is a 10-year-old raped, impregnated little girl capable of suffering?

Is a teenage, pregnant girl capable of suffering?

Is a college-age pregnant trans man capable of suffering?

Is a 35-year-old pregnant woman capable of suffering?

Is a zygote capable of suffering? (A fertilized egg that is a single cell.)

Is a blastocyst capable of suffering? (The fertilized egg becomes multicellular and implants usually in the uterus by week 4 of the person's pregnancy, though sometimes it implants elsewhere like a fallopian tube or somewhere in the abdomen.)

Is an embryo capable of suffering? (Weeks 4-11 of the person's pregnancy.)

Is a fetus capable of suffering? (12th week of pregnancy onward. Pregnancy is *not* dated from fertilization, but earlier. No offense, but I don't know what you know and you'd be shocked what legislators do not know but feel very confident to write laws about.)

What is more compassionate? What causes more suffering, against the pregnant person and the other hypothetical party directly involved?

Thank you for your patience and endurance, if you got this far.

B.R. Swenson

Kenai Peninsula Borough

Jake Almeida

From: Catey Burtness-Adams
Sent: Monday, February 26, 2024 07:05
To: House Judiciary
Subject: Oppose HB 107

Dear Judiciary Committee,

As a lifelong Alaskan I am shocked by HB 107. The limitations placed by this bill on individual Alaskans is in direct opposition to the liberty we have as Alaskans and Americans. The Alaska Constitution privacy clause protects our liberties and privacy in ALL matters including bodily autonomy and personal healthcare decisions.

Dressing up this right to life argument does not negate the impact and precedent that it would have on the privacy we all have in all matters. What is next?

Additionally, healthcare and a sufficient number of healthcare providers is a serious concern statewide. Criminalizing any type of medical procedures or services (particularly those so blatantly targeting a specific patient group) only decreases our statewide provider pool and the quality healthcare available.

Do no pass HB 107. It is in direct opposition to the protection of privacy we all love and expect as Alaskans.

Thank you for your consideration,
C. Burtness-Adams
Fairbanks

Jake Almeida

From: Cypher Necro-Sigh
Sent: Monday, February 26, 2024 07:13
To: House Judiciary
Subject: Opinion on NOT supporting house bill 107

Hello, as a concerned Alaska Resident, I am opposed to house bill 107. Firstly the right to abortion is protected in the Alaska State constitution, it shouldn't change. There are lots of reasons why someone would want/ need an abortion. From just their birth control failed, their not in a good spot in life, they were raped, maybe they have health issues that they know would be passed down to a future child. Other than the fact that it is THEIR body. So no one should take the right away to choose. You wouldn't force someone to not get the health care they need, just because of someone else's opinion. In the end someone else's views should not be forced on another. Let people choose for themselves.

Jake Almeida

From: Leslie Pierce
Sent: Monday, February 26, 2024 07:39
To: Rep. Kevin McCabe; Rep. Sarah Vance; Rep. Jamie Allard; Rep. Ben Carpenter; Rep. Craig Johnson; Rep. Jesse Sumner; Rep. Cliff Groh; Rep. Andrew Gray
Cc: House Judiciary
Subject: STRONGLY OPPOSE HB107

Dear Alaska Representatives,

Please put HB 107 in the trash can. This bill is ridiculous, dangerous, not good for the people of our state, and unconstitutional.

Our Alaska state constitution protects Alaskans “right to privacy” and that right was upheld in the case of reproductive rights in 1997. That is settled law. Reproductive rights are a privacy issue and also protected under the HIPAA laws (enacted in 1996).

The bill includes a definition of “living organism” that comes straight out of the biology book I used when I taught high school biology. Does that mean that this bill is meant to cover all living organisms, including plants, fungi, protozoans, and bacteria? (Clearly, the authors of this bill are examples of why we need more funding for education, another argument for later!)

We value our right to privacy in this state, and we mean ALL rights. We cannot “nit-pick” and choose which rights to deny without putting all of them at risk. This is a very shaky position to be in and one that I think most Alaskans are not in favor.

I am going on record as STRONGLY OPPOSING this bill and any similar bill that attempts to take away Alaskan's reproductive rights.

Please do not give this bill the light of day.

Sincerely,

Leslie Pierce

Leslie Pierce

Jake Almeida

From: Callie Conerton
Sent: Monday, February 26, 2024 07:50
To: House Judiciary
Subject: Oppose HB107

Dear members of the judiciary committee,

Life does not begin at contraception. You cannot collect child support for a cluster of cells. You cannot insure a cluster of cells.

Moving this bill forward could mean that doctors that value the lives of their patients that are in front of them could get charged with murder. Is a cluster of cells more important than a woman's life?

This could also limit those who are trying to have a child but need help of IVF. This also means that some women might not be able to use the birth control that works correctly with their body so that they do not bring children into world that are not wanted.

Abortion and the right to privacy is healthcare. No one is asking you or your partner to choose to have an abortion, but everyone deserves the choice.

You are not doctors. Please leave women's health alone unless it is allowing more access to Alaskans. This is not protecting children or families.

This bill would limit healthcare for women, families, and children. This does not build a stronger Alaska.

Callie Conerton
Juneau, Alaska

Jake Almeida

From: Megan Baker
Sent: Monday, February 26, 2024 12:07
To: House Judiciary
Subject: HB 107

Hello,

I am writing in to say that I oppose HB 107.

Thank you.

Megan Baker
Anchorage

Sent from my iPhone

Jake Almeida

From: Holly Novack
Sent: Monday, February 26, 2024 12:03
To: House Judiciary
Subject: I oppose HB107

I, Holly Novack MD, strongly oppose HB107. Alaskan women deserve access to Healthcare without interference from politicians. This includes abortions which are an essential part of comprehensive medical care. A patient's personal decision to end a pregnancy following appropriate consultation with their trusted medical professional should be treated with upmost respect. Additionally, "personhood" laws have far reaching consequences that most people with strong anti-abortion stances find problematic. One example being loss of desired pregnancies through IVF. Thank you for your time and attention.

Respectfully,
Holly Novack MD

. Abortion is an essential part of comprehensive medical care, and a patient's decision to end a pregnancy following appropriate consultation with their trusted medical professional should be treated with respect.



Alliance Advocates - Alaska

House Judiciary Committee
Alaska State Capitol
Juneau, AK 99081

Re: HB 107 – Abortion Criminalization/Personhood Bill

February 26, 2024

Dear Chair Vance and Members of the Judiciary Committee:

Planned Parenthood Alliance Advocates strongly opposes HB 107, an extremist personhood bill that attempts to classify a fetus as a person and criminalize doctors for providing abortion care. This bill blatantly violates the Alaska Constitution, which protects our right to obtain or reject medical treatment without government interference in our personal, private decisions.

This bill is clearly an attempt to further an anti-abortion agenda and undermine the rights and well-being of pregnant people by laying the groundwork for fetal “personhood” in our state’s criminal code, which would outright ban abortion and implicate other types of health care as well. We know that “personhood” bills like this create confusion and chaos in our legal system and often result in surveillance and criminalization of pregnant people at the earliest stages of pregnancy, including those that experience negative pregnancy outcomes like miscarriage and stillbirth. HB 107 could also have ramifications for families attempting to use assisted reproductive technologies, including IVF. We refuse to let the chaos happening right now in Alabama happen in Alaska.

Bizarrely, HB 107 adds “an entity that has the moral right to self-determination” to the definition of “person” in the state’s Criminal Law statute, an anti-science attempt to establish personhood. It adds an expansive statutory definition of “life” that is vague, ambiguous, and divorced from the practice of medicine, and could be interpreted as encompassing all living things, including animals and plants. We have no understanding of what the terms “moral right,” “life,” or “self determination” mean under this bill draft. The definitions in this bill are not only poorly drafted and not medically or scientifically informed, they are also extremely dangerous. This bill would have sweeping, harmful consequences for pregnant people, their families, and our communities. This bill even takes the state of Alaska a step beyond an outright abortion ban toward criminalizing any behavior that is deemed to threaten a pregnancy and placing the rights of a fetus or embryo above the rights of the pregnant person.

Alaska is already a nationwide leader in poor indicators of sexual and reproductive health, with some of the highest rates of unintended pregnancy, STIs, and sexual assault in the country. Alaska is also facing a provider shortage, with people living in rural and remote areas struggling to access lifesaving reproductive health care. Given this appalling public health data, the provider shortage, and an underfunded family planning program, Alaska lawmakers need to focus on improving health outcomes, not threatening to send providers to jail for murder and restricting access to care even further. This bill is just the latest in a troubling nationwide trend of implementing extreme abortion bans.

Criminalizing abortion through HB 107 would put pregnant people's health and lives at great risk. People denied a wanted abortion are more likely to suffer negative health outcomes – including increased maternal and infant mortality – and are more likely to stay tethered to abusive partners. Those denied access to abortion care are also more likely to fall into poverty and be less financially secure, which decreases their overall health. With Alaska's flagging economy and limited resources, our communities cannot afford policies that further harm their pocketbooks and their health. Furthermore, while abortion is one of the safest medical procedures in the United States, history and current events tells us that banning abortion care undoubtedly harms health and risks lives, especially for historically marginalized communities. You need only pick up a newspaper to hear about how abortion bans are causing a reduction in access to obstetric care and dramatic spikes in maternal mortality rates.

The impact of a ban on abortion and increased criminalization would be predominantly felt by those who already experience barriers to reproductive health care in Alaska. This includes people with low incomes, BIPOC people (Black, Indigenous, people of color), immigrants, LGBTQ people, people with disabilities, young people, those who live in rural areas, and those whose identities intersect. While increased access to birth control and family planning services has substantially reduced unintended pregnancies in Alaska, rates of unintended pregnancy remain elevated in communities of color due to factors such as structural racism and discrimination that create income inequality and barriers to accessing health care. These communities, including American Indian and Alaska Native people, have endured a history of state-controlled reproduction, coercion, and denial of bodily autonomy. Banning abortion in the state would continue this legacy by denying people of color the ability to meaningfully consider all options available to them, threatening their health and lives in the process.

Furthermore, people in Alaska do not want HB 107. Alaska voters are coming out stronger than ever in their support for increased access to reproductive health care, including abortion care – nearly 80 percent of Alaska voters say they would have doubts about a law that bans abortion care. Alaska people know that access to abortion is critical to their health, the health of their families, and the stability of their communities. This bill is blatantly unconstitutional under Alaska's State Supreme Court's rulings and if passed, will lead to costly litigation that will waste important state resources. Since 2001, the state has spent at least an estimated \$4.2 million losing lawsuits related to abortion. HB 107 would yet again be a waste of taxpayer resources on a divisive, unconstitutional bill with vast consequences.

The Alaska Constitution should and must continue to protect our right to obtain or reject medical treatment without government interference. PPAA urges the committee to reject HB 107, and instead be courageous by devoting your time and energy to proactive policies that actually improve public health, help pregnant people, and ensure access to sexual and reproductive health care across Alaska.

Sincerely,

Morgan Lim
Alaska Government Relations Manager
Planned Parenthood Alliance Advocates

Jake Almeida

From: Raymond VanBuskirk
Sent: Monday, February 26, 2024 12:15
To: House Judiciary
Subject: Oppose HB 107

Alaska is better than Texas or Alabama.

Oppose HB 107

Thank you,
Raymond L VanBuskirk (a concerned citizen)

Sent from my iPhone

Jake Almeida

From: Mary Hudson Kelley
Sent: Monday, February 26, 2024 12:23
To: House Judiciary
Subject: I oppose HB107

To whom it may concern,

I am an Anchorage resident and dumbfounded that the Alaska House is even considering this blatantly unconstitutional bill. I can only hope that sounds minds will vote against extending constitutional rights to "fetuses, embryos, and fertilized eggs starting at the point of conception." This nonsense will only serve to endanger the health of women. Further, these measures will make medical professionals jobs even more difficult and put them in more danger of unfounded litigation. In a state with a lack of accessible medical care, the problem of access would become even worse. Where will the madness in the debate about right to life end? Please stop this now.

Mary Hudson Kelley

Jake Almeida

From: Tara Bonardi
Sent: Monday, February 26, 2024 12:34
To: House Judiciary
Subject: HB 107

Emailing in regards to HB 107.

My name is Tara Bonardi and I oppose HB 107.

Tara Bonardi

Sent from my iPhone

Jake Almeida

From: Amanda Mary Sweeting
Sent: Monday, February 26, 2024 12:42
To: House Judiciary
Subject: HB 107 Testimony

Hello,

My name is Amanda Mary Sweeting - my community is Seward, Alaska and I OPPOSE HB 107.

Feel free to reach out to me if you have any question. Please protect my rights and my agency.

Sincerely,
Amanda Sweeting

Jake Almeida

From: Jennine Williamson
Sent: Monday, February 26, 2024 12:47
To: House Judiciary
Subject: I oppose HB107

Greetings. I strongly urge you to oppose HB107.

I oppose any bill that would chip away at any woman's right to reproductive freedom.

Thank you.

Jennine Williamson

Jake Almeida

From: Mary Corcoran
Sent: Monday, February 26, 2024 12:51
To: House Judiciary
Subject: PUBLIC TESTIMONY HB107

To Chair Vance and Members of the House Judiciary Committee,

Thank you for this opportunity to comment on HB 107 sponsored by Representatives McCabe and Tomaszewski. I DO NOT support this bill and ask you to consider the following points.

The definition of "person" as it appears in this bill immediately presents a multitude of questions, gray areas and controversies. It will easily conflict with the Alaska State Constitution, women's rights to healthcare, freedom of religion, individual right to privacy, pregnancy resulting from sexual abuse, and parents rights to choose if, when and how to have children.

Clearly, this definition will require enforcements to be considered by the Departments of Law and Public Safety, causing additional trauma to those whose healthcare mandates terminating a pregnancy either deliberately as is legal now or "blame" for a miscarriage, etc.

Medical providers are also threatened by this as seen in many other states where this type of legislation is proposed/passed. We cannot anticipate all the circumstances that may require a woman's right to choose.

Currently a fetus is protected from illegal violence. Beyond that protection and the rights guaranteed in the Alaska Constitution, this bill proposes to make life changing decisions that are not the business of the legislature. HB107 has the potential to be 100% invasive and a restriction that does not benefit us beyond the current law.

I urge you to not advance this bill.

Thank you again for this opportunity and your work.

Sincerely,
Mary Corcoran
Delta Junction AK

Jake Almeida

From: Bradford Buddenberg
Sent: Monday, February 26, 2024 12:51
To: House Judiciary
Subject: HB 107

I oppose HB 107. I am a healthcare giver in this state and find the wording change in HB 107 to take away woman's rights.

Brad Buddenberg MHS, CRNA

Sent from my iPhone

Jake Almeida

From: Chennery Fife
Sent: Monday, February 26, 2024 13:02
To: House Judiciary
Subject: Oppose HB 107 and Protect healthcare in AK

Hello,

I am an Alaska resident in Anchorage representing myself, a person with a uterus of childbearing age. I am strongly urge you all to oppose House Bill 107. This bill has implications for criminalizing abortion, and therefore severely limits my rights and healthcare options for myself and my family. It goes against the Alaska State Constitution's explicit right to privacy. According to a [study](#) from the Commonwealth Fund, restricted abortion access is correlated with 62% higher maternal death rates. [Taking steps](#) to restrict or ban abortion does not prevent them from happening; it makes it more dangerous.

Abortion access is healthcare. Again, I urge you to oppose House Bill 107.

Thank you.

-Chennery Fife

Anchorage, AK

Jake Almeida

From: Arctic Goddess
Sent: Monday, February 26, 2024 13:02
To: House Judiciary
Cc: Rep. Frank Tomaszewski
Subject: HB 107

I'm unable to testify in person or wait on phone today due to job duties. I am an autonomous, living woman with a full time job trying to bring in a \$100 million plus contract to Alaska today. Yet I'm distracted by HB 107, that would put a sack of cells above my own well being.

HB 107 is a waste of time. As a constituent of Rep. Tomaszewski, I am embarrassed that he would cosponsor legislation that would make me less than a fully functional informed person capable of making my own medical decisions and having a right to privacy per the Alaskan State Constitution. This has been settled time and time again in Alaska, yet Frank is continuing this legacy of throwing junk legislation at the wall to see what sticks to appease national GOP handlers.

Protect my right to privacy and do not support HB 107. Let's take care of Alaskan women and families without making half of that equation chattel.

Thank you

Rhonda Widener
Fairbanks

Jake Almeida

From: Katherine Tisch
Sent: Monday, February 26, 2024 13:02
To: House Judiciary
Subject: House Bill 107

My name is Katherine Tisch,

I am a life long Alaskan who would like to testify House Bill 107. This bill is wrong due to its an invasion of privacy.

Access to reproductive freedom is protected under the right to privacy in the Alaska state constitution

Thank you for your time
Katherine

Jake Almeida

From: Ashleigh Reger
Sent: Monday, February 26, 2024 13:08
To: House Judiciary
Subject: Opposition to HB107

My name is Ashleigh Allen. I live in my hometown of Fairbanks, and attend the University of Alaska Fairbanks.

HB 107 jeopardizes the personhood of anyone who needs access to reproductive care. Basic healthcare. HB 107 has dangerous implications for all Alaskans, not just women of reproductive age. Medical providers will be less inclined to practice medicine here, something Alaskans cannot afford.

Personhood begins at birth. Period. A woman's personhood matters, too.

Thank you.

Jake Almeida

From: Sarah Histand
Sent: Monday, February 26, 2024 13:08
To: House Judiciary
Subject: HB 107

Hello-

I am a constituent from Anchorage and am concerned about HB 107.

I am unable to attend the Judiciary committee meeting today but wanted to submit my testimony in OPPOSITION to HB 107.

As someone who has benefited from IVF here in Alaska, I find this bill extremely concerning. Many families in our state require support to conceive. I am one of these, and the experience of infertility is stressful enough without this added unnecessary layer of legal conflict.

HB 107 needs to be stopped immediately.

Thank you for your attention to this matter.

-Sarah

Sarah M Histand (she/they) | Mind & Mountain

I live, work, & play on the traditional lands of the Dena'ina people.

Jake Almeida

From: Heather T
Sent: Monday, February 26, 2024 13:09
To: House Judiciary
Subject: comment - OPPOSED to HB 107

Hello,

I am an East-Anchorage resident who opposes HB 107. This bill would have staggering effects on my rights to seek abortion and reproductive healthcare. This bill goes against my rights in the Alaska Constitution and I oppose all parts of this bill.

I urge the House to deny this bill in its entirety.

-Heather Thomas

Jake Almeida

From: Julianne Pacheco
Sent: Monday, February 26, 2024 13:10
To: House Judiciary
Subject: OPPOSITION to HB 107

Name: Julianne Pacheco

Community: Juneau, AK

I vehemently oppose HB 107, a bill that would assert personhood and legal rights at conception when those cells would not be determined viable and without genetic abnormalities for a minimum of another six weeks. Therefore those indeterminate cells should not hold the same rights as the absolutely viable female who is carrying them should have.

