

ACTIONS TAKEN BY U.S. REPRESENTATIVE ED CASE IN OPPOSITION TO TRUMP ADMINISTRATION

This document lists signed amicus briefs, key votes, joint letters, social media posts and public statements taken by Congressman Ed Case in opposition to the Trump administration.

KEY LAWSUITS

- Joined [*State of New York v. Linda McMahon*](#), which seeks to protect the Department of Education (USDOE).
- Joined [*American Foreign Service Association, et al. v. Trump, et al.*](#), which opposed effort to close the U.S. Agency for International Development (USAID).
- Joined [*Harris v. Bessent and Wilcox v. Trump*](#), which opposes efforts to fire the Democratic members of the National Labor Relations Board and the Merit Systems Protection Board.
- Joined [*Slaughter and Bedoya v. Trump, et al.*](#), which opposes efforts to fire the Democratic members of Federal Trade Commission.
- Joined [*National Treasury Employees Union \(NTEU\), et al. v. CFPB Acting Director Russell Vought, et al.*](#) and a related second brief, which were filed in response to a long list of unlawful actions by the Trump Administration to undermine the Consumer Finance Protection Bureau.
- Joined the consolidated cases [*Commonwealth of Massachusetts v. NIH, Assoc. of Am. Medical Colleges v NIH, and Association of Am. Universities v. HHS*](#), which seeks to prevent the National Institutes of Health (NIH) from unilaterally capping the indirect cost rate for grants recipients.
- Joined [*Oregon, et al., v. Trump, et al.*](#), which is challenging President Trump's sweeping tariffs that were imposed under the International Emergency Economic Powers Act.
- Joined [*NAACP v. United States*](#), filed in the U.S. District Court for the District of Maryland, opposes the Trump Administration's unlawful effort to dismantle USDOE.
- Joined [*New York v. Trump*](#), filed in the U.S. Court of Appeals for the First Circuit, opposes the Trump administration's unconstitutional freeze of Congressionally appropriated federal funds.
- Joined amicus brief to defend Congress's authority to enact removal protections for members of independent agencies, specifically the Consumer Product Safety Commission (CPSC) in the case [*Trump v. Boyle*](#) before the Fourth Circuit.
- Joined 2nd amicus brief supporting the lawsuit [*Oregon, et al. v. Trump, et al.*](#) before the U.S. Supreme Court, challenging President Trump's use of the International Emergency Economic Powers Act (IEEPA) to impose broad tariffs.
- Joined 2nd amicus brief opposes President Donald Trump's attempt to have the ability to fire members of the Federal Trade Commission (FTC).

- Joined amicus brief in [*Ethical Society of Police v. Bondi*](#) to defend the Department of Justice's Community Relations Service which the Trump Administration moved to unilaterally close earlier this year.
- Joined amicus brief in [*Center for Biological Diversity v. Burgum*](#), which contests the use of President Trump's image on the America the Beautiful Pass.
- Joined amicus brief in [*State of Louisiana v. U.S. Food and Drug Administration*](#), which would force the FDA to reinstate medically unnecessary in-person dispensing requirements for mifepristone.
- Joined amicus brief in [*National Trust for Historic Preservation v. National Park Service*](#), which challenges the President's unilateral demolition and reconstruction of the White House East Wing without congressional authorization or appropriation.
- Joined amicus brief in [*Trump v. District of Columbia*](#), which challenges the President's unlawful deployment of National Guard troops to police D.C. over the objections of local leaders.
- Joined amicus brief in [*Jackler and Jaroch V. The Department of Justice*](#), to defend the historic protections for civil servants, two of which are the defendants who were fired without cause or process by the DOJ.
- Joined amicus brief to oppose Trump's unconstitutional effort to restrict mail-in ballots.

KEY VOTES

- [H.R. 1, the Republican Reconciliation Budget Proposal](#). Opposed the "One Big Beautiful Bill" that provides huge tax breaks to those who least need it, devastates Medicaid, the Supplemental Nutrition Assistance Program and other bedrock safety nets for those in the most need, increases our national debt by trillions of dollars, reverses decades of sound energy policy and hides various special interest giveaways in its thousand pages.
- [H.R. 4, the Recissions Act of 2025](#). Opposed the recissions bill which would rescind \$9.4 billion in unobligated funds that were provided to State Department, U.S. Agency for International Development, the Corporation for Public Broadcasting and the U.S. Institute of Peace.
- [H. Con. Res. 113, the Republican Budget Resolution FY27](#). Opposed the budget proposal that will provide \$88 billion in supplemental funding for the Iran conflict, including \$67.1 billion for the Department of Defense, after the Secretary of Defense testified that the war has already cost at least \$37.5 billion (and likely more). Approving funding for a conflict Congress did not authorize could set a troubling precedent by appearing to ratify unilateral military action after the fact.
- [H.R. 9970, the Fiscal Year 2027 Continuing Resolution](#). Opposed the bill that does not restrict further funding to CBP or ICE, or require substantial reform, priorities House Democrats have been pushing for months, among other inadequate funding levels and an overtly partisan voting measure.
- [H.Con.Res. 14, the Republican Budget Resolution](#). Opposed the budget proposal that will lead to massive tax cuts for the wealthy, drastically reduce funding for several critical programs and drive up our federal budget deficits and debt by trillions.

