

Private Citizen
HCR 5021 Opposition Testimony
1/29/2026

Hello members of the committee; I appreciate your time. I'm Samiya Rasheed and I am a voter in Douglas County, and I am asking you to vote NO on HCR 2051.

Kansas elections are well run and already secure. There is no need to push for further restrictions on how to and who can vote. Eligible Kansans will be pushed away from being able to vote because of this amendment. Furthermore, asking for it to be added to the constitution is shortsighted. That is a document that is meant to guide us throughout our history, but this resolution pushes for a very restrictive and specific to this moment in politics law to be added. It will be harmful to Kansans for no benefit.

Thank you again for your time. I ask you to vote no on the passage of HCR 2051.



PO Box 654
Lawrence, KS 66044

KansasInterfaithAction.org
KIFA@kansasinterfaithaction.org

Rabbi Moti Rieber, Executive Director
Rev. Dr. Annie Ricker, Board Chair

Written-only Testimony by Rabbi Moti Rieber in Opposition to HCR 5021, Amending article 5 of the constitution of the state of Kansas to require voters to present photographic identification at the time of voting.
House Elections Committee, Rep. Pat Proctor, Chair - January 29, 2026

Mr. Chair, Members of the Committee:

I serve as Executive Director for Kansas Interfaith Action, an multifaith advocacy group that works for justice and equality for all people across the state of Kansas. I submit testimony today in opposition to HCR 5021.

Our state constitution is a fundamental – some might say, sacred – document. It is the bedrock of our rights as Kansans, and it is supposed to protect citizens from the whims of partisanship. Amending it should be undertaken only after exhaustive due diligence and, most importantly, undeniable evidence of necessity.

While (as constantly needs to be said) ***there is no evidence of widespread voter fraud***, as AG Kobach's hamfisted attempts to find it have shown, there is a lot of evidence that restrictive ID laws cause tangible harm. When asked to study this issue, the United States Government Accountability Office suggested that "the turnout decreases in Kansas beyond decreases in comparison states were attributable to changes in voter ID requirements."¹

By narrowing the types of identification acceptable at the polls, this bill creates bureaucratic barriers that target, not "fraud, but" Kansas voters. By moving toward a strict state or federal photo ID requirement, this resolution would target voters attempting to legally vote using student IDs and tribal IDs. These are our neighbors: young people engaging in likely their first ever election, and Indigenous people who have lived on this land for generations. To tell them their legal ID is suddenly insufficient is a slap in the face to some of the most vulnerable among us. In addition, for many Kansans – such as the elderly, those in rural areas, and those living in poverty – getting a new, specific form of government ID is burdensome. It requires time off work, transportation, and often the cost of underlying documents like birth certificates.

Our faith calls us to build a 'Beloved Community' where every voice is heard. KIFA's position has always been that we should make voting as easy as possible for everyone who is eligible to vote. We are concerned that this bill is more about protecting political power than protecting the ballot box. Election security comes from high participation and a clear, transparent process, not arbitrary hurdles. Making voting more complicated and challenging for eligible citizens does not make an election safer. It only makes it less representative.

We ask you to protect the sacredness of the vote by ensuring that voting remains open, accessible, and supported for all those who are eligible to vote – even if they do not have a photo ID. We ask you to please vote NO on HCR 5021. Thank you.

¹ USGAO, Elections: Issues Related to State Voter Identification Laws [Reissued on February 27, 2015]:
<https://www.gao.gov/products/gao-14-634#:~:text=GAO's%20analysis%20suggests%20that%20the,two%20states'%20voter%20ID%20requirements.>

I am a private citizen who lives in Wyandotte County. In addition, I am a proud member of Voter Rights Network of Wyandotte County. By placing a restriction on the types of ID will restrict an individual's right to vote in elections.

HCR 5021 Opposition Testimony

1/29/2026

Dear Chair Proctor and Members of the Committee,

I reside in Kansas City, Kansas and a member of the Voter Rights Network of Wyandotte County. I am encouraging the committee to vote NO on HCR 2051. Thank you for time and listening to me as I share my concerns and thoughts.