Jake Almeida

From: Jacquelyn Smale
Sent: Monday, February 26, 2024 13:12
To: House Judiciary
Subject: HB 107 Testimony

1>

Hello,

My name is Jackie Smale and I live in Anchorage, Alaska. I am writing to testify on HB 107 for the House Judiciary committee.

I am a young professional growing roots in Alaska. I want to settle down and start a family, ideally getting pregnant and having children. A bill like HB 107 would prevent me from doing so, since I have no idea as to what type of issues may arise during my pregnancy.

Jake Almeida

From: Kimberly Fitzgerald
Sent: Monday, February 26, 2024 13:12
To: House Judiciary
Subject: HB 107 Opposition

My name is Kimberly Fitzgerald and I live in Fairbanks, Alaska. First of all, thank you for all of your incredibly hard work to protect not only those of us in Fairbanks, but across the state!

I am writing to you to convey that I **STRONGLY OPPOSE HB 107** and all of the negative implications this bill will have on women's reproductive health. By deciding that personhood and legal rights begin at conception, this bill will undoubtedly lead to denying women the right to privacy in their decisions about their own body. This includes, but is not limited to, a woman's right to choose when and if they want to start a family and difficult medical and health decisions that impact their own safety during this process. These are the very rights to privacy that our own Alaska state constitution protects. In 2022 voters across the state overwhelmingly decided AGAINST holding a convention, much in part to protect any changes to women's rights.

This bill is terrifying to me on many levels. As a woman who is currently trying to start a family, this bill is a certain step towards stripping me of my rights to a safe pregnancy, medical care related to potential miscarriages, as well as the possibility of using IVF to conceive a child. As the partner of a hospital emergency room RN, this bill is incredibly concerning because it will put my partner at risk of criminal prosecution for providing life-saving, necessary measures in emergency situations involving women's health.

Bills such as HB 107 are NOT the way to protect lives. I am asking you to PLEASE listen to your constituents and protect women's rights to safe and effective reproductive health in our state. As the founders of our country believed, we must keep separation of church and state so that the religious beliefs of any elected officials do not impact the laws that protect the bodily autonomy of others. We are counting on our elected officials to protect our rights as women living in Alaska.

Kimberly Fitzgerald
Fairbanks, AK

Jake Almeida

From: Eva >
Sent: Monday, February 26, 2024 13:13
To: House Judiciary
Subject: Opposition to HB 107

To whom it may concern,

My name is Eva White, and I live in Anchorage. I am writing to express my opposition to HB 107, which has a hearing in about 20 minutes. I oppose this bill because of the negative impacts to public health, taking away autonomy for families to engage in family planning, and taking away individual autonomy of people to make decisions about their bodies. I am a new resident, and if this bill passes, I would likely not stay in the state long term.

Sincerely,
Eva White

Jake Almeida

From: Jacquelyn Smale
Sent: Monday, February 26, 2024 13:20
To: House Judiciary
Subject: Re: HB 107 Testimony

n>

I accidentally sent the email, sorry!

As I'm sure others are testifying, many issues can arise in a pregnancy, from miscarriage to an unviable pregnancy. I'm terrified of not being able to choose for myself if I want to carry a baby to term only to watch it fight for a few breaths and die an excruciating death. I am also terrified of a miscarriage, where I could be persecuted if suspected of inducing a miscarriage for murder. I am terrified that my life will be on the line, and my doctors will have to scramble for the government to approve a medically necessary abortion in order to survive.

How can we want to have families want to grow here if we cannot promise mothers that their lives will still be prioritized during their pregnancies? A bill like HB 107 would likely stop me from becoming pregnant in Alaska for fear of persecution, mental and physical harm, or even death. This testimony is only about an intentional pregnancy, but it is also crucial to note we live in a state with dreadfully high sexual assault rates, and the repercussions of this bill extend far further than my own fears.

Please consider Alaskan women when considering HB 107. Our lives depend on this bill not becoming law.

Cheers,
Jackie Smale

On Mon, Feb 26, 2024, 1:11 PM Jacquelyn Smale

wrote:

Hello,

My name is Jackie Smale and I live in Anchorage, Alaska. I am writing to testify on HB 107 for the House Judiciary committee.

I am a young professional growing roots in Alaska. I want to settle down and start a family, ideally getting pregnant and having children. A bill like HB 107 would prevent me from doing so, since I have no idea as to what type of issues may arise during my pregnancy.

Jake Almeida

From: Alaina Plauché
Sent: Monday, February 26, 2024 13:20
To: House Judiciary
Subject: Opposition to HB 107

Good afternoon,

My name is Alaina Plauché, and I am a resident of Anchorage. I am writing to express my very strong opposition to HB 107, which I understand is being considered in a hearing this afternoon.

This bill would infringe upon the constitutional rights of Alaskans to decide how to plan their families. Additionally, I oppose it because of the inevitable negative impacts to public health, removal of autonomy for families to engage in family planning, and imposing harmful infringements to women's rights to privacy regarding their own bodies in this state.

To reiterate, I am strongly opposed to HB 107.

Sincerely,

Alaina Plauché

Jake Almeida

From:
Sent: Monday, February 26, 2024 13:21
To: House Judiciary
Subject: OPPOSE HB 107

OPPOSE HB 107

Jaclyn Randall
from Palmer, Alaska

Jake Almeida

From: Sean McDowell
Sent: Monday, February 26, 2024 13:27
To: House Judiciary
Subject: HB 107 Testimony

To whom it may concern,

My name is Sean McDowell, and I live in Anchorage at 1210 W 15th St. I am writing to express my **opposition to HB 107**, which has a public hearing today.

HB 107 would negatively impact the lives of Alaskans, their ability to responsibly plan a family, and take away from individuals' rights over their own bodies.

I am a newer young resident to Anchorage, and if this bill and bills like it are passed, I likely will not stay in the state.

Respectfully,

Sean McDowell

Jake Almeida

From: Megan Baker
Sent: Monday, February 26, 2024 12:07
To: House Judiciary
Subject: HB 107

Hello,

I am writing in to say that I oppose HB 107.

Thank you.

Megan Baker
Anchorage

Sent from my iPhone

Jake Almeida

From: Holly Novack
Sent: Monday, February 26, 2024 12:03
To: House Judiciary
Subject: I oppose HB107

I, Holly Novack MD, strongly oppose HB107. Alaskan women deserve access to Healthcare without interference from politicians. This includes abortions which are an essential part of comprehensive medical care. A patient's personal decision to end a pregnancy following appropriate consultation with their trusted medical professional should be treated with upmost respect. Additionally, "personhood" laws have far reaching consequences that most people with strong anti-abortion stances find problematic. One example being loss of desired pregnancies through IVF. Thank you for your time and attention.

Respectfully,
Holly Novack MD

. Abortion is an essential part of comprehensive medical care, and a patient's decision to end a pregnancy following appropriate consultation with their trusted medical professional should be treated with respect.



Alliance Advocates - Alaska

House Judiciary Committee
Alaska State Capitol
Juneau, AK 99081

Re: HB 107 – Abortion Criminalization/Personhood Bill

February 26, 2024

Dear Chair Vance and Members of the Judiciary Committee:

Planned Parenthood Alliance Advocates strongly opposes HB 107, an extremist personhood bill that attempts to classify a fetus as a person and criminalize doctors for providing abortion care. This bill blatantly violates the Alaska Constitution, which protects our right to obtain or reject medical treatment without government interference in our personal, private decisions.

This bill is clearly an attempt to further an anti-abortion agenda and undermine the rights and well-being of pregnant people by laying the groundwork for fetal “personhood” in our state’s criminal code, which would outright ban abortion and implicate other types of health care as well. We know that “personhood” bills like this create confusion and chaos in our legal system and often result in surveillance and criminalization of pregnant people at the earliest stages of pregnancy, including those that experience negative pregnancy outcomes like miscarriage and stillbirth. HB 107 could also have ramifications for families attempting to use assisted reproductive technologies, including IVF. We refuse to let the chaos happening right now in Alabama happen in Alaska.

Bizarrely, HB 107 adds “an entity that has the moral right to self-determination” to the definition of “person” in the state’s Criminal Law statute, an anti-science attempt to establish personhood. It adds an expansive statutory definition of “life” that is vague, ambiguous, and divorced from the practice of medicine, and could be interpreted as encompassing all living things, including animals and plants. We have no understanding of what the terms “moral right,” “life,” or “self determination” mean under this bill draft. The definitions in this bill are not only poorly drafted and not medically or scientifically informed, they are also extremely dangerous. This bill would have sweeping, harmful consequences for pregnant people, their families, and our communities. This bill even takes the state of Alaska a step beyond an outright abortion ban toward criminalizing any behavior that is deemed to threaten a pregnancy and placing the rights of a fetus or embryo above the rights of the pregnant person.

Alaska is already a nationwide leader in poor indicators of sexual and reproductive health, with some of the highest rates of unintended pregnancy, STIs, and sexual assault in the country. Alaska is also facing a provider shortage, with people living in rural and remote areas struggling to access lifesaving reproductive health care. Given this appalling public health data, the provider shortage, and an underfunded family planning program, Alaska lawmakers need to focus on improving health outcomes, not threatening to send providers to jail for murder and restricting access to care even further. This bill is just the latest in a troubling nationwide trend of implementing extreme abortion bans.

Criminalizing abortion through HB 107 would put pregnant people's health and lives at great risk. People denied a wanted abortion are more likely to suffer negative health outcomes – including increased maternal and infant mortality – and are more likely to stay tethered to abusive partners. Those denied access to abortion care are also more likely to fall into poverty and be less financially secure, which decreases their overall health. With Alaska's flagging economy and limited resources, our communities cannot afford policies that further harm their pocketbooks and their health. Furthermore, while abortion is one of the safest medical procedures in the United States, history and current events tells us that banning abortion care undoubtedly harms health and risks lives, especially for historically marginalized communities. You need only pick up a newspaper to hear about how abortion bans are causing a reduction in access to obstetric care and dramatic spikes in maternal mortality rates.

The impact of a ban on abortion and increased criminalization would be predominantly felt by those who already experience barriers to reproductive health care in Alaska. This includes people with low incomes, BIPOC people (Black, Indigenous, people of color), immigrants, LGBTQ people, people with disabilities, young people, those who live in rural areas, and those whose identities intersect. While increased access to birth control and family planning services has substantially reduced unintended pregnancies in Alaska, rates of unintended pregnancy remain elevated in communities of color due to factors such as structural racism and discrimination that create income inequality and barriers to accessing health care. These communities, including American Indian and Alaska Native people, have endured a history of state-controlled reproduction, coercion, and denial of bodily autonomy. Banning abortion in the state would continue this legacy by denying people of color the ability to meaningfully consider all options available to them, threatening their health and lives in the process.

Furthermore, people in Alaska do not want HB 107. Alaska voters are coming out stronger than ever in their support for increased access to reproductive health care, including abortion care – nearly 80 percent of Alaska voters say they would have doubts about a law that bans abortion care. Alaska people know that access to abortion is critical to their health, the health of their families, and the stability of their communities. This bill is blatantly unconstitutional under Alaska's State Supreme Court's rulings and if passed, will lead to costly litigation that will waste important state resources. Since 2001, the state has spent at least an estimated \$4.2 million losing lawsuits related to abortion. HB 107 would yet again be a waste of taxpayer resources on a divisive, unconstitutional bill with vast consequences.

The Alaska Constitution should and must continue to protect our right to obtain or reject medical treatment without government interference. PPAA urges the committee to reject HB 107, and instead be courageous by devoting your time and energy to proactive policies that actually improve public health, help pregnant people, and ensure access to sexual and reproductive health care across Alaska.

Sincerely,

Morgan Lim
Alaska Government Relations Manager
Planned Parenthood Alliance Advocates

Jake Almeida

From: Raymond VanBuskirk
Sent: Monday, February 26, 2024 12:15
To: House Judiciary
Subject: Oppose HB 107

Alaska is better than Texas or Alabama.

Oppose HB 107

Thank you,
Raymond L VanBuskirk (a concerned citizen)

Sent from my iPhone

Jake Almeida

From: Mary Hudson Kelley
Sent: Monday, February 26, 2024 12:23
To: House Judiciary
Subject: I oppose HB107

To whom it may concern,

I am an Anchorage resident and dumbfounded that the Alaska House is even considering this blatantly unconstitutional bill. I can only hope that sounds minds will vote against extending constitutional rights to "fetuses, embryos, and fertilized eggs starting at the point of conception." This nonsense will only serve to endanger the health of women. Further, these measures will make medical professionals jobs even more difficult and put them in more danger of unfounded litigation. In a state with a lack of accessible medical care, the problem of access would become even worse. Where will the madness in the debate about right to life end? Please stop this now.

Mary Hudson Kelley

Jake Almeida

From: Tara Bonardi
Sent: Monday, February 26, 2024 12:34
To: House Judiciary
Subject: HB 107

Emailing in regards to HB 107.

My name is Tara Bonardi and I oppose HB 107.

Tara Bonardi

Sent from my iPhone

Jake Almeida

From: Amanda Mary Sweeting
Sent: Monday, February 26, 2024 12:42
To: House Judiciary
Subject: HB 107 Testimony

Hello,

My name is Amanda Mary Sweeting - my community is Seward, Alaska and I OPPOSE HB 107.

Feel free to reach out to me if you have any question. Please protect my rights and my agency.

Sincerely,
Amanda Sweeting

Jake Almeida

From: Jennine Williamson
Sent: Monday, February 26, 2024 12:47
To: House Judiciary
Subject: I oppose HB107

Greetings. I strongly urge you to oppose HB107.

I oppose any bill that would chip away at any woman's right to reproductive freedom.

Thank you.

Jennine Williamson

Jake Almeida

From: Mary Corcoran
Sent: Monday, February 26, 2024 12:51
To: House Judiciary
Subject: PUBLIC TESTIMONY HB107

To Chair Vance and Members of the House Judiciary Committee,

Thank you for this opportunity to comment on HB 107 sponsored by Representatives McCabe and Tomaszewski. I DO NOT support this bill and ask you to consider the following points.

The definition of "person" as it appears in this bill immediately presents a multitude of questions, gray areas and controversies. It will easily conflict with the Alaska State Constitution, women's rights to healthcare, freedom of religion, individual right to privacy, pregnancy resulting from sexual abuse, and parents rights to choose if, when and how to have children.

Clearly, this definition will require enforcements to be considered by the Departments of Law and Public Safety, causing additional trauma to those whose healthcare mandates terminating a pregnancy either deliberately as is legal now or "blame" for a miscarriage, etc.

Medical providers are also threatened by this as seen in many other states where this type of legislation is proposed/passed. We cannot anticipate all the circumstances that may require a woman's right to choose.

Currently a fetus is protected from illegal violence. Beyond that protection and the rights guaranteed in the Alaska Constitution, this bill proposes to make life changing decisions that are not the business of the legislature. HB107 has the potential to be 100% invasive and a restriction that does not benefit us beyond the current law.

I urge you to not advance this bill.

Thank you again for this opportunity and your work.

Sincerely,
Mary Corcoran
Delta Junction AK

Jake Almeida

From: Bradford Buddenberg
Sent: Monday, February 26, 2024 12:51
To: House Judiciary
Subject: HB 107

I oppose HB 107. I am a healthcare giver in this state and find the wording change in HB 107 to take away woman's rights.

Brad Buddenberg MHS, CRNA

Sent from my iPhone

Jake Almeida

From: Chennery Fife
Sent: Monday, February 26, 2024 13:02
To: House Judiciary
Subject: Oppose HB 107 and Protect healthcare in AK

Hello,

I am an Alaska resident in Anchorage representing myself, a person with a uterus of childbearing age. I am strongly urge you all to oppose House Bill 107. This bill has implications for criminalizing abortion, and therefore severely limits my rights and healthcare options for myself and my family. It goes against the Alaska State Constitution's explicit right to privacy. According to a [study](#) from the Commonwealth Fund, restricted abortion access is correlated with 62% higher maternal death rates. [Taking steps](#) to restrict or ban abortion does not prevent them for happening; it makes it more dangerous.

Abortion access is healthcare. Again, I urge you to oppose House Bill 107.

Thank you.

-Chennery Fife

Anchorage, AK

Jake Almeida

From: Arctic Goddess
Sent: Monday, February 26, 2024 13:02
To: House Judiciary
Cc: Rep. Frank Tomaszewski
Subject: HB 107

I'm unable to testify in person or wait on phone today due to job duties. I am an autonomous, living woman with a full time job trying to bring in a \$100 million plus contract to Alaska today. Yet I'm distracted by HB 107, that would put a sack of cells above my own well being.

HB 107 is a waste of time. As a constituent of Rep. Tomaszewski, I am embarrassed that he would cosponsor legislation that would make me less than a fully functional informed person capable of making my own medical decisions and having a right to privacy per the Alaskan State Constitution. This has been settled time and time again in Alaska, yet Frank is continuing this legacy of throwing junk legislation at the wall to see what sticks to appease national GOP handlers.

Protect my right to privacy and do not support HB 107. Let's take care of Alaskan women and families without making half of that equation chattel.

Thank you

Rhonda Widener
Fairbanks

Jake Almeida

From: Katherine Tisch
Sent: Monday, February 26, 2024 13:02
To: House Judiciary
Subject: House Bill 107

My name is Katherine Tisch,

I am a life long Alaskan who would like to testify House Bill 107. This bill is wrong due to its an invasion of privacy.

Access to reproductive freedom is protected under the right to privacy in the Alaska state constitution

Thank you for your time
Katherine

Jake Almeida

From: Ashleigh Reger
Sent: Monday, February 26, 2024 13:08
To: House Judiciary
Subject: Opposition to HB107

My name is Ashleigh Allen. I live in my hometown of Fairbanks, and attend the University of Alaska Fairbanks.

HB 107 jeopardizes the personhood of anyone who needs access to reproductive care. Basic healthcare. HB 107 has dangerous implications for all Alaskans, not just women of reproductive age. Medical providers will be less inclined to practice medicine here, something Alaskans cannot afford.

Personhood begins at birth. Period. A woman's personhood matters, too.

Thank you.

Jake Almeida

From: Sarah Histand
Sent: Monday, February 26, 2024 13:08
To: House Judiciary
Subject: HB 107

Hello-

I am a constituent from Anchorage and am concerned about HB 107.

I am unable to attend the Judiciary committee meeting today but wanted to submit my testimony in OPPOSITION to HB 107.

As someone who has benefited from IVF here in Alaska, I find this bill extremely concerning. Many families in our state require support to conceive. I am one of these, and the experience of infertility is stressful enough without this added unnecessary layer of legal conflict.

HB 107 needs to be stopped immediately.

Thank you for your attention to this matter.

-Sarah

Sarah M Histand (she/they) | Mind & Mountain

I live, work, & play on the traditional lands of the Dena'ina people.

Jake Almeida

From: Heather T
Sent: Monday, February 26, 2024 13:09
To: House Judiciary
Subject: comment - OPPOSED to HB 107

Hello,

I am an East-Anchorage resident who opposes HB 107. This bill would have staggering effects on my rights to seek abortion and reproductive healthcare. This bill goes against my rights in the Alaska Constitution and I oppose all parts of this bill.

