

Opponent Oral Testimony on House Bill 2437

House Committee on Elections
Davis Hammet – Loud Light Civic Action
January 15, 2026

Chair Proctor, Members of the Committee,

I'm the President of Loud Light Civic Action which works to protect and advance voting rights. I've worked on Kansas election policy for the last decade and appreciate the opportunity to raise concerns within the proposed language of HB 2437.

Short-Notice Hearings Deprive the Public of Participation & Legislators of Information

This bill hits on a complex area of law that cannot be thoroughly considered with such short notice.

KSA 25-2316c(i)(3)(B) “any change of residency information provided by a nongovernmental entity;”

This appears to create a standardless challenge provision where any nonprofit organization in the world could provide a list of Kansans registrants they want removed from the voter roll under the guise of a residency challenge. This is a completely subjective and standardless challenge provision that raises significant concerns of wrongful disenfranchisement and administrative chaos.

KSA 25-2316c(f)(2)(F) – “*that has been verified by other reliable means*”

What does “verified” and “reliable means” mean? These terms appear to be undefined. Additionally, why is this additional condition applied to social security administration data, but no other data source?

KSA 25-2316c(j) – KORA Exemption of Records Related to Purging Voters

Why was a KORA exemption added to the new sources listed in subsection (i)? What information is being sealed from public scrutiny that's not covered under existing KORA exemptions? This is especially concerning given that the bill allows any “nongovernmental entity” to challenge any or every registered voter in Kansas with no guardrails, and this subsection would prevent the public from ever knowing what entity is trying to disenfranchise Kansans.

KSA 25-2316c(j) – “*The provisions of this section shall expire on July 1, 2031*”

This may be a statutory construction misunderstanding that could not be investigated due to the rushed timing of this hearing, but the bill refers to the “section” expiring and the entirety of the bill exists under “Section 1.” Would this expire the entire statute or only “subsection” (i) on KORA exemptions?

Conclusion

We do not oppose putting in statute the existing voter roll maintenance practices and enhancing them in thoughtful ways that ensure citizens are not wrongfully disenfranchised; however, we have significant concerns about the lack of standards, definitions, and guardrails throughout parts of this bill and particularly regarding nongovernmental entities. Because of these reasons, we oppose HB2437 as written. Thank you. I'm happy to stand for any questions when appropriate.