I encourage you to block the passage of HCR 2051. It is important to me as I think of all people who will not benefit from this if it becomes law. This also interferes with one of our fundamental rights "the right to vote." One group that stands out in my mind is young voters. This group whose members may range from 18-21 may own only school ID and not a driver's license or don't own a vehicle. They should not be penalized because they may not own a passport or driver's license.

As I conclude my thoughts, think about all of us and not leave out those who may not become a part of the process early in life. That might be a vote that members in state government need to win elections or reelections. Again, thank you for hearing my thoughts as I encourage you all to vote no of the passage of HCR 2051.

PRIVATE CITIZEN

HCR 5021 Opposition Testimony

1/29/2026

Members of the committee, thank you for listening to my thoughts on HCR 5021 today. My name is Taia Sarazov and I am a voter in Kansas City, Kansas. I am writing today to encourage the committee to vote no on HCR 2051.

This is an unnecessary amendment to the Kansas constitution that is meant to impede my right to vote. Kansas has repeatedly proven it has fair elections in court. The proposed amendment is an attempt to limit Kansas citizens from exercising their civic duties.

For these reasons, I urge you to vote no on the passage of HCR 2051. Thank you.

January 29, 2026

Kansas House Committee on Elections
300 SW. 10th Avenue
Topeka, KS 66612

Re: Health Forward Foundation opposition to HCR 5021: Amending article 5 of the constitution of the state of Kansas to require voters to present photographic identification at the time of voting.

Chair Proctor and members of the House Committee on Elections:

On behalf of the Health Forward Foundation (Health Forward), I submit this letter of testimony in opposition to House Concurrent Resolution 5021 which proposes amending the state constitution to require voters to present photographic identification to vote. An individual's ability to exercise their right to vote plays a key role in shaping one's living conditions and the communities in which they live; our aim should be to make voting more accessible, not create unnecessary barriers. A Kansas law, passed in 2011, currently requires voters to present a valid photo ID. Placing the voter ID requirements in the state constitution only serves to make it more challenging to increase access and accessibility to voting in response to technology advancements (or constraints, local or national emergencies, etc.) In instances that require Kansas to be adaptable, it'll be significantly more challenged to do so.

Additionally, this legislation further restricts the types of IDs that can be used to vote. According to HCR 5021, the photo ID must be issued by the state or federal government, while current law allows for the use of college IDs and out-of-state IDs. There is no certainty that there will continue to be important exceptions like those that allow seniors to use an expired ID or Indigenous voters whose tribal ID may not include a photo or an expiration date. HCR 5021 will increase barriers to voting by making it harder to obtain an approved voter ID.

2300 Main, Suite 304
Kansas City, MO 64108
816.241.7006
HealthForward.org



The Health and Democracy Index highlights a distinct relationship between inclusive voting and the overall health outcomes of communities: where healthier states have more inclusive voting policies and greater levels of participation.ⁱ HCR 5021 will negatively impact the health of Kansas as it increases barriers to voting and will hinder personal ability to vote for the issues and candidates that advance our health.

Health Forward asks members of the committee to vote no on HCR 5021. Please contact me if you have any questions or would like additional resources at eshankland@healthforward.org. We would welcome the opportunity to remain engaged with you on this issue.

Sincerely,
Emma Shankland
Impact Strategist – Policy
Health Forward Foundation

ⁱ "Advancing Health Equity Through Voter Participation." The Network for Public Health Law. August 2022. Accessed at <https://www.networkforphl.org/news-insights/advancing-health-equity-through-voter-participation/>.

PRIVATE CITIZEN

HCR 5021 Opposition Testimony

1/29/2026

Chair Proctor and Members of the Committee, thank you so much for giving me time to share my thoughts on HCR 5021 with you today. My name is Sandra M. Siebert and I am a voter in Jefferson County. I am writing today to encourage the committee to vote NO on HCR 2051. Let's reduce obstacles to voting, not put up more.

We should reduce obstacles to voting, not put up more.

I thank you all for hearing my story and thoughts on this bill, and I encourage you all to vote no of the passage of HCR 2051.