I urge the House to deny this bill in its entirety.

-Heather Thomas

Jake Almeida

From: Julianne Pacheco
Sent: Monday, February 26, 2024 13:10
To: House Judiciary
Subject: OPPOSITION to HB 107

Name: Julianne Pacheco

Community: Juneau, AK

I vehemently oppose HB 107, a bill that would assert personhood and legal rights at conception when those cells would not be determined viable and without genetic abnormalities for a minimum of another six weeks. Therefore those indeterminate cells should not hold the same rights as the absolutely viable female who is carrying them should have.

Jake Almeida

From: Jacquelyn Smale
Sent: Monday, February 26, 2024 13:12
To: House Judiciary
Subject: HB 107 Testimony

1>

Hello,

My name is Jackie Smale and I live in Anchorage, Alaska. I am writing to testify on HB 107 for the House Judiciary committee.

I am a young professional growing roots in Alaska. I want to settle down and start a family, ideally getting pregnant and having children. A bill like HB 107 would prevent me from doing so, since I have no idea as to what type of issues may arise during my pregnancy.

Jake Almeida

From: Kimberly Fitzgerald
Sent: Monday, February 26, 2024 13:12
To: House Judiciary
Subject: HB 107 Opposition

My name is Kimberly Fitzgerald and I live in Fairbanks, Alaska. First of all, thank you for all of your incredibly hard work to protect not only those of us in Fairbanks, but across the state!

I am writing to you to convey that I **STRONGLY OPPOSE HB 107** and all of the negative implications this bill will have on women's reproductive health. By deciding that personhood and legal rights begin at conception, this bill will undoubtedly lead to denying women the right to privacy in their decisions about their own body. This includes, but is not limited to, a woman's right to choose when and if they want to start a family and difficult medical and health decisions that impact their own safety during this process. These are the very rights to privacy that our own Alaska state constitution protects. In 2022 voters across the state overwhelmingly decided AGAINST holding a convention, much in part to protect any changes to women's rights.

This bill is terrifying to me on many levels. As a woman who is currently trying to start a family, this bill is a certain step towards stripping me of my rights to a safe pregnancy, medical care related to potential miscarriages, as well as the possibility of using IVF to conceive a child. As the partner of a hospital emergency room RN, this bill is incredibly concerning because it will put my partner at risk of criminal prosecution for providing life-saving, necessary measures in emergency situations involving women's health.

Bills such as HB 107 are NOT the way to protect lives. I am asking you to PLEASE listen to your constituents and protect women's rights to safe and effective reproductive health in our state. As the founders of our country believed, we must keep separation of church and state so that the religious beliefs of any elected officials do not impact the laws that protect the bodily autonomy of others. We are counting on our elected officials to protect our rights as women living in Alaska.

Kimberly Fitzgerald
Fairbanks, AK

Jake Almeida

From: Eva >
Sent: Monday, February 26, 2024 13:13
To: House Judiciary
Subject: Opposition to HB 107

To whom it may concern,

My name is Eva White, and I live in Anchorage. I am writing to express my opposition to HB 107, which has a hearing in about 20 minutes. I oppose this bill because of the negative impacts to public health, taking away autonomy for families to engage in family planning, and taking away individual autonomy of people to make decisions about their bodies. I am a new resident, and if this bill passes, I would likely not stay in the state long term.

Sincerely,
Eva White

Jake Almeida

From: Jacquelyn Smale
Sent: Monday, February 26, 2024 13:20
To: House Judiciary
Subject: Re: HB 107 Testimony

n>

I accidentally sent the email, sorry!

As I'm sure others are testifying, many issues can arise in a pregnancy, from miscarriage to an unviable pregnancy. I'm terrified of not being able to choose for myself if I want to carry a baby to term only to watch it fight for a few breaths and die an excruciating death. I am also terrified of a miscarriage, where I could be persecuted if suspected of inducing a miscarriage for murder. I am terrified that my life will be on the line, and my doctors will have to scramble for the government to approve a medically necessary abortion in order to survive.

How can we want to have families want to grow here if we cannot promise mothers that their lives will still be prioritized during their pregnancies? A bill like HB 107 would likely stop me from becoming pregnant in Alaska for fear of persecution, mental and physical harm, or even death. This testimony is only about an intentional pregnancy, but it is also crucial to note we live in a state with dreadfully high sexual assault rates, and the repercussions of this bill extend far further than my own fears.

Please consider Alaskan women when considering HB 107. Our lives depend on this bill not becoming law.

Cheers,
Jackie Smale

On Mon, Feb 26, 2024, 1:11 PM Jacquelyn Smale

wrote:

Hello,

My name is Jackie Smale and I live in Anchorage, Alaska. I am writing to testify on HB 107 for the House Judiciary committee.

I am a young professional growing roots in Alaska. I want to settle down and start a family, ideally getting pregnant and having children. A bill like HB 107 would prevent me from doing so, since I have no idea as to what type of issues may arise during my pregnancy.

Jake Almeida

From: Alaina Plauché
Sent: Monday, February 26, 2024 13:20
To: House Judiciary
Subject: Opposition to HB 107

Good afternoon,

My name is Alaina Plauché, and I am a resident of Anchorage. I am writing to express my very strong opposition to HB 107, which I understand is being considered in a hearing this afternoon.

This bill would infringe upon the constitutional rights of Alaskans to decide how to plan their families. Additionally, I oppose it because of the inevitable negative impacts to public health, removal of autonomy for families to engage in family planning, and imposing harmful infringements to women's rights to privacy regarding their own bodies in this state.

To reiterate, I am strongly opposed to HB 107.

Sincerely,

Alaina Plauché

Jake Almeida

From:
Sent: Monday, February 26, 2024 13:21
To: House Judiciary
Subject: OPPOSE HB 107

OPPOSE HB 107

Jaclyn Randall
from Palmer, Alaska

Jake Almeida

From: Sean McDowell
Sent: Monday, February 26, 2024 13:27
To: House Judiciary
Subject: HB 107 Testimony

To whom it may concern,

My name is Sean McDowell, and I live in Anchorage at 1210 W 15th St. I am writing to express my **opposition to HB 107**, which has a public hearing today.

HB 107 would negatively impact the lives of Alaskans, their ability to responsibly plan a family, and take away from individuals' rights over their own bodies.

I am a newer young resident to Anchorage, and if this bill and bills like it are passed, I likely will not stay in the state.

Respectfully,

Sean McDowell

Jake Almeida

From: meagan byrne
Sent: Monday, February 26, 2024 13:28
To: House Judiciary
Subject: House bill 107 OPPOSE

To whom it may concern,

As a women's care physician in Alaska I strongly OPPOSE this bill. It will threaten the lives of mothers in Alaska and have negative impact on the care women are able to receive in Alaska. It will additionally have negative impacts on providers willing to move to Alaska to provide women the care they need. It will threaten the ability of physicians to make life saving medical decisions without fear of legal actions and threaten a patients right to privacy regarding their medical care.

Dr Meagan Byrne
OBGYN

Jake Almeida

From: Laura Bonner
Sent: Monday, February 26, 2024 13:31
To: House Judiciary
Cc: Rep. Andrew Gray; Rep. Cliff Groh
Subject: HB 107 Written testimony

Representative Vance - Chair
Members of the House Judiciary Committee

I am retired and have lived in South Anchorage for over 50 years.

I oppose HB 107. This bill amends the definition of “person” in criminal law statutes. That raises questions in my mind. Is the real purpose to deprive a woman’s right to reproductive freedom in the future? Interfere with IVF treatments? Cause more grief for a woman who had a miscarriage by being interrogated of how and why she miscarried?

If this bill becomes law, I assume this “person” would be eligible to apply for a PFD if conceived in Alaska. Of course date and location at the time of conception may be difficult to document.

I urge you to focus on issues that affect those who are breathing like affordable housing, childcare, energy, food security, public safety, recruitment and retention of public employees, shortage of caregivers for seniors and the disabled to name a few.

Laura Bonner
Anchorage AK

Jake Almeida

From: Whitney Willcut
Sent: Monday, February 26, 2024 13:34
To: House Judiciary
Subject: Testimony HB 107

Alaska legislators,

As a healthcare provider and Alaskan resident, I firmly oppose the notion that life begins at the moment of conception. This is an attempt to oversimplify the complex biological, ethical, and social implications surrounding the concept of life.

To begin with, early embryonic development is precarious at best and while the union of sperm and egg may initiate the developmental process, it in no way guarantees the formation of a viable organism.

From an ethics standpoint, declaring life to begin at conception disregards the well-being and autonomy of pregnant individuals. It undermines their right to make informed choices about their bodies that may very well have long lasting effects on their reproductive health. This perspective fails to acknowledge the complexity of pregnancy and the many factors that influence decision-making regarding prenatal care, termination, or continuation of pregnancy.

Lastly, restrictive reproductive legislation often disproportionately affects marginalized communities, exacerbates social inequalities and prevents access to essential healthcare services. This rings especially true in Alaska, specifically within the villages with poor access to care and within our Alaska Native population, in which economic and health disparities are rampant.

Alaskans have already spoken, we do not want this legislation or any like it.

Whitney Willcut, MSN, CRNA

Sent from my iPhone

Jake Almeida

From: Whitney Willcut
Sent: Monday, February 26, 2024 13:40
To: House Judiciary
Subject: HB 107 Testimony, community added for clarification

Alaska legislators,

As a healthcare provider and Alaskan resident, I firmly oppose the notion that life begins at the moment of conception. This is an attempt to oversimplify the complex biological, ethical, and social implications surrounding the concept of life.

To begin with, early embryonic development is precarious at best and while the union of sperm and egg may initiate the developmental process, it in no way guarantees the formation of a viable organism.

From an ethics standpoint, declaring life to begin at conception disregards the well-being and autonomy of pregnant individuals. It undermines their right to make informed choices about their bodies that may very well have long lasting effects on their reproductive health. This perspective fails to acknowledge the complexity of pregnancy and the many factors that influence decision-making regarding prenatal care, termination, or continuation of pregnancy.

Lastly, restrictive reproductive legislation often disproportionately affects marginalized communities, exacerbates social inequalities and prevents access to essential healthcare services. This rings especially true in Alaska, specifically with in the villages with poor access to care and within our Alaska Native population, in which economic and health disparities are rampant.

Alaskans have already spoken, we do not want this legislation or any like it.

Whitney Willcut, MSN, CRNA
Eagle River, AK

Sent from my iPhone

Jake Almeida

From: Kimberly Hunt
Sent: Monday, February 26, 2024 15:41
To: House Judiciary
Subject: Testimony against HB 107

Speaking as a female of the species, I am against HB 107 because, as Rep. Andrew Gray stated, "this could potentially cause providers of reproductive health care to be prosecuted for murder. This could also have ramifications for in vitro fertilization..."

Enough already- with it being in the news a few months ago that the mayor of Anchorage sent cookies in the shape of genitalia to meetings and that he also enjoyed the smell of his own f*rt, and with the governor of Alaska slashing education funding in past years, it has been established that executives in Alaska are not sensitive to women and children. As such, and because I am actually for agency and the right of human beings (who have survived a live birth and have been breathing on their own as a result) I must vehemently disagree with HB 107.

I am against any bill that could endanger pregnant women and health care providers. As President Obama stated, abortion needs to be "safe, legal and rare." This is because sometimes the procedure that results in an aborted fetus also removes a non-viable fetus or group of cells as the only way to protect a mother's life.

Women should not be criminalized for obtaining health care, surviving a medical procedure, and living a healthy life after

nature determines a fetus or group of cells is not going to grow into a human being that can breathe on its own. Likewise, medical health providers should not be criminalized for ensuring women survive carrying a non-viable fetus or group of cells.

I am for women's health and I am for women's agency. I am for affordable, accessible modern medical care. I am for the safety and integrity of health care providers.

I am against HB 107.



Kimberly Hunt (Kim)
907-855-9374 (EST -4)

Jake Almeida

From: Ruth Jacob-Hardage
Sent: Monday, February 26, 2024 13:41
To: House Judiciary
Subject: HB 107 testimony-opposition

My name is Ruth Jacob-Hardage, I live in Palmer Alaska, and I oppose HB 107, which would attempt to defy all medical evidence to the contrary and decide that human life begins at conception.

Jake Almeida

From: Allison vanHaastert
Sent: Monday, February 26, 2024 10:40
To: House Judiciary
Subject: HB 107

To whom it may concern,

As an OB GYN physician I strongly oppose HB 107. This bill will have significant negative impacts on the women and children of Alaska. Necessary life saving procedures will not be allowed to be performed or will be held out of fear of legal action. Women will die if this bill is passed. This legislation will penalize life-saving procedures. We already have difficulty recruiting doctors to come to Alaska to provide care for our residents if this bill happens that will significantly impact future physicians coming to Alaska.

Please listen to the medical providers of this state, there is nothing positive that will come from HB 107 only harm.

Respectfully,

Dr. Allison van Haastert MD, FACOG

Jake Almeida

From: Carla Copenhaver
Sent: Monday, February 26, 2024 13:57
To: House Judiciary

My name is Carla Copenhaver and I live in Scenic Foothills in Anchorage, AK and myself and many of my registered voter friends and acquaintances (possibly all but I've not recently had conversations with them all) wholeheartedly OPPOSE HB 107.

As a law abiding Christian, I must ask what has happened to separation of church and state? As someone TRULY pro-life as far as my personal choices, I am concerned at how detrimental state's decisions to limit women's ability to save their own live's has been.

I was born in 1973 when my parents were the ONLY ones in their community that did not want to abort me (even preachers of both my grandparents encouraged them to give me up). My mother became a single woman with 2 girls 5 and under and I grew up watching how she was shamed by by people in our church and other churches as well as her employment community and agencies she reached out to for support. My sister and I were also shamed for not having a Dad at home, wearing hand-me-downs, and generally not being able to afford most of the things others we grew up with in church and school.

However, we both grew up to earn college educations and work as public servants because we were lucky enough to have parents and grandparents willing and able to make sacrifices for us to do so.

As a public servant since 1995, I have seen how few other mothers and children have been afforded the same opportunities and rarely have seen or heard about mothers in similar situations mine was in were not similarly shamed and ostracized - oftentimes far worse.

And I've seen how few men get punished for forcing sex onto women who do not want it. And how little men still get punished for other life-threatening abuses they perpetuate on women. And how much respect men get if they adequately take on responsibilities of being a single parent - not that they shouldn't be respected, but women should also receive the same respect.

Government has no business even considering such legislation until women's lives are far better protected than they have been and men are being held far more accountable for their part in producing children.

I have friends who are Healthcare providers in other states where things like HB 107 are being concisdered or already enacted. Women's lives are being lost due to medical facilities fear of the repercussions of taking life saving measures for pregnant women. And many medical providers specializing in obstetric care and Operating Room specialities are leaving their professions as a result. Several septic, ectopic, and other life saving abortions are performed in Alaska today. So HB 107 will lead to several pregnant women's lives being in jeopardy every day.

And I've not even spoken of IVF - why would we limit the ability of people with the resources to adequately care for children to have their own? As a public servant, I cannot speak much of my experience working with people with these kinds of means.

I am someone who REALLY wanted kids of her own but decided to not attempt such a procedure for a few reasons. #1 is because I got sexually assaulted by someone I considered to be a best friend around the time my pregnancy would've been considered geriatric. I DEFINITELY would have maintained the pregnancy if it had occurred, but it didn't. The trauma of someone I trusted doing such a thing and being conflicted about pressing charges and exposing myself to even more trauma for it to be very unlikely he would face any consequences ... I chose to not pursue to rollercoaster of emotions I was aware other friends who pursued IVF went through.

Please do not consider HB 107 to pave the way for so many Alaskan lives to be at risk - not just the women that will be impacted, but all Alaskans when we lose medical professionals this will hurt.

Very respectfully,
Carla Copenhaver

From: Jeff kilcorse
Sent: Monday, February 26, 2024 13:59
To: House Judiciary
Subject: HB 107 testimony

As a concerned Alaskan resident, I firmly oppose the notion that life begins at the moment of conception. The concept of life has complex biological, ethical, and social implications.

Firstly, while the union of sperm and egg may initiate the developmental process, it in no way guarantees the formation of a viable organism.

From an ethics standpoint, declaring life to begin at conception disregards the well-being and autonomy of pregnant individuals. It undermines their right to make informed choices about their bodies that may very well have long lasting effects on their reproductive health. This perspective fails to acknowledge the complexity of pregnancy and the many factors that influence decision-making regarding prenatal care, termination, or continuation of pregnancy.

Lastly, restrictive reproductive legislation often disproportionately affects marginalized communities, exacerbates social inequalities and prevents access to essential healthcare services. This rings especially true in Alaska, specifically with in the villages with poor access to care and within our Alaska Native population, in which economic and health disparities are rampant.

Alaskans have already spoken, we do not want this legislation or any like it.

Jefferson Kilcorse
Eagle River, AK

Jake Almeida

From:
Sent: Monday, February 20, 2017 14:01
To: House Judiciary
Subject: I oppose HB107

I am a 69 year old woman and business owner in Anchorage. I have lived in Alaska for over 30 years.
I strongly, vehemently oppose HB 107.
It is a violation of every woman past, present and future. The thought of a bunch of cells having status over a living, BREATHING woman is so wrong and profoundly offensive.
Thank you for your consideration.

Janet Gregory

Jake Almeida

From: Millissa Morin
Sent: Monday, February 26, 2024 14:02
To: House Judiciary
Subject: HB 107 Opposition

Hello,

My name is Millissa Morin. I'm a constituent who lives in South Anchorage. I'm writing to testify that I OPPOSE HB 107.

This bill infringes on rights to privacy, including reproductive freedom.

Thank you,

Millissa Morin



Re: Oppose HB 107

February 26, 2024

Dear Alaska State Legislators,

We are writing in opposition to House Bill 107. Our community will be harmed by using the overbroad and misleading definitions of when life begins. There are several bills introduced to redefine everything from pornography, sexual abuse of children, to sex trafficking of a minor and now life itself. These attempts to statute into Alaska state law unnecessary and confusing definitions are a part of the Christians Fascist movement who's real agenda is to impose their world views not only upon other **religions** but other **cultures**, and even political parties which do not march under the banner of their militant beliefs at any cost.

These misleading definitions are the gateway to criminalizing women and women's bodies to the extremes of which we've seen in the news where women are now having to break laws as a means to gain access to medical care.

We urge you to oppose HB107 because it will ultimately strip the rights of bodily autonomy to all women and children by remote, which is antithetical to what being Alaskan is all about.

Thank you,
Terra Burns
Maxine Doogan
Amber Nickerson
Kat McElroy

Jake Almeida

From: Ian Scholl
Sent: Monday, February 26, 2024 14:11
To: House Judiciary; Representative.Sarah.Vance@akleg.gov; Representative.Jamie.Allard@akleg.gov; Representative.Ben.Carpenter@akleg.gov; Representative.Craig.Johnson@akleg.gov; Representative.Cliff.Groh@akleg.gov; Representative.Andrew.Gray@akleg.gov; Representative.Jesse.Sumner@akleg.gov
Subject: HB 107 Testimony

Judiciary Committee,

I do not support this bill. My life did not start at conception. I have the right to self-determination as well as privacy and you are infringing on those rights by saying that a few cells, or an "entity" is potentially more or even equal to my life and my self determination. I understand Rep. MacCabe that you want to define "life" but as you have said that is something that we as humans struggle with. It is not a clear definition, nor is it possible or necessary to have a clear definition in statutes. Let's stop using old science to justify this.

A woman's role in childbearing is anything but "passive", it is sacred and beautiful, but it is the mothers decision as a responsible person to decide when to experience both the sacrifice and joy of becoming a parent.

Let's stop wasting our time debating what constitutes life and support the life already existing in Alaska. Let's focus our attention on the systems currently failing life in Alaska. The foster care system, behavioral healthcare, the prison industrial complex, the racist institutions that devalue native lives, and our higher rates of sexual assault, domestic violence, sex trafficking, and murder for alaska native women.

-Ian Scholl
citizen, constituent.

Jake Almeida

From: Henry Huntington
Sent: Monday, February 26, 2024 14:12
To: House Judiciary
Subject: I oppose HB107

Dear Madam/Sir,

Please reject HB107. This does not address any actual problem, but simply drags Alaska into distracting national "culture wars." The legislature should not indulge in symbolic grandstanding, but instead should address the real issues facing Alaskans.

Sincerely,

--Henry P. Huntington

--
Henry P. Huntington, Ph.D.

Jake Almeida

From: Alden Bookey
Sent: Monday, February 26, 2024 14:35
To: House Judiciary
Subject: House Bill 107

To whom is may concern,

My name is Alden Bookey, and I am a constituent of the State of Alaska. I was born and raised in Kenai, where I spent 19 years, before moving to Anchorage, where I have spent the last 4 years. As a proud Alaskan, I want the State to represent myself, my family, and my communities; I do not believe that House Bill 107 represents what we stand for. I do not believe it is being put forth in the best interest of Alaskans, or reflects our values as a State. I am urging my representatives to vote no to House Bill 107.

Thank you sincerely for your time.

Alden Bookey

Jake Almeida

From: Emily Mueller
Sent: Monday, February 26, 2024 14:43
To: Representative.Kevin.McCabe@akleg.gov; House Judiciary; Rep. Sarah Vance; Rep. Jamie Allard; Rep. Ben Carpenter; Rep. Craig Johnson; Rep. Jesse Sumner; Rep. Cliff Groh; Rep. Andrew Gray
Subject: HB107 is unconstitutional and against the will of Alaskans

Good afternoon,

HB107 is unconstitutional. This is an extreme proposal that has no foundation in mainstream science and medicine and is unconstitutional under Alaska's constitution. Not to mention, it is against the will of the majority of people in the state, who consistently voice their support for abortion rights.

- Not only this but a person experiencing a miscarriage—as just one example—may need emergency treatment to prevent serious damage to their health or to save their life. This legislation could prevent doctors from saving the lives of these patients for fear of the law. Experiencing a miscarriage is devastating enough, without then being unable to access care that may keep them from dying from it.
- HB107 is unconstitutional and against the will of Alaskans, who believe in the right to make their own medical decisions without government interference. Do not move forward with this bill.

Emily
West Anchorage

Jake Almeida

From: Laura Herman
Sent: Monday, February 26, 2024 14:44
To: Rep. Stanley Wright; House Judiciary
Subject: I oppose HB107

Hi members of the House Judiciary Committee,

I strongly oppose HB107 and would hope you all would spend your time on the real problems we are facing in Alaska rather than going down ideological rabbit holes. We have many issues that deserve our attention and creativity, and this is not it.

CC'ing my own Representative, Stanley Wright, who I hope will oppose this bill moving forward in any way.

Thanks,
Laura Herman

Jake Almeida

From: David Reed
Sent: Monday, February 26, 2024 14:45
To: House Judiciary
Subject: HB 107

As a voting Anchorage taxpayers in the Oceanview neighborhood. I vehemently oppose House Bill 107. It is not only contrary to the Alaska Constitution, but areas of the country that have enacted similar laws are showing significant declines in women's health care and family planning. Any support for this bill by any elected representative will not receive my vote, and I will work to convince others to ensure they no longer represent this neighborhood..

Jake Almeida

From:
Sent: Monday, February 26, 2024 14:53
To: House Judiciary
Subject: OPPOSE HB107

Hi,

There were a lot of people testifying that were more eloquent than I am so I may not be able to get testify online.

I oppose HB107. It's a horrible bill! It goes against our constitution; it will impact women's autonomy and healthcare access; and the efforts in other states show how these poorly written bills negatively impact the justice system, economy, and healthcare access in the state.

Thank you

Heidi and Steve Frost

Sent from myMail for iOS

Jake Almeida

From: Heather Percy >
Sent: Monday, February 26, 2024 14:56
To: House Judiciary; Rep. Kevin McCabe
Subject: Testimony in opposition of HB 107

I am writing to oppose House Bill 107.

This bill is an unnecessary waste of time for our Alaska government and the pursuit of this bill should be abandoned immediately.

This bill goes against the Alaska state constitution as well as common sense and the will of a woman to have control over her own body.

This bill will scare health care providers away from practicing in Alaska, which is a detriment to our health care system in a state that already struggles to attract and keep health care providers. This is especially frightening considering the rural nature of health care throughout the state.

This bill goes against the freedoms that we seek by living in Alaska, as Alaska is a place where people come to live free and independent from government overreach. This is simply NOT Alaskan.

If Representative McCabe wishes to introduce a bill that curtails the freedom of nearly half of the population, perhaps he needs to seek residence and run for election elsewhere in another state, not in Alaska where we value our freedom.

Finally, why is Rep. McCabe, a man who is neither scientist nor health care provider, introducing a bill that is completely out of his wheelhouse?

Heather Percy
Anchorage, AK

Jake Almeida

From: _____
Sent: Monday, February 26, 2024 14:57
To: House Judiciary
Subject: HB 107

As a long time resident of Alaska, I oppose HB 107. Life does not begin at conception. Defining it as such endangers women. It is also harmful to the state of Alaska, as it will increase the flow of young people out of our state. My husband is retired military and works for the states; I am an ASD employee. We have lived in Alaska for almost 17 years and thought we would never leave. We are also parents to a teenager. If HB 107 were to pass, I would no longer feel like my child's future was safe in the state of Alaska. This bill would force my family to join the many others fleeing the state.

Jacquelyn Reed
Anchorage, AK

Jake Almeida

From: Dick Anderson
Sent: Monday, February 26, 2024 14:59
To: House Judiciary
Subject: I oppose HB107

The legislature should not expand the legal concept of personhood. People are born and people die. It's sad when they die but it's natural and we all do it. Sometimes pregnancies do not reach the point of birth and it's sad but it's usually natural and should never be considered a crime.

-- Richard Anderson

Jake Almeida

From: wendy plantholt
Sent: Monday, February 26, 2024 14:59
To: House Judiciary
Subject: Testimony on House Bill 107

Hello,

I am Wendy Plantholt an Alaska resident living in Anchorage. If it isn't too late I would like to state that I
OPPOSE HB 107

A fertilized embryo is not life. An embryo does not become a fetus until week 9-12. What about the mother's life? She has a full conscience and a high risk pregnancy. Is her life worth less than an embryo that in this bill has the same definition as yeast or mold? Oppose HB 107

Jake Almeida

From: Courtney Moore
Sent: Monday, February 26, 2024 15:00
To: House Judiciary
Subject: Oppose HB 107

I oppose HB 107

Jake Almeida

From: M Zegzy
Sent: Monday, February 26, 2024 15:01
To: House Judiciary
Subject: OPPOSE HB 107

My name is Marta Zegzdry and I am a resident of the Fishhook community outside of Wasilla, AK. I vehemently OPPOSE HB 107. Please note my opposition as public testimony concerning this matter.

Thank you.

Marta Zegzdry
Owner/Artist MEZ Pottery

Jake Almeida

From: Cassie McCraw
Sent: Monday, February 26, 2024 15:01
To: House Judiciary
Subject: Oppose HB 107

Cassie McCraw
Palmer

Oppose HB107
Sent from my iPhone

Jake Almeida

From: Liann Peryea
Sent: Monday, February 26, 2024 15:01
To: House Judiciary
Subject: Oppose HB 107

Greetings.

My name is Liann Peryea, and I am writing to oppose HB 107.

I am testifying for myself.

A lifelong Alaskan, I have 6 children who are growing up here, among them daughters.

I oppose HB 107, for many reasons.

Liann Peryea

Jake Almeida

From: Meghan Garner
Sent: Monday, February 26, 2024 15:06
To: House Judiciary
Subject: Oppose House bill 107

I am a registered voter in the municipality of anchorage and I strongly oppose house bill 107.

Thank you,

Meghan Garner

Sent from a mobile device, please forgive any typos!

Jake Almeida

From: ian
Sent: Monday, February 26, 2024 15:06
To: House Judiciary
Subject: OPPOSED

Hello,

My name is Ian Roberts. A registered voter in Anchorage. I don't know if this is the right place to do this. I couldn't call in. I strongly oppose HB 107. This is not the way our state should be representing the women of this great state. This bill has no place in our state. Women deserve the right to choose what their body has to do. Not voters, religious followers, and people who feel the need to make or agree to laws that have nothing to do with them personally. These types of bills are created to control women. No other reason. No one else's beliefs, religion, or opinions should be a reason to dictate someone else's life.

From Ian Roberts

Jake Almeida

From: Stephanie Sweesy
Sent: Monday, February 26, 2024 1:50:01
To: House Judiciary
Subject: Opposing HB 107

My name is Stephanie, I am 31 and from anchorage Alaska, and I oppose HB 107. Please do not threaten women's lives more than they already are.

Sent from my iPhone

Jake Almeida

From: Todd Burns
Sent: Monday, February 26, 2024 10:20
To: House Judiciary
Subject: OPPOSE HB 107

I, Todd Burns, would like to voice my **opposition to HB 107** in the strongest possible way. This type of governmental interference into the private lives of Alaskan citizens has no place in our great state.

Todd Burns

Jake Almeida

From: Cali
Sent: Monday, February 26, 2024 15:22
To: House Judiciary
Subject: HB 107

I have lived in Alaska my entire life, I was born in Anchorage and raised in the Matsu-Valley.

I was raised to believe that while the federal government may not always care for us at least our fellow representatives DID care about representing the voice of the people. Please do not do me the disservice of proving me wrong.

I am under the firm belief that life begins at birth, not at conception. I just recently had my son, I'm very well versed and up to date on the development of life. I believe this issue shouldn't even be readdressed. Roe V Wade was a court case I had hoped settled issues like this far far ago. Never in my life did I think I would have to worry about my bodily rights as a woman in my home state.

While I understand the opposing sides firm beliefs as to why they believe they're doing good for the people but they aren't; they're trying to regain control over a matter that was long over and settled. I was raised Christian, I believe in the sanctity of life and love. But I also believe in the right to every human having control over their own bodies.

There are CHILDREN raising children in other states because they were raped and abused and forced to keep their pregnancies. Can you really sit there and say that is a good thing? For one who hasn't even reached puberty; someone whose brain isn't even **HALFWAY** developed yet, you truly believe that THAT is the route we need to go as a society? Can you really tell me that children raising children is the path you want our society to go down?

Children deserve to live, be happy, and be immature for as long as possible. Bills like HB 107 are setting up the law with language to force rape victims into a role they didn't choose. As a mother I believe every mother deserves the right to choose a better life for her AND her future children. Just because a seed was fertilized doesn't mean the environment it will develop in is one it **SHOULD** develop in. There are plenty of children born into horrible circumstances that leave them broken, destitute, and alone.

If you as my representatives truly believe in the sanctity of life then at the very least this bill needs to be paired with funding for schools, Denali kid care, and WIC. If you're going to force these lives into this world then you should also fit the bill to support them.

I truly hope the council understands the full gravity of the situation if they pass HB 107. It doesn't just change a definition in the law; it will be a financial snowball that will keep rolling down hill. Schools and our social services net are already deteriorating as it is, and rather than focus on preserving the lives we already have you're sitting here trying to redefine what life is. It's confusing, it's asinine, and it feels like politicians wasting our time and tax payer money arguing about issues that were already dead and done.

It's time to stop beating a dead horse and focus on feeding the one still alive and well.

I hope my words can reach you all during this trying time. Thank you.

-Calista Watkins

Jake Almeida

From: David Shadley
Sent: Monday, February 26, 2024 15:25
To: House Judiciary
Cc: Rep. Sarah Vance
Subject: HB107

I oppose house bill HB107. Thank you for your continued support for ALL Alaskans.

Thank you
Dave Shadley

Jake Almeida

From: Colette Henderson
Sent: Monday, February 26, 2024 15:29
To: House Judiciary
Subject: HB107

Hello,

I am a married woman and a mother of 2 young children, I live in Kasilof.

I would like some clarification about HB107.

How are the estimates 25% of pregnancies (likely higher) that end in miscarriage going to be treated? What about the women and families who desperately wanted and loved that pregnancy, who are grieving, will they be treated to an investigation in addition to suffering their loss? Will they be treated like murderers if they seek medical help, given that they are present when the "life of a person" ended?

A 2nd question, if you are still reading:

How do families add this new person (from the moment of conception) to their PFD, health insurance, and Alaska state taxes? Is this being ironed out and debated at the same time as the definition change?

And now the question near to my heart:

What happens in the event of the death of a mother (and likely the death of the child she is carrying) that could have been prevented by reproductive healthcare? Who will help care for the children they leave behind? Who will be paying for their funeral services?

I ask because in 2022 I had an absolutely standard pregnancy with a very much wanted, loved, and tried for baby. Birth went textbook smooth, and then bled I out. I suffered a hemorrhage losing more than half of my blood in under 10 minutes. I required a "Mass Rapid Transfusion" and an emergency surgery, all before even holding my son. Unfortunately, because I am a woman under the age of 35, the doctor would not agree to a full tubal ligation, only clips. If I ever have the misfortune of falling pregnant again, and they aren't able to save my life this time, who should I have my lawyer reach out to for compensation and support for my existing children?

Thank you so much for your timely response,
Colette Henderson

Jake Almeida

From: Marissa Hedman
Sent: Monday, February 26, 2024 15:30
To: House Judiciary
Subject: House Bill 107

I'm testifying "No" with regards to house bill 107, I OPPOSE this bill.

Marissa Hedman
Eagle River, Alaska

Jake Almeida

From: Brady Sizelove
Sent: Monday, February 26, 2024 15:34
To: House Judiciary
Subject: I oppose HB 107

To whom it may concern,

I'm writing to say that I oppose HB 107. Alaska must not infringe on a persons right to bodily autonomy.

--Brady Sizelove

Jake Almeida

From:
Sent: Monday, February 26, 2024 15:35
To: House Judiciary
Subject: HB 107 is unconstitutional and I do NOT support

Dear members of the Judiciary,

I absolutely do NOT support HB 107 and urge you to reject it. Keep politics out of our physician's office.

The fact is, abortion is an essential component of women's health care. Like all medical matters, decisions regarding abortion should be made by patients in consultation with their health care providers and without interference by outside parties. Like all patients, women obtaining abortion are entitled to privacy, dignity, respect, and support.

Many factors influence or necessitate a woman's decision to have an abortion. They may include, contraceptive failure, barriers to contraceptive use and access, rape, incest, intimate partner violence, fetal anomalies, illness during pregnancy, and exposure to teratogenic medications. Pregnancy complications, including placental abruption, bleeding from placenta previa, preeclampsia or eclampsia, and cardiac or renal conditions, may be so severe that abortion is the only measure to preserve a woman's health or save her life.

FACT: Where healthcare is restricted, women resort to unsafe measures to end unwanted pregnancies, including self-inflicted abdominal trauma, ingestion of dangerous chemicals, self-medication with a variety of drugs, and reliance on unqualified abortion providers. Today, approximately 21 million women around the world obtain unsafe, illegal abortions each year, and complications from these unsafe procedures account for approximately 13% of all maternal deaths, nearly 50,000 annually.

Sound health policy is best based on scientific fact and evidence-based medicine. **The best health care is provided free of political interference in the patient-physician relationship.** Personal decision-making by women and their doctors should not be replaced by political ideology.

HB 107 that you support is an extremist bill that attempts to assert personhood and legal rights beginning at conception – which could have staggering impacts on the right to abortion, IVF, and some forms of contraception. This bill could allow **prosecution of abortion providers for murder** – an extreme proposal that is out of line with mainstream science and medicine, and out-of-touch with the will of the majority of people in our state. This bill is not only unconstitutional under Alaska's constitution, it also flies in the face of the will of Alaska voters, who consistently voice their support for abortion rights.

Please remember that Alaska's constitution protects the right to abortion and maybe you should spend more time on topics and projects that Alaskans really need. I am sure you are aware that the state has paid an estimated \$4.1 million in legal fees defending its unconstitutional anti-abortion legislation that the courts repeatedly overturn. Stop wasting time and money on this issue.

Sincerely,
Shellie Worsfold
Homer, AK

Jake Almeida

From: victory lavalle
Sent: Monday, February 26, 2024 15:39
To: House Judiciary
Subject: HB 107

Dear Representative

I am concerned about there recent house bill proposal by rep Vance and rep Tomaszewski,

HB 107 is an extremist bill that attempts to assert personhood and legal rights beginning at conception — which could have staggering impacts on the right to abortion, IVF, and some forms of contraception. This bill will allow **prosecution of abortion providers for murder** — an extreme proposal that is out of line with mainstream science and medicine, and out-of-touch with the will of the majority of people in our state. This bill is not only unconstitutional under Alaska's constitution, it also flies in the face of the will of Alaska voters, who consistently voice their support for abortion rights.

The Facts:

- Personhood provisions open the door to the likelihood of prosecutions and investigations against pregnant people who experience bad pregnancy outcomes, like certain complications, miscarriage, or stillbirth. Worse still, it could subject those who experience these tremendous losses to **criminal convictions and prison sentences**.
- HB 107 adds “an entity that has the moral right to self-determination” to the definition of “person” in the state’s Criminal Law statute, a bizarre and anti-science attempt to establish personhood. It adds an expansive statutory definition of “life” that is vague, ambiguous, and divorced from the practice of medicine, and could be interpreted as encompassing **all living things, including animals and plants**.
- A person experiencing a miscarriage or ectopic pregnancy may need emergency treatment to prevent serious damage to her health or to save their life. This legislation could effectively tie doctors’ hands rather than allowing them to treat their patient without fear of prosecution.
- Alaska’s constitution protects the right to abortion and the state has paid an estimated \$4.1 million in legal fees defending its unconstitutional anti-abortion legislation that the courts repeatedly overturn.

This bill hurts women and strips women of sovereignty of their bodies and basic human rights.

Do Not create this HB

Victory Cheney
Anchorage AK

Jake Almeida

From: Rebecca Friedman
Sent: Monday, February 26, 2024 15:39
To: House Judiciary; Rep. Kevin McCabe
Subject: HB 107

Hello!