Private Citizen
HCR 5021 Opposition Testimony
1/29/2026

Good morning Chair Proctor and committee members. Thank you for taking the time to read my testimony today on HCR 5021. My name is Jonathan Smith, a voter in Shawnee County, and I encourage the committee to vote NO on HCR 5021

As an individual that has worked multiple election poll locations, I can assure you that a statewide mandate for a photo ID would not make elections more secure, it would only force more voters to be turned away on Election Day.

Every voter that comes in already has the expectation that they need to bring *A* form of voter identification, and there are several options that they can choose from per county and state regulations. That ID is then compared against what we have in the poll books that are connected directly to the county's voter database.

If there is a discrepancy, it is handled there, or with a provisional ballot to make sure that the voter has the opportunity to vote, and then can potentially fix their ballot later at the election office.

All of this to say that our elections are safe and this House Concurrent Resolution is a solution in search of a problem. We do not have a problem with voter fraud, and the idea that someone had the audacity to recommend changing our entire Constitution of the State of Kansas based on these imagined feelings of voter fraud is one of the most disrespectful things Kansas Lawmakers have recommended yet.

I appreciate you taking the time. I encourage a strong NO in regard to HCR 5021. Put some respect on the State of Kansas and keep your partisan antics on social media, away from our Constitution. Thank you.

PRIVATE CITIZEN

HCR 5021 Opposition Testimony

1/29/2026

Chair Proctor and Members of the Committee, thank you so much for giving me time to share my thoughts on HCR 5021 with you today. My name is Emily Steinwart and I am a voter in Overland Park, KS. I am writing today to encourage the committee to vote NO on HCR 2051.

Voter fraud is so rare as to be non existent. This wasting time and our tax dollars to solve a problem that doesn't exist. As your constituent, I would prefer you spend your time and my money to fix things that are actually broken. You could start with healthcare, public schools, corporate greed, the environment...the list goes on. Anyone of these topics would be far more beneficial than conspiracy theory based baloney like HCR 2051.

Once again, I thank you all for hearing my story and thoughts on this bill, and I encourage you all to vote no of the passage of HCR 2051. Thank you.

PRIVATE CITIZEN
HCR 5021 Opposition Testimony
1/29/2026

Chair Proctor and Members of the Committee, thank you so much for giving me time to share my thoughts on HCR 5021. My name is Ronald Szymankowski and I am a voter in Johnson County/Overland Park. I am writing to encourage the committee to vote NO on HCR 2051

This legislative proposal is a solution in search of a problem. Kansas elections are already secure. If not, where is the evidence based on sound methodology. In my opinion restricting voter access through bureaucratic barriers like restrictive ID laws cause harm through voter suppression. This legislation would potentially disenfranchise thousands of Kansans who currently have an eligible ID.

Once again, I thank you all for hearing my opinions and thoughts on this bill, and I encourage you all to vote no on the passage of HCR 2051. Thank you.

Fiscal Note Response Template

Kansas Division of the Budget

Bill number: HB 2529 Due date: 1/27/2026

Responding agency: Office of the Kansas Attorney General

Prepared by: Chase Bond DOB Analyst: Leyton Gunn

Fiscal Impact

State—Would this bill have a fiscal effect on your agency? Yes ☐ No ☒

Local—Would this bill have a fiscal effect on local government? Yes ☐ No ☒

Tax Revenue—Would this bill affect State General Fund revenues? Yes ☐ No ☒

Fee or Other Revenue—Would this bill affect revenues to other state funds? Yes ☐ No ☒

Comparable program from another state available for reference? Yes ☐ No ☒

	<u>FY 2026</u>	<u>FY 2027</u>	<u>FY 2028</u>
Expenditures			
State General Fund	\$0.00	\$0.00	\$0.00
Fee Fund(s)	\$0.00	\$0.00	\$0.00
Federal Fund	\$0.00	\$0.00	\$0.00
Total Expenditures	\$0.00	\$0.00	\$0.00
Revenues			
State General Fund	\$0.00	\$0.00	\$0.00
Fee Fund(s)	\$0.00	\$0.00	\$0.00
Federal Fund	\$0.00	\$0.00	\$0.00
Total Revenues	\$0.00	\$0.00	\$0.00
FTE Positions	0.00	0.00	0.00

Bill Description

Briefly describe what the legislation does. Describe the change(s) from current law that would drive an increase or decrease in expenditures or revenues. If federal funds are affected by the bill in some way, explain that relationship as well. Note any technical or mechanical defects with the bill (bill drafting errors only, do not include commentary as to whether the bill should be enacted or not). Please include an explanation of the assumptions used when determining increases or decreases in revenues or expenditures.