I am writing to express my disgust with HB 107. I am a 29 year old woman about to be married and am engaging in family planning discussions with my fiance regularly. I have to tell you, when I learned about HB 107, my stomach dropped. Will I be able to have a family in Alaska like I've planned?

I've learned a lot about how Roe v. Wade's repeal has impacted mothers Southern states - they don't have access to LIFE-SAVING medical care when their pregnancies become medically complex. You'd have to be willingly sticking your head in the sand to not realize how disastrous these "life begins at conception" laws are for REAL couples who are engaging in family planning. I don't want to die in an Anchorage hospital because doctors are **too afraid of breaking the law** to save my life. I don't want to carry a nonviable pregnancy for months because I can't afford to fly out of state for a D&C.

You have the opportunity to do the right thing and save thousands of women's lives and protect the family planning rights of all Alaskans. I urge you to not pass this bill. Women shouldn't have to be fighting this fight anymore.

I appreciate your consideration.

Becky Friedman in Kenai, AK

Jake Almeida

From: Ashley Franklin
Sent: Monday, February 26, 2024 15:44
To: Rep. Kevin McCabe; House Judiciary; Rep. Sarah Vance; Rep. Jamie Allard; Rep. Ben Carpenter; Rep. Craig Johnson; Rep. Jesse Sumner; Rep. Cliff Groh
Cc: Jay Allyn
Subject: Oppose HB 107

Dear Representatives,

I am a family medicine physician living and practicing in Fairbanks, Alaska. I also completed a fellowship in Obstetrics and provide reproductive health care as well as provide care to patients with pregnancy, including high risk.

Please oppose HB 107, a bill that would criminalize doctors who provide reproductive health care. There are occasions other than an abortion in which this bill would directly prevent a doctors' ability to provide necessary health care. Examples include: ectopic pregnancy with fetal heart rate; sudden onset end stage renal disease in the second trimester needing termination to save the life of the mother; chromosomal anomaly incompatible with life in a high risk pregnancy).

Please oppose HB 107, a bill that would violate the privacy of a doctor-patient relationship.

Please oppose HB 107, a bill that would have significant long-term effects including a further strain on our already limited reproductive health care. Just in Fairbanks alone, the city has lost 3 OB/GYNs and 2 midwives. Fairbanks has a dire reproductive health care provider shortage. As seen in other states such as Idaho, Texas, and Alabama, passing laws that impact the ability to provide full scope reproductive care leads to an exodus of physicians.

If HB 107 passes, I would seek to limit the care I provide to patients out of fear of litigation. I would also consider moving out of state. **I do not want to live and work in a state that limits my ability to make educated, evidence based medical decisions.**

Thank you for your time and consideration.

Sincerely,
Ashley Franklin, MD

Jake Almeida

From: Casey Youngblood >
Sent: Monday, February 26, 2024 15:45
To: House Judiciary
Subject: House Bill 107

I opposed this incredible invasion of privacy by the state. I have put up with a lot to stay here because I was born here, it is my home and I love it. But I will sell my house and business and pack up my young daughter to leave this place if this becomes law.

Stay out of women's healthcare decisions.

Respectfully,

Casey Youngblood
Resident of Fairbanks North Star Borough

Jake Almeida

From: Ryan
Sent: Monday, February 26, 2024 10:40
To: House Judiciary
Subject: I Oppose HB107 vehemently

I Oppose HB107 vehemently.

Ryan Haynes

Sent from a mobile device

Jake Almeida

From: Toni Walsh
Sent: Monday, February 26, 2024 15:53
To: House Judiciary
Subject: I oppose HB 107

My name is Toni Walsh and I oppose HB 107. What a blatant religious power grab. I support the right to privacy. Again, I oppose HB 107.

Thank you,
Toni Walsh
Anchorage Resident

Jake Almeida

From:
Sent: Monday, February 26, 2024 15:55
To: House Judiciary
Subject: I Oppose HB 107

My name is Jonathan Cannon and I am writing today to show opposition to the HB 107.

I live and work in Anchorage, AK and can be reached at 907-351-5403

I am fundamentally opposed to HB 107 – redefining the starting point of human life as from conception fundamentally robs the mother of the ability to make decisions about her own body.

Please do not pass this bill.

Thanks -Jon

Jake Almeida

From: Whitney Mauldin
Sent: Monday, February 26, 2024 15:58
To: House Judiciary
Subject: HB 107 opposition

I oppose this bill. The state has no right to determine this.

Whitney Mauldin
Sand Lake, Anchorage, AK

Jake Almeida

From: Lucas Flurry
Sent: Monday, February 26, 2024 16:03
To: House Judiciary
Subject: HB 107

I oppose hb107

Lucas Flurry, Anchorage

Jake Almeida

From: Liz Perry
Sent: Monday, February 26, 2024 16:07
To: House Judiciary
Subject: No to B107

Members of the Alaska House of Representatives,

Under no circumstances should this bill become law. This is overreach to the extreme. This bill has no place in Alaska's constitution and our history of independent living and thinking. The maker of the bill and representatives supporting it should be ashamed of themselves.

We're losing population because of our dire economic circumstances and bills like this will encourage more outmigration. Please focus on that, funding schools, and making Alaska livable again.

Thank you,

Liz Perry
Juneau

Jake Almeida

From: Megan Fritts
Sent: Monday, February 26, 2024 16:08
To: House Judiciary
Subject: OPPOSE HB 107

Megan Fritts
Fishhook, Mat-Su Valley
OPPOSE HB 107

Thanks!

Megan Fritts

Jake Almeida

From: Michelle Sparck
Sent: Monday, February 26, 2024 16:15
To: House Judiciary
Subject: Opposition to HB 107

To the Chairman and members of the House Judiciary Committee,

I am a mother of two healthy children, one is now an adult, and the other a freshman in High School.

My path to motherhood was not easy, and my husband and I experienced grievous loss in pursuit of building a family.

Our first son was born too soon, and the neonatology department advised against life saving measures for him, and he only lived a few hours. I had my other son, after some very uncomfortable procedures to make sure I could carry him to term. In the 12th week of my next pregnancy, there was no heartbeat detected. That far into the development, it required a D&E, a procedure that saved my life, and made the conception, gestation and birth of my daughter possible next.

Maternal-Fetal issues like these affect more women than the public cares to know. They are deeply personal and I resent that as a free American woman, I have to defend my right to privacy by sharing these agonizing experiences in order to preserve my rights and that of my daughter.

Before anyone morally approves of - and sympathizes of my cases only because they were wanted children and I am a straight married woman - I can't imagine forcing girls and women to undergo such scenarios because it fits a stranger's moral standards, legislating morals is dangerously unconstitutional territory. After all, it was only a generation ago that the government health system forced sterilization of many American Indian and Alaska Native women.

Loosing those pregnancies were terrible, but the thought of facing a gauntlet of morally righteous arbiters of 'life' during the course of these developments, or in a post-mortem, is an unwarranted form of policing in the face of such bitter soul crushing disappointments. The state does not belong in my womb, nor should be inserted between me and my doctor, between any girl or woman with their medical team. And state mandated speech and medical procedures are an inhumane affront to living and breathing Americans. *Primum non nocere*

Thank you for your attention.

Michelle, Anchorage

Jake Almeida

From: Nick Parker
Sent: Monday, February 26, 2024 16:32
To: House Judiciary
Subject: HB107 Opposition

Hello, I am a long time Alaskan and plan on dying here. I hate to see attempts like HB107 try to take our voted on rights to privacy away. Defining life at inception is based in religion and this is not a Christian country or a Christian state. Our federal constitution specifically forbids establishment of religion and our state constitution has guaranteed our right to privacy. HB107 is simply an attempt to circumvent our constitutions. I strongly oppose HB107 and strongly support Alaskans right to privacy.

If you don't want an abortion don't get one!

Nicholas Parker

Jake Almeida

From: Toby Currin
Sent: Monday, February 26, 2024 16:35
To: House Judiciary
Subject: Opposing HB 107

Hello, I wanted to offer testimony as I was not available by phone today. I whole heartedly oppose HB 107. I am Dr. Toby Currin from Anchorage. I've never done this before but this required it! So please let me know if there is anything else that is needed.

Thank you for your time
Toby Currin
Sent from my iPhone

Jake Almeida

From: * VaporwaveVibes * >
Sent: Monday, February 26, 2024 16:35
To: House Judiciary
Subject: I oppose house bill 107

Freedoms of Alaskan citizens shouldn't be infringed upon do to religious beliefs

IVF shouldn't be banned

Jake Almeida

From: Kristin Worman
Sent: Monday, February 26, 2024 16:52
To: House Judiciary
Subject: Opposition to HB 107

Good afternoon,
I am a voter in Anchorage and I am writing to oppose House Bill 107.

One of the fundamental principles of the Alaskan way is the respect for privacy. This bill threatens women's health and healthcare privacy and is not a reflection of Alaskan principles. This bill is a stepping stone to forced birth and its passage cannot be allowed.

Respectfully,
Kristin Worman

Jake Almeida

From: Heather Fortune
Sent: Monday, February 26, 2024 17:13
To: House Judiciary
Subject: Oppose HBO 107

i>

Dear Legislators,

Please consider your actions before voting too soon on a bill that has vast ramifications of which you cannot comprehend. We are seeing similar laws too quickly passed in other states, and it is costing them not just state dollars but political capital as well.

Having undergone IVF, I can tell you firsthand the financial strain it cost to start our family, and I can tell you it would have taken me 15 lifetimes to use all my viable embryos. Would we have ever been able to support a family of 30+? No. Would the state have helped? No. Would I have been able to claim them for tax credits?

There are too many issues for you to have grand sweeping and ill impulses.

Sincerely,

Heather Fortune

HF

Jake Almeida

From: Hannah Hill
Sent: Monday, February 20, 2024 11:21
To: House Judiciary
Subject: Opposition to HB 107

My name is Hannah Hill & am I am writing in opposition of HB 107, on my own behalf as an Alaskan resident & voter. HB 107 is unconstitutional, unscientific, anti-woman, anti-life & just extremely poorly written.

It is unbelievably disappointing - yet such a common occurrence - to be forced to repeatedly defend Alaskan's right to privacy against our elected officials' disregard for the law. When did the Constitution become conditional? HB 107 is not written with any scientific understanding of or regard for "biology" - it is a basely theocratic attempt at control, written by people in power who clearly have very little regard for the consistent majority will of Alaskans.

If the men who sponsored this ridiculous bit of governmental overreach actually cared about the "moral right of self-determination," they'd protect the self-determination of those of us who actually can get pregnant. If HB 107's sponsoring Representatives value only certain lives when it's politically convenient to them, then they have no regard for anyone's. Is next year an election year for Mr. McCabe & Mr. Tomaszewski?

HB 107 is an expensively embarrassing waste of the legislation's time, an attack on women's health care & a violation of Alaskan's constitutional rights.

Thank you for your time,

Hannah C. Hill
Fairbanks, Alaska

"Love is an act of will,
both an action & an intention."
-bell hooks

Jake Almeida

From: Autry, Sydney
Sent: Monday, February 26, 2024 17:34
To: House Judiciary
Subject: OPPOSE HB 107

I am writing today to voice my opposition to House Bill 107.

I have lived in Anchorage, Alaska for over ten years working in the oil & gas industry and intend to stay here for the foreseeable future. When I think about my options to live and work, essentially Texas vs Alaska, Alaska is the clear winner in large part due to the existing access to reproductive health care for women. Putting religious-based limitations on women's access to reproductive healthcare goes against the separation of church state, drives away medical professionals that cannot provide the care their patients deserve (already observed in other states like Idaho), and most importantly, puts women's lives in danger when they are unable to access the healthcare they need.

Thank you,
Sydney Autry

Jake Almeida

From: Amanda Lyon >
Sent: Monday, February 26, 2024 17:48
To: Representative.Kevin.McCabe@akleg.gov; House Judiciary; Rep. Sarah Vance; Rep. Jamie Allard; Rep. Ben Carpenter; Rep. Craig Johnson; Rep. Jesse Sumner; Rep. Cliff Groh; Rep. Andrew Gray; Rep. Kevin McCabe
Cc: Rep. Cathy Tilton; Rep. Frank Tomaszewski
Subject: Protect Abortion Access in Alaska

To the House Judiciary Committee and those supporting HB 107,

Abortion is health care. Please oppose HB 107, a bill that would criminalize doctors who provide abortions and reclassify a fetus as a person. This bill is unconstitutional and goes against the will of Alaska voters.

I believe that women should have the right to make their own medical decisions without government interference. This proposal is not in alignment with medical best practice and will put women's health at risk through denial of care or criminalization of care.

Sincerely,
Amanda Lyon

Jake Almeida

From: Lindsay Monty
Sent: Monday, February 26, 2024 17:50
To: House Judiciary
Subject: HB107

Personhood begins at conception? As a grown woman my personhood should not end arbitrarily based on your religious beliefs. If you believe a fertilized egg equates to personhood, and that's your belief based on religion or anecdote, you're welcome to apply it to your own life. We adamantly oppose HB 107. How does this bill improve the lives of Alaskans? In a state with the highest rate of sexual assault, the wish is to further oppress victims by denying healthcare because the minority decided it's more righteous to support a fertilized egg? This bill would usher in the criminalization of miscarriage, abortion, medical treatment and birth control. While Christians definitely need Jesus, politicians need to convey that they've taken basic civics classics and uphold a separation of church vs state. Unless you want my religious beliefs to determine YOUR medical treatment? How does that fair? There's no moral high ground in supporting embryos over Persons, but it's especially hypocritical when the state impedes the delivery of food, healthcare and educational funding to those born and their families. There are so many things that could be done to support healthy babies, education, family planning- but that's not as sexy and politically advantageous as taking up the mantle of the fertilized egg in an election year. It does allow people to clutch pearls and advocate for something, whilst detracting from any actual progress. No thank you. Without education funding, nutritional fortification and sovereignty, is the great reward for growing families ignorance, poverty and faux religiousity? Grand. For political careers I suppose. Not for the women and families of Alaska. I oppose, we oppose this bill and everything it represents. Can't wait to hear what you're coming up with to support the inconvenient, already born persons and families of Alaska.

Lindsay Monty
Fairbanks, Alaska-wise

[Sent from Yahoo Mail on Android](#)

Jake Almeida

From: Cortez Villasenor >
Sent: Monday, February 26, 2024 17:58
To: House Judiciary
Subject: I oppose HB 107

My name Cortez Villasenor.
Resident of Anchorage, AK. Voting district: 15-H
I oppose HB 107.

Jake Almeida

From: LN Lurie (gmail)
Sent: Monday, February 26, 2024 10:27
To: House Judiciary
Subject: I oppose HB107

To whom this may concern,

I live in Anchorage (spenard),
My name is Ellen Lurie
I oppose HB107.

While I agree that *MY* life started when I moved to/resided in Alaska, I don't think that should be the definition for everyone. Especially something that is not able to live on it's own independently.

I have significant reservations about the Alaskan Health Care system being robust enough to take care of it's women now – but you want to have more restrictions and less freedom of choice forced on to fellow Alaskans over a definition/governance made by NOT pregnant women.

LN Lurie

Jake Almeida

From: Paris White
Sent: Monday, February 26, 2024 19:30
To: House Judiciary
Subject: Opposition to HB 107

I live in Anchorage, am a born and raised Alaskan and I vehemently oppose this bill. It is an infringement upon right to privacy and bodily autonomy.

- Paris White
Anchorage, AK

Jake Almeida

From: Esther Smith
Sent: Monday, February 26, 2024 19:42
To: House Judiciary
Subject: Oppose HB 107

Dear House Judiciary Committee,

I am an Alaskan resident and registered voter. I live in Anchorage. I am writing to oppose House Bill 107.

Thank you,
Esther Smith

Jake Almeida

From: Danielle Varney
Sent: Monday, February 26, 2024 19:44
To: House Judiciary
Subject: HB 107

To whom it may concern,

I vehemently oppose HB107. As a woman who has experienced a much-wanted pregnancy that was non-viable and had to rely on medical intervention to end the pregnancy (and to keep from killing me), I cannot even fathom how my world would have changed if I had not been able to have this medical care. And more importantly, why in the hell do I even need to share this information? Why do I need to justify this to ANYONE? If you don't want an abortion because of your religious beliefs - great, but don't you dare tell me how to manage my health and body!

Danielle Varney

Jake Almeida

From: Dawn Elliott
Sent: Monday, February 26, 2024 19:58
To: House Judiciary
Subject: HB107

To all concerned

I am strongly against HB 107. A clump of cells is not a life. Moving forward with this bill will remove healthcare options from hundreds to thousands of women across Alaska. This violates to constitution of Alaska.

Dawn Elliott
Chugiak, Alaska

Jake Almeida

From: Lindsay Standish
Sent: Monday, February 26, 2024 20:05
To: House Judiciary; Rep. Genevieve Mina; Sen. Forrest Dunbar
Subject: House bill 107

I learned about this bill this evening. I, apparently, missed my only opportunity to express my absolute disgust with and non-support for house bill 107. I wish that sneaky naughty, constitution violating bills where an attempt to make people's personal religious beliefs into law, like this one, were noticed to the public better.

I do not support this bill. I have no words to appropriately express how sick to death I am of religious opinions I do not hold being forced upon me in violation of the separation of church and state.

Lindsay

Jake Almeida

From: 'f of Rebecca Siegel

Sent: Monday, February 26, 2024 21:16

To: House Judiciary

Subject: Please oppose HB 105/SB 96, an attack on LGBTQ+ youth and sex ed

Dear Alaska House Judiciary Committee,

Please oppose HB 105/SB 96, Governor Dunleavy's attack on LGBTQ+ youth and sex ed.

Governor Dunleavy's HB 105/SB 96 is an attack on LGBTQ+ youth and will undoubtedly increase bullying, harassment, and stigmatization towards trans students in particular. Through this bill, Dunleavy is attacking Alaska students' sense of safety, making it extremely difficult for LGBTQ+ kids to live healthy and safe lives. All kids deserve to be safe at school. Trans youth should be treated with dignity and respect and should have the opportunity to live a healthy life.

To protect all students' privacy and health, I urge you to oppose HB 105/SB96.

Thank you for your time.

Sincerely,
Rebecca Siegel

Jake Almeida

From: Matthew Bradley
Sent: Monday, February 26, 2024 22:54
To: House Judiciary
Subject: OPPOSE HB 107

Dear House Members,

I would like to formally profess my strong and vocal disapproval of this bill. Not only is it an absurd definition that will only bring harm to your own constituents and even those who support pro-life causes, but it also feels like a pointless waste of time for both the time of the legislature and the inevitable clogging of our bureaucratic and legal systems, overwhelmed as they already are, with uncertainty and doubt. Furthermore, this whole event feels poorly thought-through and horribly timed as multiple other states are currently suffering the consequences of rushed legislation and our state, which so fervently believes in the freedom of autonomy of its people, is not the proper field in which to experiment stunts such as this.

To summarize, I wish to voice my opposition to this bill and hope that our legislature is wise and competent to avoid dragging the citizens they are responsible for into nightmarish experiences bred from their representative's foolishness.

Sincerely and with the greatest of politeness,

Matthew Bradley, Resident of Anchorage

Jake Almeida

From: Susan A
Sent: Monday, February 26, 2024 23:32
To: House Judiciary
Subject: HB107

HB 107

Strongly oppose

We are a military community. We must have only the very best women's health care available for our military members. This bill cuts right at the heart our community members biggest employer and their families. This would most likely condemn soldiers to be sent here on hardship tours, instead of that place their families dreamt of retiring too.

Speaking as a female veteran, I can attest the need for care for females in the military after rapes, sexual trauma, and other violence, it is often needed. As an Alaskan, the care is much more at a greater need.

This is not based scientific terms, unconstitutional in numerous ways, and so vague of definition this could nearly be nonhuman. I will only raise one here, the first amendment is very clear, congress shall make no law pertaining to religion. This has time and time again ended in lawsuits, that the state pays out.

It is the government job is to assist us with things we can not do for ourselves. It has never been the governments job to tell us how to manage our lives.

Please consider the amount of time and money you are wasting on bills that do not better serve our communities, but only segregates us further apart. We are supposed to be building communities and rejuvenating Alaska, this will only add to the Red State Brain Drain. When the suicides, maternal, and infant death rates rise, your values and morals will be represented in thoughts and prayers to our communitys' to ease your guilty conscience and cleanse your spirit, but it will not be appeased.

Susan Allmeroth
Two Rivers

Jake Almeida

From: Crystal
Sent: Tuesday, February 27, 2024 00:02
To: House Judiciary
Subject: Oppose HB 107

The government thinking the church should dictate health issues via law over actual health professionals is beyond disgusting, as a health professional Operating Room RN, the disturbing current Republican trend to ignore reality and science is nothing I thought I would see in my lifetime. I am ashamed of the current conditions of the country, politics, and if Alaska follows the trend of idiocy of the general Republican party the party will find this very purple state will turn blue.

I am a moderate independent, I have voted both republican and democrat in multiple elections. I support those that actually care about the state, my rights and freedoms, and are educated enough to respect the difference between science and religion. Any politician that supports removing abortion rights I will vote against, there is no room for church to dictate and discriminate in the law in this country or state. As a politician you may not understand the science, but educate yourself before you attempt to make a law that goes against every scientific and medical recommendation available. How arrogant to think you know better than anyone else, it's disgusting to watch.

Crystal Hartman RN

Sent from my iPhone

Jake Almeida

From: Paul Gilski
Sent: Tuesday, February 27, 2024 04:45
To: House Judiciary
Subject: I oppose HB 107

Please burn that piece of legislation once we vote against it.

With Respect,

Paul Gil, MSPM, PMP

Jake Almeida

From: Douglas Watts
Sent: Tuesday, February 27, 2024 04:48
To: House Judiciary
Subject: I OPPOSE House Bill 107

Hello,

I would like to give testimony on HB107 life beginning at conception. I strongly believe that this should not be the focus of the state right now which should be focused on funding our schools and making sure our state has a future. I believe Alaska should not be derailed by the anti-choice, anti-freedom and divisional politics of the lower 48. Keep choice in the state for women's health and don't bring forth any anti-abortion regulation. We'll lose critical healthcare professionals and many wonderful people to other states that actually care about freedom.

Doug

Jake Almeida

From: Sarah Puliafico-Oubari
Sent: Tuesday, February 27, 2024 06:36
To: House Judiciary
Subject: HB 107

I am an Alaska voter, and I oppose HB 107.

Sarah Oubari
Eagle River

Sent from my iPhone

Jake Almeida

From: Lawrence Höschel
Sent: Tuesday, February 27, 2024 07:14
To: House Judiciary
Subject: Opposition to HB107

I think my Subject states the premise of this e-mail clear enough.

I'm not even going to regurgitate the various reasons we need access to abortions or list the various negative repercussions of an environment that blatantly criminalizes Abortions, because it's not an argument that we should be having in 2024.

I will list that I am disgusted by the time spent squabbling over the unborn, when we could be spending our time improving the "Life" of those already born. If you all care about life so much, lets put that sort of gumption towards funding our education, improving our medical access, and improving access to nutrition. Let's work toward solutions to decrease domestic violence and homelessness. Maybe, just maybe, let's talk to all the people that are choosing to "End a Life" and determine the why's and start working towards fixing those. I know this might take a little more effort than writing a little house bill that changes the meaning of life, but that's the job you all signed up for.

--

Best Regards,
Lawrence Höschel

Jake Almeida

From: Jayne Hardin
Sent: Tuesday, February 27, 2024 08:11
To: House Judiciary
Subject: HB 107 No!

My name is Jayne Hardin and I live in Dillingham AK. I've lived here for a decade next month.

In these ten years I've seen an erosion of rights, especially for women.

This bill blatantly reduces human women to incubators.

There are no exceptions for life of the mother or rape. Keep in mind we (AK) have the highest rape incidence in the country.

If Alaskan women are forced to carry pregnancies this will have a demonstrable affect on future generations. No child should be a burden or a consequence for having sex; or worse- being assaulted/raped. Many of these unplanned children will require government assistance to be fed, clothed and housed- which will all be seen as a negative. But if you wanted the child born you have to support caring for it. Can't complain about people on food stamps when you forced them to have a baby they didn't want, couldn't afford, and weren't allowed to terminate.

This bill dehumanizes Alaskan women and fundamentally is fighting to remove our rights to bodily autonomy, which is horrifying when Alaskans, especially Native Alaskan women have had to fight so hard for their right to be heard. There are still elders alive who were forcibly sterilized against their will. The inverse (forced pregnancy) also shouldn't be allowed to happen or be promoted or sanctioned by the government.

This will also cause a ton of medical providers to leave the state as they did with Oklahoma, leaving many people with subpar or non-existent healthcare. We already have subpar to horrid healthcare now. Don't make it even worse and take the few resources we people have in favor of a zygote.

It's 2024, not 1824 for the love of God. Don't send us back there because of the radical beliefs of very few that refuse to abide by their own rules and will simply fly out of state for their 'totally justified' abortion when their 15 year old daughter is raped. But will ignore all the girls in the villages that are sexually assaulted and forced to bear children of their abusers, while lambasting them for being 'irresponsible teen mothers'.

Do not let this bill pass, it's an egregious violation of human rights and the right to bodily autonomy.

Regards,
Jayne Hardin
Dillingham, AK

Jake Almeida

From: Savannah Lee
Sent: Tuesday, February 27, 2024 10:17
To: House Judiciary
Subject: Hb 107

To whom it may concern,
I oppose HB 107 and will be looking to see who votes for this when I vote next. I am a homeowner in Ketchikan.
Thanks!
~Savannah

Jake Almeida

From: Jessica Goldberger
Sent: Tuesday, February 27, 2024 08:43
To: House Judiciary
Subject: Opposition to HB107

To Whom It May Concern:

I'd like to send my written opposition to house bill 107. It will negatively affect the ability of doctors to provide medical care for fear of persecution. Decisions affecting the medical condition of a women should be left between her and her doctor.

Please vote against this bill.

Jessica Goldberger, MD, (OBGYN)

Sent from my iPhone

Jake Almeida

From: Daniella Ambrosino May
Sent: Tuesday, February 27, 2024 09:52
To: House Judiciary
Subject: Testimony in opposition to HB 107

Hello,

My name is Daniella May, and I live in Eagle River, Alaska. Thank you for your time. I am emailing today in strong opposition to HB 107. This bill is a disgusting attempt to legislate healthcare, and is unconstitutional under Alaska's constitution. The lawmakers who introduce these bills attempt to impose their religious beliefs onto all citizens of Alaska, which is absolutely egregious. It seems that every year our legislators continue to defy the will of Alaskan residents who consistently vote to support abortion rights. STOP trying to legislate healthcare. You are not healthcare providers, or scientists. This bill is regressive, and has no place in Alaska.

Furthermore this bill is an absolute waste of time in a state that barely attempts to protect, educate and support the children of Alaska who are living. We have a failing education system, a housing crisis, and rising costs of living that threatens the health, and safety of all Alaskans including children. Do better, and actually work to help your constituency instead of this disgusting extremist pandering. Stop attacking the citizens of Alaska. This is not a topic that requires legislation, and it is absolutely disgusting that as legislators you all think that you are fit to impose your extremist views onto your constituency.

--

Regards,
Daniella N. Ambrosino May

Jake Almeida

From: Celia Sheppard
Sent: Tuesday, February 27, 2024 10:16
To: House Judiciary
Subject: HB 107

My name is Celia and I am a community member of Anchorage. I strongly oppose HB 107 and its implications of restricting access to healthcare for many people. We deserve the right to chose what is right for our bodies and especially with the nature of this bill, the choice over our futures as well. I also believe healthcare providers should not be prosecuted for providing any health care services.

Overall I do not support HB 107 at all.

Sincerely,
Celia Sheppard

Jake Almeida

From: Elizabeth Pyanowski
Sent: Tuesday, February 27, 2024 10:21
To: House Judiciary
Subject: Testimony on HB 107

Greetings Esteemed Committee Members,

My name is Elizabeth Pyanowski, I am a resident of Anchorage Alaska, Northeast Anchorage No 2 and I am opposed to HB107. In a state that has more than 50% intimate partner violence and sexual assault against women, approving HB107 is a landslide with no end. The language in this bill is suggestive that women (or people with uteruses) are viewed as "brood stock" to only house an embryo. If, per the language chosen for this bill, an embryo is independent of the womb, how can said embryo exist outside of the womb to "term" or become a baby? Additionally, the final sentence of the bill violates my right as an Alaskan to have a government free from religion or religious views. Abortion care IS healthcare.

Thank you
Elizabeth Pyanowski

Jake Almeida

From: Charlotte James
Sent: Tuesday, February 27, 2024 10:33
To: House Judiciary
Subject: House Bill 107

To whom it may concern,

I strongly oppose house bill 107. The state should not be in control of a persons body or choices. To impose a bill like this on Alaskans to to take away the rights of women. Alaska has the highest rates of sexual assault anywhere.

Do not pass bill 107. Period.

Charlotte James

Jake Almeida

From: Breana Thompson
Sent: Tuesday, February 21, 2024 11:08
To: House Judiciary
Subject: HB 107: OPPOSE Testimony

Hello,
My name is Breana Simants and I live in Fairbanks, Alaska.

I am writing to let you know that I am **opposed** to the HB 107 bill. Abortion is a healthcare right in our Alaskan constitution and should remain untouched by politicians. This is a very personalized decision that should be with the woman making this decision and their healthcare provider, no one else. There are many different reasons someone may have an abortion and it is not anyone's business except for the woman and their healthcare team.

Please write back if you have any additional questions,
Thank you,
-Breana Simants

Jake Almeida

From: Jayne Michelini ·
Sent: Tuesday, February 27, 2024 11:10
To: House Judiciary
Subject: HB 107

Good Morning,

I am writing today in response to HB 107. This bill is a not even veiled attempt to do an end run around the AK Constitution. The sponsor is attempting to insert language that will erode rights in Alaska. It is a waste of time and resources when the legislature should be concentrating on important issues in the budgetary process. Alaskans expect our Reps to spend the time in Juneau working for us, not their personal agendas. I live in the Valley and Rep. McCabe is not working for the concerns we have here. I urge the committee to kill this nonsense and not pass this bill forward.

Jayne Michelini

Mat-Su Valley, AK

Sent from [Mail](#) for Windows



Virus-free www.avast.com

Jake Almeida

From: Ally
Sent: Tuesday, February 27, 2024 11:14
To: House Judiciary
Subject: Public Testimony HB 107

I am Allyson Burdett, I live in the city of Seward, and I strongly oppose HB 107. The vague language that this bill proposes would have drastic negative effects on the livelihood of Alaska women-- despite what Rep. Kevin McCabe claims, this bill will be the catalyst for the criminalization of abortion. The bill goes against the Alaska Constitution and against the will of us voters. Protect abortion rights and protect Alaska women.

Jake Almeida

From: Hooded Raven
Sent: Tuesday, February 27, 2024 11:55
To: House Judiciary
Subject: Don't Support B107

Please do not support HB 107. Decisions regarding personal reproductive health care are best made by the family with the help of professional medical advice not the AK State government. The decision to define embryonic tissue as a person is based in religion and should not be apart of of our State statutes. Please do not support this bill.

Jake Almeida

From: Mary Burtress <
Sent: Tuesday, February 27, 2024 11:44
To: House Judiciary
Subject: NO to HB 107

Members of the committee: I am in total opposition of HB 107. Respect our state constitution!
Mary C Burtress

Jake Almeida

From: Aerial View
Sent: Tuesday, February 27, 2024 11:41
To: House Judiciary
Subject: 55-2 Abortion Rights

To whom it may concern,

As elected representatives, you are there to protect your constituents rights, not take them away. Protect abortion, protect a woman's right to choose.

Sincerely
Kendell Macomber

Jake Almeida

From: RJ Fontaine
Sent: Tuesday, February 27, 2024 12:21
To: House Judiciary
Subject: HB 107: Written Testimony - I OPPOSE

Hello,

My name is RJ Fontaine-McHendry and I grew up in Wasilla. I now reside in Anchorage. Like many people my age (childbearing years, just got married) I want to start a family. This attack on reproductive healthcare (HB107) is forcing me to consider having to leave the country with my husband (likely, fully immigrate out) for the safety of my body and our future children. My family (doctors from Russia) immigrated to America for safety from an all-too-similar propaganda-driven regime the USSR forced on us. We committed wholeheartedly to the United States, built the American Dream for ourselves and in service to others. And now, after all that - There is no way, with this religion-motivated and propaganda-filled campaign against medicine, that I would feel safe to start a family here. It would be an insult to my mother who left Russia to ensure freedom for her descendants, for me to die for being denied care under this kind of policy-making.

For countless Alaskans, you are risking lives and yes, childrens' lives with HB 107. By pursuing nonsense that goes against established modern science, are also wasting already limited state funds to force your people to either leave our community or risk death, in cases of reproductive health concerns, for your religious self-righteousness. I grew up in a conservative Wasilla community. I know exactly what you're afraid of and why you think this is what God wants. I am here to tell you, you're wrong. And it's your fault Alaska's workforce is leaving in droves. Unconstitutional policy-making like this increases suicides, preventable deaths, and educated Alaskans leaving the state.

Not only have the vast majority of my Wasilla childhood friends (working professionals, college educated) LEFT Alaska behind forever due to this kind of nonsense, I no longer have the energy to invite anyone to consider moving here.

Either you throw this bill in the trash, or you are putting a thick nail in the coffin of our economy, healthcare, and constitutional freedom as Americans in the State of Alaska.

I'd like my children to be born and raised here as Alaskans, but not under HB 107. It's not worth risking my death (due to reproductive complications, or suicide as someone with PTSD & triggers related to my bodily autonomy) or my childrens deaths, just to create more taxpayers to support you making more unconstitutional moves like this.

OPPOSE HB 107.

You are wasting more than time with this one.

-RJ Fontaine McHendry
Anchorage, AK

Jake Almeida

From: irblock@
Sent: Tuesday, February 27, 2024 12:52
To: House Judiciary
Subject: Opposition to house bill 107

Hi,

I am testifying my opposition of house bill 107. This bill goes directly against the Alaskan Constitution Article 1 section 22 regarding privacy.

Jake Almeida

From:
Sent: Tuesday, February 27, 2024 12:53
To: House Judiciary
Cc: Sen. James Kaufman; Rep. Julie Coulombe
Subject: HB 107

I do not support HB 107. It is an attempt to control women's choices and body autonomy, where is support for women's "moral right of self-determination"?

Joy Boston, District F11 resident

Jake Almeida

From: Kate Grumbles
Sent: Tuesday, February 27, 2024 13:19
To: House Judiciary
Subject: Testimony - Oppose HB 107

My name is Kate Grumbles, I live in Sitka AK - I would like to state my opposition to HB 107.

I ask that my representatives allow me to have access to the healthcare I need- and receive an abortion if it is needed. Personhood does not begin at conception.

Jake Almeida

From: Ashlyn Johnson ·
Sent: Tuesday, February 27, 2024 15:04
To: House Judiciary; Rep. Sarah Vance; Rep. Jamie Allard; Rep. Ben Carpenter; Rep. Craig Johnson; Rep. Jesse Sumner; Rep. Cliff Groh; Rep. Andrew Gray;
Subject: Representative.Kevin.McCabe@akleg.gov
Opposition to HB 107

Dear Members of the Legislature,

I am writing to express my deep concerns and opposition regarding HB 107, a recent legislative proposal in our state that, if passed, could have devastating consequences similar to those seen in other states where similar bills have been enacted.

The passage of bills akin to HB 107 in other states has led to alarming outcomes, including harm and even loss of life. By criminalizing abortion, these bills have forced healthcare professionals to operate under the constant threat of prosecution and persecution, endangering both their lives and the lives of individuals seeking essential reproductive healthcare services.

In addition to the immediate harm caused by these bills, they also perpetuate harmful stigmas and barriers to accessing reproductive healthcare services, leading to increased rates of unsafe abortions and maternal mortality. This is unacceptable and goes against our shared values of dignity, equality, and justice for all individuals.

We cannot afford to repeat history and jeopardize the health and well-being of our communities by passing legislation that restricts access to essential reproductive healthcare services.

Thank you for your attention to this matter. I trust that you will approach this issue with empathy, compassion, and a commitment to promoting the health and well-being of all.

Sincerely,

Ashlyn Johnson

--

~ I live and work on Dena'ina lands ~

Jake Almeida

From: Nikki Davis
Sent: Tuesday, February 27, 2024 15:45
To: House Judiciary
Cc: Rep. Zack Fields; Rep. Frank Tomaszewski; Rep. Kevin McCabe
Subject: HB 107 Opposition Letter

Dear Members of the House Judiciary Committee,

I am writing to express my strong opposition to House Bill 107, introduced by Representatives McCabe and Tomaszewski. As a concerned citizen of Alaska, I believe that the proposed amendments to AS 11.81.900 would have significant negative consequences and fail to uphold the principles of justice and human rights.

The proposed amendment to AS 11.81.900(b)(47), expanding the definition of "person" to include entities such as organizations, governments, or governmental instrumentalities, is deeply concerning. By equating these entities with natural persons who possess the moral right of self-determination, the bill opens the door to potential misuse and abuse of power. Granting legal personhood to non-human entities could undermine the fundamental rights and protections afforded to individuals, potentially leading to violations of civil liberties and unchecked corporate influence.

Furthermore, the addition of a new definition for "life" in AS 11.81.900(b)(69) is problematic. While it is essential to define terms accurately within criminal law, the proposed definition lacks clarity and precision. By attempting to encapsulate the complex concept of life within a legal framework, the bill oversimplifies and diminishes its significance. Life encompasses a wide range of phenomena that extend beyond mere biological functions, including consciousness, autonomy, and dignity. This reductionist approach fails to acknowledge the inherent value and intrinsic worth of all living beings.