HB2529 updates Kansas grand jury procedures by requiring judicial review of citizen petitions before signatures are collected and by penalizing fraud in the petition process. It also limits liability for good-faith participants and prohibits diversion agreements following a citizen grand jury indictment and amends multiple statutes.

Methodology and Assumptions for Fiscal Effect Estimate

Expenditures: Detail the methodology and assumptions made in preparing the cost estimate. Describe agency expenditures that would become necessary with passage of the bill and how workload assumptions translate into the cost estimates. The estimate for any new position should be detailed to show the salary, benefits and associated other operating costs (such as a computer or other equipment). Distinguish between one-time and ongoing costs.

Revenues: Describe the methodology and assumptions used in estimating the bill's effect on revenues. Detail the source of the revenue—is it a tax, agency earning, fee income or a federal reimbursement—and the fund that would receive the revenue. Distinguish between one-time and ongoing revenue changes estimated to result from passage of the bill.

The Office of the Kansas Attorney General does not anticipate a direct fiscal impact on the agency. The bill grants the Office discretion to accept or decline referrals for prosecution, which is consistent with authority already provided under existing law.

This bill carries an elevated risk of litigation. At this time, the Office is unable to estimate the potential costs associated with any such litigation.

Long-Term Fiscal Considerations

If the bill affects future years, beyond those shown in the table above, explain the long-term fiscal effect—are the revenues stable over the long term or would there be a phase-in of costs or revenues; if the bill ends at a specific future date, indicate this as well.

The Office of the Kansas Attorney General does not anticipate any long-term fiscal considerations.

Local Government Fiscal Effect

If the bill affects local governments, identify which local governments would be affected (e.g., cities, counties, school districts, water districts, etc.). Describe the bill's fiscal effect to the local governments.

The Office of the Kansas Attorney General does not predict that there will be any fiscal effect onto local government.

References/Sources

If there are supporting documents or spreadsheets explaining calculations or assumptions, please attach them. Be specific when citing the methodology used to calculate the fiscal effect of this legislation. Are there examples of actual costs or revenue changes from similar legislation passed in other states? If so, please detail how the estimated fiscal effect in Kansas compares to that of other states, and identify any programmatic differences that would lead to a fiscal effect that is different in Kansas than in other states.

If you have questions, please contact the Budget Analyst assigned to this fiscal note.

Private Citizen
HCR 5021 Opposition Testimony
1/29/2026

Chair Proctor and Members of the Committee, thank you for your time. My name is Eliana Valdez and I am an active voter in Garden City, located in Finney County. I am writing today to advocate for the committee to vote NO on HCR 2051.

I believe that Kansas elections are fair and safe, and I don't support amending our Constitution. To me, this feels completely unfair to people with limited resources, the unhoused, and those that are home-bound. This bill would disenfranchise so many Kansans that "don't have the proper papers." Everyone deserves to have their voice heard. Our legislators making it more challenging to vote feels wrong, and against the will of the people. It is truly suppressing voters. There is no real evidence that this bill would make our elections secure either way, and this just reflects badly on those currently in power.

I implore you all to vote NO on HCR 2051. Thank you for hearing my thoughts on this bill.

PRIVATE CITIZEN
HCR 5021 Opposition Testimony
1/29/2026

Chair Proctor and Members of the Committee, thank you so much for giving me time to share my thoughts on HCR 5021 with you today. My name is Andrew Vanderwerf and I am a voter in Johnson County/Shawnee. I am writing today to encourage the committee to vote NO on HCR 2051

I oppose this bill because it is making an unnecessary change to an important amendment with no real basis other than making it harder for people to vote. It has no utility and no clear goal other than making it harder for citizens to vote.

Thank you all for hearing my view on this bill and I encourage you all to vote no for the passage of this bill.