Additionally, the retroactive applicability clause included in Section 3 of the bill is unjust and contrary to the principles of fairness and due process. Retroactive laws have the potential to disrupt settled expectations, undermine legal certainty, and violate the rights of individuals who may have acted in accordance with the law as it stood at the time of their actions. Such retroactive application could lead to unjust outcomes and erode public trust in the legal system.

Moreover, it's evident that this bill represents a thinly veiled attempt to restrict reproductive rights and outlaw abortion. Such legislative efforts not only undermine the rights guaranteed by the Alaska Constitution, including the right to privacy, but also jeopardize the health and autonomy of individuals across the state. Attempting to impose ideological beliefs through the guise of criminal law definitions is not only disingenuous but also fundamentally unconstitutional.

In conclusion, I urge you to reject House Bill 107 in its current form. Instead, I encourage the committee to engage in meaningful dialogue and consultation with stakeholders to address any legitimate concerns regarding criminal law definitions in Alaska. It is essential to ensure that any proposed changes uphold the principles of justice, fairness, and respect for human rights.

Thank you for considering my perspective on this important matter.

Sincerely,

Nikki Davis
Anchorage, AK

Jake Almeida

From: Dylan G.
Sent: Tuesday, February 27, 2024 10:21
To: House Judiciary
Subject: Against HB 107

Hello,

I wanted to reach out to have my voice heard that I adamantly oppose HB 107. It's a reckless, uninformed bill that would have direct devastating impacts on Alaskan lives. Please do not allow this to pass.

Thank you,
Dylan Gillespie
Seward, AK

Jake Almeida

From: Claire Sharp · >
Sent: Tuesday, February 27, 2024 18:04
To: House Judiciary
Subject: Testimony against HB 107

My name is Claire Sharp, I am an Anchorage resident living in the Klatt area. I am opposed to this bill. One of the beautiful things about Alaskan values is the value of freedom and this significantly inhibits my freedom to have a child when I plan to and not have my body used for the will of other people's.

This also would put me in danger during a pregnancy. The U.S. already has the highest maternal death rate of any country of its status and medical care for pregnant women is not good. Abortion care is an important part of saving the lives of pregnant mothers. I would be too terrified to even try to have a child during this time with a change that abortion care might not be available if I have a life threatening issue with a pregnancy.

This is an attack on women's liberty and health and livelihood.

Thank you for your time,
Claire Sharp



**The American College of
Obstetricians and Gynecologists**
WOMEN'S HEALTH CARE PHYSICIANS

February 27, 2024

Alaska House Judiciary and Alaska House of Representatives

Members of the Alaska House Judiciary and Alaska House of Representatives :

The Alaska Section of the American College of Obstetricians and Gynecologists (ACOG), representing physicians and partners in Alaska dedicated to advancing the health of all those in need of obstetric and gynecologic care, strongly opposes HB 107, which would amend the definition of "person" and "life" under Alaska's criminal statute. This legislation poses a significant threat to the personal rights, privacy, and health care of individuals in Alaska, as it attempts to confer "personhood" to a fertilized egg, embryo, or fetus.

Elevating the legal status of fertilized eggs to that of women and pregnant people has wide implications for health care privacy, access to medications, medical interventions, and management of high-risk pregnancies. In addition, HB 107 opens the door to further restrict patients' access to the reproductive care they need, such as emergency contraception, in vitro fertilization, and birth control.

Furthermore, HB 381 would set a dangerous precedent by allowing the government to dictate language in medical and legal contexts. This could lead to further infringement upon bodily autonomy and erosion of trust in medical experts, which could harm patients and the clinicians who care for them. Shared decision-making must remain solely between patients and physicians and must continue to rely on science, best practices, and individual needs to determine appropriate medical care without political interference. Ultimately, requiring physicians to treat an egg, embryo, or fetus as a person with the same scope of rights as people in their care will jeopardize the lives and health of those patients.

Again, we urge you to oppose HB 107, as it threatens the rights, autonomy, and privacy of Alaskans. Science must be at the core of our legal framework to ensure clarity and respect for all perspectives. Thank you for your attention to this matter.

Sincerely,

Sarah Truitt, MD, FACOG

ACOG Alaska Section Chair

Jake Almeida

From: Jessica
Sent: Wednesday, February 28, 2024 21:04
To: House Judiciary
Subject: HB 107

Hello members of the House Judiciary Committee,

I'm writing to ask that you oppose HB 107. This bill is not based on CURRENT medical knowledge. If enacted, would deter me from wanting to have children for fear of not being able to access the medical care I may need to save my life should something terrible occur. Please stop trying to impose your religious views on other Alaskans who do not share your same theological views.

Thank you,
Jessica Hoffman
Anchorage

Jake Almeida

From: Emily Andrulli
Sent: Thursday, February 29, 2024 16:35
To: House Judiciary
Subject: HB 107

ALASKANS SUPPORT SAFE, LEGAL ABORTION! KEEP YOUR FILTHY FUCKING PAWS OFF OF WOMENS REPRODUCTIVE RIGHTS!

Sent from my iPhone

Jake Almeida

From: Landa Baily
Sent: Thursday, February 29, 2024 10:30
To: House Judiciary
Cc: Rep. Cliff Groh; Rep. Sarah Vance; Sen. Gary Stevens; Rep. Andrew Gray
Subject: OPPOSED: HB 107 Define Person Life

For the House Judiciary Committee Record:

Make no mistake: **HB 107 is an abortion bill.** The sponsor denied that the intent is to get an abortion bill passed via HB 107, but the bill would impact reproductive health decisions and invitro fertilization practices in Alaska. Per the Attorney General's Office representative, a care provider could be charged with felony crimes related to those health issues.

Government is not the ingredient necessary for families in Alaska to decide reproductive decisions or their reproductive health, and is not the burning issue.

I heard the public testimony and predict an exodus of child bearing women and men from Alaska, who don't want to live in an anti abortion state, and who seek IVF treatment so they can have a family.

HB 107 is unconstitutional on several fronts: It infringes on freedom of religion; it violates Alaska's constitutional right to privacy; and it is vague.

Why is there no legal analysis from Legislative Legal in the available documents? Why is there no written legal opinion from the Attorney General's office in the available documents?

Defining when life begins or what is a person imposes a religious belief; imposition of a religious belief is unconstitutional.

The bill is also, according to the Attorney General's office representative, vague. That means it will necessarily need extensive litigation, impacting the Alaska Court System. To my knowledge, the House Judiciary Committee has not obtained a fiscal note from the Alaska Court System. The Alaska Department of Law's fiscal note states it is impossible to predict the cost to Alaska to litigate the provisions in HB 107.

The lack of a definitive fiscal note from the Alaska Department of Law and the total lack of a fiscal note from the Alaska Court System is a failure on the part of the Chair, the Vice Chair and the House Judiciary special assistant.

Finally, this bill has the potential to produce a firestorm of controversy among the members of the Alaska House of Representatives.

Alaskans are worried about housing; keeping schools open; roads plowed and maintained; federal funds getting dispersed to school districts and the Alaska Department of Transportation; state funds getting timely dispersed to non-profits at the community level; and other basic issues like solving the looming energy crisis for all of Anchorage, the Kenai Peninsula, and many other parts of Alaska. As you know, just on the energy crisis level: we must have heat in our homes; if we don't have heat, the values of our homes plummet with tidal wave effects on banks, insurance providers, all utility providers, and all large and small businesses. Those effects are not what I think is helpful to working Alaskan families.

Having an unnecessary philosophical debate on what is or what is not a person/life taking up time in the House Judiciary or on the floor of the Alaska House of Representatives is not what Alaskans need right now, and the issue of abortion is not likely helpful to pass laws designed to enhance Alaska's economy, the burning question.

HB 107 is an embarrassment: Any lawyer admitted to the Alaska Bar Association would recite the constitutional problems with HB 107, and would further inquire why the House Judiciary Committee of our Great State of Alaska's Legislature is giving bandwidth to patently unconstitutional proposed legislation. HB 107 should be quietly allowed to perish in House Judiciary Committee. The focus of all House members should be held on issues that affect schools, home heating fuel, roads that get us to and from work, adequate housing, ensuring federal funds are dispersed for education and

transportation projects, along with myriad other economic issues, most notably how to reign in the billions of dollars wasted by AIDA.

No further hearings should be held in the House Judiciary Committee on HB 107. The Chair should issue an apology to Alaskans who value Alaska's Constitution for having taken two House Judiciary Committee meetings on **this unconstitutional legislation designed, in my opinion, to 'wave the flag of anti-abortion' in order to get campaign donations from various anti reproductive choice groups.**

Thank you and regards,
Landa Baily
Homer, Alaska

PS: Strong letter to follow.

Jake Almeida

From: Heather MacFarlane · 1>
Sent: Thursday, February 29, 2024 18:39
To: House Judiciary
Subject: Comments on HB 107

Hello,

I am a mom, wife, and voter in Fairbanks. I am writing to express my absolute disgust with the proposed HB 107. This bill is a thinly-veiled attempt to regulate a woman's right to manage her own healthcare. This is not about defining life. This is about controlling women. The government has absolutely NO business in my personal life or in my doctor's office. My decision to have a child remains between me and my husband, and no one else.

Furthermore, I am appalled that the same legislators who are putting forth this bill are the same ones who will not advocate for fully funding our schools. If you feel a fetus deserves personhood status, then you need to support that person through their whole life--otherwise how else am I supposed to believe you actually care about the baby, and not just about controlling the mother?

Please reject HB 107 and any other bill that attempts government overreach into Alaskans' private healthcare decisions.

Thank you for your time,
Heather MacFarlane
Fairbanks

Jake Almeida

From: Sue Steinacher
Sent: Friday, March 1, 2024 08:20
To: Rep. Kevin McCabe; House Judiciary; Rep. Sarah Vance; Rep. Jamie Allard; Rep. Ben Carpenter; Rep. Craig Johnson; Rep. Jesse Sumner; Rep. Cliff Groh; Rep. Andrew Gray
Subject: HB 107

Dear Representatives,

You may not represent my district in Nome, but the laws you propose and vote on impact all Alaskan residents.

I am a 44-year resident of Alaska, steadfastly opposed to HB 107. How can a State that has always valued personal freedom and responsibility, not recognize and honor that having control over the direction over one's body and one's entire future, by having the freedom to decide if and when to have a child, is the most intimate and personal freedom an individual possesses? Freedom from government intrusion seems to primarily be applied to the right to own guns, and to resist paying taxes, but the control over one's very own body, and one's future, is a far more significant and essential freedom.

Legislators and anti-abortionists seem to think that women are casually using abortion as a regular form of birth control – which is not only inaccurate but insulting. Nobody wants to have to undergo an abortion. It takes two people to create a pregnancy, and even taking all precautions, pregnancy is not 100% preventable - and yet only one partner's future hangs in the balance. We celebrate the options open to women, from becoming an astronaut, a surgeon, a teacher, a fighter pilot, to choosing to be a mother. But these options require freedom of choice – not government dictate.

For many women who very much want a child, their pregnancy doesn't go as they'd hoped, and an abortion may be necessary to save their life, and to make it possible for them to have another chance to carry a pregnancy to term.

What is also either misunderstood or overlooked is that at least 60% of women seeking abortions are already mothers. These are women acting responsibly for the well-being of the children they already have, recognizing that they simply cannot afford another child financially or emotionally. This bill would require a child to be born against the mother's desire. To genuinely respect life, a child deserves to be wanted, not mandated by the government.

In 2021, the United Nations High Commission on Human Rights wrote, "It is shocking to see the extent to which the authorities have applied criminal law to restrict women's fundamental rights. This law violates the rights to life and health, the right to non-discrimination and equality, and the right to freedom of expression by making it illegal to access a range of reproductive health services." They were referring to a law criminalizing abortion that was passed - in Iran - the country we demonize for turning their religious Sharia law into government law. This effort for our government, at a local, state or federal level, to determine when human life begins, and take control of a woman's body and choice, seems very much to resemble a Christian version of Sharia law.

Despite the views of certain groups in our country, there is NO consensus of religious beliefs on when human life has reached a stage such that it needs to be protected. And frankly, there never will be. This is a religious and spiritual question – not one for the government to determine. Our country is founded on religious freedom, and every woman should be free to follow her own faith in deciding to choose or reject the option of abortion.

I steadfastly oppose legislating one religious group's beliefs over another's. It is a violation of our country's Founders belief in the separation of Church and State. It is also a violation of the First Amendment to the US Constitution, which prevents the government from prohibiting the free exercise of religion. My faith is as a Quaker, and I am a supporter of abortion rights because MY Christian belief is that a woman's choice is a matter of individual conscience to be taken in relationship with her God, not her government, as she weighs the multiple impacts of pregnancy.

I absolutely do not support HB 107. I would never support the government legislating that a woman must have an abortion, just as I cannot support the government legislating that having or performing an abortion is a criminal act. This is a personal faith decision – not a government decision.

With sincere conviction,

Sue Steinacher

Despite the views of some individuals, there is NOT a consensus of religious beliefs in our country as to when a human life has reached a stage such that it needs to be protected. It is a violation of the First Amendment of our US Constitution for the government to pass a law that infringes on my free exercise of religion. As a Quaker, I support abortion rights because my Christian belief is that a woman's choice is a matter of individual conscience to be taken in relationship with her God, not her government, as she weighs the multiple impacts of pregnancy. Therefore, even on religious grounds a woman should be free to choose or to reject the option of abortion without government intervention.

I absolutely do not support HB 107.

Despite the views of certain groups in our country, there is NO consensus of religious beliefs on when human life has reached a stage such that it needs to be protected. And frankly, there never will be. This is a religious and spiritual question – not one for the government to determine. And our country is founded on religious freedom. This is why every woman should be free to follow her own faith in deciding to choose or reject the option of abortion.

I steadfastly oppose, as did our country's Founders, legislating one religious group's beliefs over another's. This is also in violation of the First Amendment to the US Constitution, which prevents the government from prohibiting the free exercise of religion. My faith is as a Quaker, and I am a supporter of abortion rights because my Christian belief is that a woman's choice is a matter of individual conscience to be taken in relationship with her God, not her government, as she weighs the multiple impacts of pregnancy.

I absolutely do not support HB 107. It is a violation of our country's foundation of the separation of Church and State. I would never support the government legislating that a woman must have an abortion, just as I cannot support the government legislating that a woman must carry a pregnancy to term. This is a personal faith decision – not a government decision.

It is a violation of the First Amendment for the government to pass a law that infringes on my free exercise of religion. In our country, there is no consensus of religious beliefs on when human life has reached a stage such that it needs to be protected. My Christian faith is as a Quaker, and I support abortion rights because my religious belief is that a woman's choice is a matter of individual conscience to be taken in relationship with her God, not her government, as she weighs the multiple impacts of pregnancy. This is why every woman should be free to choose or to reject the option of abortion without government intervention.

Jake Almeida

From: ivy ivanoff
Sent: Monday, March 4, 2024 08:16
Subject: HB 107

Hello,

I am a registered nurse, home owner and lifelong Alaskan. I am emailing to ask that you do not support the proposed HB 107 regarding fetal personhood. It is unconstitutional and would be antithesis to the rights of Alaskan women. Not to mention create a huge mess like in Alabama.

Please do the right thing.

Thank you.
Ivy Ivanoff

Jake Almeida

From: Jarret Freeman
Sent: Monday, March 4, 2024 11:35
To: House Judiciary
Subject: FW: HB 107

-----Original Message-----

From: Evan Anderson <Evan.Anderson@akleg.gov>
Sent: Monday, March 4, 2024 11:12 AM
To: Robert Ballinger <Robert.Ballinger@akleg.gov>
Cc: Rep. Sarah Vance <Rep.Sarah.Vance@akleg.gov>;
Subject: FW: HB 107

Hi Mr. Ballinger,

Rep. Fields received this communication from a voter opposed to HB 107. He requests that Ms. Taylor's letter be added to BASIS.

Best,

Evan Anderson
Office of Rep. Fields

-----Original Message-----

From: Barbara Taylor
Sent: Wednesday, February 28, 2024 1:20 PM
To: Rep. Zack Fields <Rep.Zack.Fields@akleg.gov>
Subject: HB 107

Again a women's rights are up for discussion and eradication. Please do not vote for this.

Barbara Taylor

[Handwritten signature]

Sent from my iPhone

Jake Almeida

From: Jarret Freeman
Sent: Monday, March 4, 2024 11:35
To: House Judiciary
Subject: FW: Abortio

-----Original Message-----

From: Evan Anderson <Evan.Anderson@akleg.gov>
Sent: Monday, March 4, 2024 11:12 AM
To: Robert Ballinger <Robert.Ballinger@akleg.gov>
Cc: Rep. Sarah Vance <Rep.Sarah.Vance@akleg.gov>;
Subject: FW: Abortio

Hi Mr. Ballinger,

Rep. Fields received this communication from a constituent opposed to HB 107. He requests that Ms. Drury's letter be added to BASIS.

Best,

Evan Anderson
Office of Rep. Fields

-----Original Message-----

From
Sent: Monday, February 26, 2024 11:49 AM
To: Rep. Zack Fields <Rep.Zack.Fields@akleg.gov>
Subject: Abortio

Dear Representative Zack Fields,

HB107 is an awful lot of government overstep for a state that prides itself on libertarian ideals...

Abortion is health care. Please oppose HB 107, a bill that would criminalize doctors who provide abortion and reclassify a fetus as a person. This bill is unconstitutional and goes against the will of Alaska voters.

Sincerely,
Tica Drury

Jake Almeida

From: Jarret Freeman
Sent: Monday, March 4, 2024 11:44
To: House Judiciary
Subject: FW: Protect Abortion Access in Alaska

-----Original Message-----

From: Evan Anderson <Evan.Anderson@akleg.gov>
Sent: Monday, March 4, 2024 11:10 AM
To: Robert Ballinger <Robert.Ballinger@akleg.gov>
Cc: Rep. Sarah Vance <Rep.Sarah.Vance@akleg.gov>
Subject: FW: Protect Abortion Access in Alaska

Hi Mr. Ballinger,

Rep. Fields received this communication from a constituent opposed to HB 107. He requests that Ms. Pillifant's letter be added to BASIS.

Best,

Evan Anderson
Office of Rep. Fields

-----Original Message-----

From:
Sent: Wednesday, February 21, 2024 4:12 PM
To: Rep. Zack Fields <Rep.Zack.Fields@akleg.gov>
Subject: Protect Abortion Access in Alaska

Dear Representative Zack Fields,

Abortion is health care. Please oppose HB 107, a bill that would criminalize doctors who provide abortion and reclassify a fetus as a person. This bill is unconstitutional and goes against the will of Alaska voters.

Sincerely,
Amelia, Alaska resident

Sincerely,
Amelia Pillifant

Jake Almeida

From: Jarret Freeman
Sent: Monday, March 4, 2024 11:44
To: House Judiciary
Subject: FW: OPPOSE HB 107

From: Evan Anderson <Evan.Anderson@akleg.gov>
Sent: Monday, March 4, 2024 11:10 AM
To: Robert Ballinger <Robert.Ballinger@akleg.gov>
Cc: Rep. Sarah Vance <Rep.Sarah.Vance@akleg.gov>;
Subject: FW: OPPOSE HB 107

Hi Mr. Ballinger,

Rep. Fields received this communication from a voter opposed to HB 107. He requests that Ms. Brewer's letter be added to BASIS.

Best,

Evan Anderson
Office of Rep. Fields

From: Kira Brewer
Sent: Saturday, February 24, 2024 11:22 AM
To: Rep. Zack Fields <Rep.Zack.Fields@akleg.gov>
Subject: OPPOSE HB 107

Dear Representative Fields,

My name is Kira Brewer and I live in Fairbanks Alaska. I STRONGLY OPPOSE HB 107 and all of the negative implications this bill will have on women's reproductive health. By deciding that personhood and legal rights begin at conception, this bill will undoubtedly lead to denying women the right to privacy in their decisions about their own body. This includes, but is not limited to, a woman's right to choose when and if they want to start a family and difficult medical and health decisions that impact their own safety during this process. These are the very rights to privacy that our own Alaska state constitution protects. In 2022 voters across the state overwhelmingly decided AGAINST holding a convention, much in part to protect any changes to women's rights.

This bill is terrifying to me on so many levels. As a woman who is currently trying to start a family, this bill is a certain step towards stripping me of my rights to a safe pregnancy, medical care related to potential miscarriages, as well as the possibility of using IVF to conceive a child. As the wife of a hospital emergency room provider, this bill is incredibly concerning because it will put my husband at risk of criminal prosecution for providing life-saving, necessary measures in emergency situations involving women's health.

Bills such as HB 107 are NOT the way to protect lives. I am asking you to PLEASE listen to your constituents and protect women's rights to safe and effective reproductive healthcare in our great state. As the founders of our great country believed, we must continue to keep a separation of church and state so that the religious beliefs of any elected officials do not impact the laws that protect the bodily autonomy of others. We are counting on you, our elected officials, to protect our rights as Alaskans and as women.

Kira Brewer
Fairbanks, AK

Jake Almeida

From: Jarret Freeman
Sent: Monday, March 4, 2024 11:45
To: House Judiciary
Subject: FW: HB 107 Opposition Letter

From: Rep. Zack Fields <Rep.Zack.Fields@akleg.gov>
Sent: Monday, March 4, 2024 11:08 AM
To: Robert Ballinger <Robert.Ballinger@akleg.gov>
Cc: Rep. Sarah Vance <Rep.Sarah.Vance@akleg.gov>;
Subject: FW: HB 107 Opposition Letter

Hi Mr. Ballinger,

Rep. Fields received this communication from a constituent opposed to HB 107. He requests that Ms. Davis' letter be added to BASIS.

Best,
Evan Anderson
Office of Rep. Fields

From: Nikki Davis
Sent: Tuesday, February 27, 2024 5:45 PM
To: House Judiciary <House.Judiciary@akleg.gov>
Cc: Rep. Zack Fields <Rep.Zack.Fields@akleg.gov>; Rep. Frank Tomaszewski <Rep.Frank.Tomaszewski@akleg.gov>; Rep. Kevin McCabe <Rep.Kevin.McCabe@akleg.gov>
Subject: HB 107 Opposition Letter

Dear Members of the House Judiciary Committee,

I am writing to express my strong opposition to House Bill 107, introduced by Representatives McCabe and Tomaszewski. As a concerned citizen of Alaska, I believe that the proposed amendments to AS 11.81.900 would have significant negative consequences and fail to uphold the principles of justice and human rights.

The proposed amendment to AS 11.81.900(b)(47), expanding the definition of "person" to include entities such as organizations, governments, or governmental instrumentalities, is deeply concerning. By equating these entities with natural persons who possess the moral right of self-determination, the bill opens the door to potential misuse and abuse of power. Granting legal personhood to non-human entities could undermine the fundamental rights and protections afforded to individuals, potentially leading to violations of civil liberties and unchecked corporate influence.

Furthermore, the addition of a new definition for "life" in AS 11.81.900(b)(69) is problematic. While it is essential to define terms accurately within criminal law, the proposed definition lacks clarity and

precision. By attempting to encapsulate the complex concept of life within a legal framework, the bill oversimplifies and diminishes its significance. Life encompasses a wide range of phenomena that extend beyond mere biological functions, including consciousness, autonomy, and dignity. This reductionist approach fails to acknowledge the inherent value and intrinsic worth of all living beings.

Additionally, the retroactive applicability clause included in Section 3 of the bill is unjust and contrary to the principles of fairness and due process. Retroactive laws have the potential to disrupt settled expectations, undermine legal certainty, and violate the rights of individuals who may have acted in accordance with the law as it stood at the time of their actions. Such retroactive application could lead to unjust outcomes and erode public trust in the legal system.

Moreover, it's evident that this bill represents a thinly veiled attempt to restrict reproductive rights and outlaw abortion. Such legislative efforts not only undermine the rights guaranteed by the Alaska Constitution, including the right to privacy, but also jeopardize the health and autonomy of individuals across the state. Attempting to impose ideological beliefs through the guise of criminal law definitions is not only disingenuous but also fundamentally unconstitutional.

In conclusion, I urge you to reject House Bill 107 in its current form. Instead, I encourage the committee to engage in meaningful dialogue and consultation with stakeholders to address any legitimate concerns regarding criminal law definitions in Alaska. It is essential to ensure that any proposed changes uphold the principles of justice, fairness, and respect for human rights.

Thank you for considering my perspective on this important matter.

Sincerely,

Nikki Davis
Anchorage, AK

Jake Almeida

From: Jarret Freeman
Sent: Monday, March 4, 2024 11:46
To: House Judiciary
Subject: FW: Protect Abortion Access in Alaska

-----Original Message-----

From: Evan Anderson <Evan.Anderson@akleg.gov>
Sent: Monday, March 4, 2024 11:07 AM
To: Robert Ballinger <Robert.Ballinger@akleg.gov>
Cc: Rep. Sarah Vance <Rep.Sarah.Vance@akleg.gov>;
Subject: FW: Protect Abortion Access in Alaska

Hi Mr. Ballinger,

Rep. Fields received this communication from a constituent opposed to HB 107. He requests that Mr. Goodnight's letter be added to BASIS.

Best,
Evan Anderson
Office of Rep. Fields

-----Original Message-----

From:
Sent: Saturday, February 24, 2024 12:55 PM
To: Rep. Zack Fields <Rep.Zack.Fields@akleg.gov>
Subject: Protect Abortion Access in Alaska

Dear Representative Zack Fields,

Abortion is health care. Please oppose HB 107, a bill that would criminalize doctors who provide abortion and reclassify a fetus as a person. This bill is unconstitutional and goes against the will of Alaska voters. Any progression of this bill would jeopardize the health of Alaskans. At a time when any health care for Alaskans is costly and difficult. Please keep the separation of church and state in tact!

Sincerely,
Tyler Goodnight

Jake Almeida

From: Jarret Freeman
Sent: Monday, March 4, 2024 11:46
To: House Judiciary
Subject: FW: Protect Alaskan's Right to Abortion

From: Evan Anderson <Evan.Anderson@akleg.gov>
Sent: Monday, March 4, 2024 11:07 AM
To: Robert Ballinger <Robert.Ballinger@akleg.gov>
Cc: Rep. Sarah Vance <Rep.Sarah.Vance@akleg.gov>
Subject: FW: Protect Alaskan's Right to Abortion

Hi Mr. Ballinger,

Rep. Fields received this communication from a constituent opposed to HB 107. He requests that Ms. Walsh's letter be added to BASIS.

Best,
Evan Anderson
Office of Rep. Fields

From: Zan Walsh
Sent: Friday, February 23, 2024 4:18 PM
To: Rep. Zack Fields <Rep.Zack.Fields@akleg.gov>
Subject: Protect Alaskan's Right to Abortion

Dear Representative Fields,

HB 107 is dangerous to Alaskan women and healthcare providers alike.

Abortion is health care. HB 107 would seek to criminalize doctors who provide abortion and reclassify a fetus as a person. The very definition of "a person" offered in the bill is vague and scientifically unsound. This bill is unconstitutional and goes against the will of Alaska voters.

Alaskan medical practitioners, women and their families are at risk and need our support. Please oppose HB 107.

Sincerely,

--
Zan Walsh

Jake Almeida

From: Jarret Freeman
Sent: Monday, March 4, 2024 11:46
To: House Judiciary
Subject: FW: Protect Abortion Access in Alaska

-----Original Message-----

From: Evan Anderson <Evan.Anderson@akleg.gov>
Sent: Monday, March 4, 2024 11:05 AM
To: Robert Ballinger <Robert.Ballinger@akleg.gov>
Cc: Rep. Sarah Vance <Rep.Sarah.Vance@akleg.gov>; maria crawfor
Subject: FW: Protect Abortion Access in Alaska

Hi Mr. Ballinger,

Rep. Fields received this communication from a constituent opposed to HB 107. He requests that Ms. Crawford's letter be added to BASIS.

Best,
Evan Anderson
Office of Rep. Fields

-----Original Message-----

Sent: Monday, February 19, 2024 6:18 PM
To: Rep. Zack Fields <Rep.Zack.Fields@akleg.gov>
Subject: Protect Abortion Access in Alaska

Dear Representative Zack Fields,

Abortion is health care. Please oppose HB 107, a bill that would criminalize doctors who provide abortion and reclassify a fetus as a person. This bill is unconstitutional and goes against the will of Alaska voters.

Sincerely,
Maria Crawford

Jake Almeida

From: Rebecca Siegel
Sent: Sunday, March 10, 2024 17:50
To: House Judiciary
Subject: Public Comment: HB 107

To the House Judiciary Committee:

I am a female-bodied Alaskan and I strongly opposed HB 107. This bill would violate my right to appropriate medical care. I, like the majority of Alaskans, support abortion rights.

I have serious fears about the personhood provisions in this bill. Here is why: I have many dear friends who have experienced miscarriages, stillbirth, and even delivered babies that lived for only a matter of minutes after birth. These experiences were heartbreakin and traumatic for my friends. The personhood provisions in this bill would subject these grieving people to criminal convictions and prison sentences for medical conditions that they could not control.

Furthermore, the language in this bill is vague and imprecise, by adding “an entity that has the moral right to self-determination” to the definition of “person” in the state’s Criminal Law statute. This could be interpreted as encompassing all living things, including bacteria. I don’t know about you, but I don’t think that a bill that could jeopardize my ability to take antibiotics when I have strep throat is a bill that should be passed.

Finally, this bill endangers the life and health of pregnant people. Conditions such as ectopic pregnancy can require emergency treatment to protect the health and life of a pregnant person. This legislation could effectively tie doctors’ hands rather than allowing them to treat their patient without fear of prosecution. If this bill passes, I would not feel safe being pregnant in Alaska.

Sincerely,
Rebecca Siegel

Jake Almeida

From: Marissa Palmer ·
Sent: Monday, March 11, 2024 19:04
To: House Judiciary
Subject: Oppose HB 107

To the member of the Alaska House Judiciary Committee,

I am writing to urge you to oppose HB 107. This bill is unconstitutional and goes against the will of Alaska voters. This bill is a waste of the limited time you have during the session.

Sincerely,
Marissa Palmer
Anchorage, AK 99504

Jake Almeida

From: Honalee
Sent: Wednesday, March 13, 2024 11:18
To: House Judiciary
Subject: Regarding HB 107 Criminalizing Abortion in Alaska

Dear Representatives -

I am a lifelong Alaskan (39+ years) and I want to add my voice to say that it is infuriating to see a bill like HB 107 even suggested (again)! This is a gross misuse of the limited time and money the state has to address actual real issues that are having a serious impact on your constituent's lives (housing costs, rampant poverty, school funding, road maintenance, and so much more).

Our bodies are our own, and not even in death can our organs be taken to save a life without our permission, so as in life-- no part of our body shall be taken to sustain another; a woman's uterus is not anyone else's to police, commandeer or control. To deny the use of our body to sustain another's life is NOT a criminal act, to force us to do so IS a criminal act.

I respectfully request that my state representatives (especially Rep. McCabe) revisit the concepts of the 'separation of church and state' and 'freedom' as I believe it will aid in their understanding the reason so many of Alaskan constituents are telling you to vote 'No', and throw out this trash-pile of a bill. I also suggest someone put forth a bill to counter any further wastage of time and taxes trying to bring such vile legislation up again, to automatically fine any representative who uses religious ideology to argue their point on any matter, as to do so is a blatant disregard of our constitutions. Should any rep. find they cannot separate their personal religious beliefs of having such an authority over others, from their duties as a public servant, I request they resign and allow someone more qualified to handle the job.

"The right of the people to privacy is recognized and shall not be infringed. The legislature shall implement this section." Alaska Constitution, Art. 1, §22.

"Congress shall make no law respecting an establishment of religion." US Constitution, First Amendment.

Sincerely,
Honalee Elkan

Jake Almeida

From: Neil Black >
Sent: Friday, March 15, 2024 14:18
To: House Judiciary
Subject: NO NO NO on HB107

Honorable House Judiciary Committee-

WHAT YOU ARE ABOUT TO READ WILL CONVINCE YOU, if we assume that you are a logical and educated American, that abortion needs to remain legal and easily available to every woman in the United States of America. It's not that long of a read and I know you have a lot of work to do for little pay (just like teachers), so here we go.

"A three-day-old human embryo is a collection of 150 cells called a blastocyst. There are, for the sake of comparison, more than 100,000 cells in the brain of a fly. The human embryos that are destroyed in stem-cell research do not have brains, or even neurons. Consequently, there is no reason to believe they can suffer their destruction in any way at all. It is worth remembering, in this context, that when a person's brain has died, we currently deem it acceptable to harvest his organs (provided he has donated them for this purpose) and bury him in the ground. If it is acceptable to treat a person whose brain has died as something less than a human being, it should be acceptable to treat a blastocyst as such. If you are concerned about suffering in this universe, killing a fly should present you with greater moral difficulties than killing a human blastocyst.

Perhaps you think that the crucial difference between a fly and a human blastocyst is to be found in the latter's potential to become a fully developed human being. But almost every cell in your body is a potential human being, given our recent advances in genetic engineering. Every time you scratch your nose, you have committed a Holocaust of potential human beings." – *Sam Harris, taken from his book titled Letter to a Christian Nation*

To this I would simply add this final fact. Most human zygotes do not implant in the woman's uterus. Most human zygotes and blastocysts are never known to exist at all by anyone, and they literally end up being passed into the woman's toilet. Keep that in mind as you debate equating each and every one of these masses of cells with an actual, birthed human baby. There is no equivalence. The Constitution, logic and moral consistency require you to vote no on HB107.

Thank you.

Neil Black

Jake Almeida

From: Bill Tremblay
Sent: Monday, February 26, 2024 13:36
To: House Judiciary
Cc: Rep. Rebecca Himschoot
Subject: I'm Opposed to HB 17

Dear House Judiciary Committee;

Let me start by saying how disappointed I am that HB 17 is even being given a hearing. Alaska has upheld the right to privacy in more than one case, which makes me believe that this bill will likely be found to be unconstitutional as written.

There should be **no person** interfering with a decision between a person and their doctor. This should be apparent to any Alaskan as this is protected in our State Constitution.

There are many reasons why a person may choose to have an abortion. The health of the mother, the health of the fetus, financial reasons, family reasons, or others. Whatever the reason, the decision is personal and should not be subject to someone's political or religious interference. (Our Constitution specifically notes the separation of Church and State.)

Alaska is one of the worst States in the nation regarding domestic violence. We also have a difficult health care system in that many rural communities don't have the medical staff necessary to maintain good health. In every case, we should defer to the personal choices taken by each individual. The State should not dictate personal choice.

For those who are concerned because of their religious beliefs, I DON'T care. It's none of your business what someone else believes or doesn't believe.

Considering the outcomes of many elections that have taken place since the Supreme Court passed the Dobbs decision that rescinded Roe v. Wade, I'd hope the sponsors of this bill would not be back for the next Legislative Session. Holding a hearing on this bill is a waste of time and money. Drop this poor bill now and start working on other issues important to the citizens in the State of Alaska.

Bill Tremblay

Jake Almeida

From: Neil Black
Sent: Friday, March 15, 2024 14:18
To: House Judiciary
Subject: NO NO NO on HB107

Honorable House Judiciary Committee-

WHAT YOU ARE ABOUT TO READ WILL CONVINCE YOU, if we assume that you are a logical and educated American, that abortion needs to remain legal and easily available to every woman in the United States of America. It's not that long of a read and I know you have a lot of work to do for little pay (just like teachers), so here we go.

"A three-day-old human embryo is a collection of 150 cells called a blastocyst. There are, for the sake of comparison, more than 100,000 cells in the brain of a fly. The human embryos that are destroyed in stem-cell research do not have brains, or even neurons. Consequently, there is no reason to believe they can suffer their destruction in any way at all. It is worth remembering, in this context, that when a person's brain has died, we currently deem it acceptable to harvest his organs (provided he has donated them for this purpose) and bury him in the ground. If it is acceptable to treat a person whose brain has died as something less than a human being, it should be acceptable to treat a blastocyst as such. If you are concerned about suffering in this universe, killing a fly should present you with greater moral difficulties than killing a human blastocyst.

Perhaps you think that the crucial difference between a fly and a human blastocyst is to be found in the latter's potential to become a fully developed human being. But almost every cell in your body is a potential human being, given our recent advances in genetic engineering. Every time you scratch your nose, you have committed a Holocaust of potential human beings." – Sam Harris, *taken from his book titled Letter to a Christian Nation*

To this I would simply add this final fact. Most human zygotes do not implant in the woman's uterus. Most human zygotes and blastocysts are never known to exist at all by anyone, and they literally end up being passed into the woman's toilet. Keep that in mind as you debate equating each and every one of these masses of cells with an actual, birthed human baby. There is no equivalence. The Constitution, logic and moral consistency require you to vote no on HB107.

Thank you.

Neil Black

Jake Almeida

From: Susan A
Sent: Tuesday, March 19, 2024 11:04
To: House Judiciary
Subject: HB 107

HB 107

My name is Susan Allmeroth. I represent myself, from the Two Rivers area.

The belief you have the power to hand any girls, any teens, or any womens (any) body over to an organization, government, or governmental instrumentality shows you believe women are property and second class citizens. It demonstrates you believe we are not equal.

Moral rights (already by legal definition) requires that your name is always shown with your art work. Self-determination denotes the legal right of people to decide their own destiny in the international order. Thus indicating the being can communicate on its own accord.

The use of moral right referred to in this bill is based on an unconstitutional premise, a religious belief, and what some may call the magic man in the sky. However, religion and religious beliefs have no place in politics. I will say, it again, NO place.

You can bring your values, morals, and interests, but leave the science and facts to legitimate experts. What you still fail to realize is females still shed out fertilized eggs every month that fail to latch on to our uterus lining. I am afraid you may be collecting the proof next because of your ignorance of female reproductive health. What a great proposal for a Lunch and Learn for you all gentlemen.

I oppose this bill and urge you all to strongly reconsider the serious legal ramifications of this very bill and the financial toll we will find our State completely engulfed in if this passed.

I strongly oppose.