- [H.Con.Res. 14 \(Amended\), the Republican Budget Resolution](#). Opposed the revised budget proposal that will lead to massive tax cuts for the wealthy, drastically reduce funding for several critical programs and drive up our federal budget deficits and debt by trillions.
- [H.R. 1968, the Fiscal Year 2025 Continuing Resolution](#). Opposed the bill that flatlined almost all federal funding; would cut non-defense spending by \$13 billion relative to current levels in violation of the Fiscal Responsibility Act; eliminate \$20 billion in spending for the Internal Revenue Service authorized under the Inflation Reduction Act (IRA); and lacks the \$23 billion in advanced funding needed for the Toxic Exposures Fund to care for veterans exposed to burn pits, Agent Orange and other toxic substances.
- [S. 5, the Laken Riley Act](#). Opposed the bill that would allow for the deportation of legal immigrants, including Deferred Action for Childhood Arrivals (DACA) and Temporary Protected Status recipients, simply by being arrested for certain crimes, without ever having their guilt or innocence determined in our judicial system.
- [S.J.Res. 31, Congressional Review Act Resolution on Air Pollution](#). Opposed the bill to that would allow over 1,800 facilities to potentially increase hazardous air pollutant emissions and avoid certain pollution control requirements.
- [S.J.Res. 18, Congressional Review Act Resolution on Overdraft Rules](#). Opposed the bill to overturn a Biden-era regulation that would prevent banks from charging excess overdraft fees.
- [S.J.Res. 28, Congressional Review Act Resolution on Digital Transaction Oversight](#). Opposed the bill to overturn a Biden-era regulation that would provide more government oversight over digital consumer payment applications.
- [H.J.Res. 61, Congressional Review Act Resolution on Hazardous Air Pollutants](#). Opposed the bill to overturn the Environmental Protection Agency's (EPA) National Emissions Standards for Hazardous Air Pollutants in Tire Manufacturing.
- [S.J.Res. 11, Congressional Review Act Resolution on Protection of Marine Archeological Resources](#). Opposed the bill to overturn a Biden-era regulation requiring oil and gas producers to submit an archeological report with their development plans on the Outer Continental Shelf.
- [H.R. 471, the Fix Our Forests Act](#). Opposed the bill which would allow federal agencies to bypass critical environmental reviews and evade legal accountability while carrying out wildfire mitigation, undermining public oversight and environmental protections.
- [H.R. 4016, the FY 2026 Defense Appropriations Bill \(Use of Military for Law Enforcement\)](#). Supported amendment in Committee that would prohibit use of federal funds that contravene the Posse Comitatus Act of 1878, which prohibits use of the military for direct law enforcement activities.
- Vote against all twelve appropriations bills in the House Appropriations Committee that sought to cut domestic programs and overturn policies of the Biden administration.

- Voted for three War Powers Resolutions ([H.Con.Res 61](#), [H.Con.Res 64](#), and [H.Con.Res 68](#)) directing the President to cease boat strikes in the Western Hemisphere and hostilities against Venezuela that are not authorized by Congress.
- Voted for five War Powers Resolutions to end the conflict in Iran ([H.Con.Res. 89](#), [H.Con.Res. 86](#), [H.Con.Res. 75](#), [H.Con.Res. 40](#) and [H.Con.Res. 38](#)).
- [H.R. 1834](#), a bill to extend enhanced Affordable Care Act premium tax credits for 3 years.
- Voted against full-year funding for the Department of Homeland Security because of a lack of effective oversight mechanisms for ICE.
- Voted for War Powers Resolutions ([H.Con.Res 38](#) and [H.Con.Res 40](#)) directing the President to cease hostilities against Iran that are not authorized by Congress.
- [H.R. 6945, the Supporting Pregnant and Parenting Women and Families Act](#). Opposed the bill which would allow states to use Temporary Assistance for Needy Families (TANF) funds for pro-life pregnancy centers to offer resources and services to those families.
- [H.R. 6359, the Pregnant Students' Rights Act](#). Opposed this bill that would require federally funded institutions to inform students about resources, accommodations and complaint processes that support those who choose to carry a pregnancy to term and parent their child.
- [H.Con.Res. 113](#). Voted against this bill that among other things would set up the process to pay for the Iran War and set the precedent of providing funding for a war that Congress did not authorize.
- [H.R. 1689](#), Protected Status for Haiti Refugees. Signed the discharge petition and voted for that bill that would redesignate Haiti for Temporary Protected Status after the Trump administration rescinded the designation.
- [H.R. 8800](#), National Defense Authorization Act (NDAA) for Fiscal Year (FY) 2027. Voted against the NDAA for FY 2027 due to lack any Congressional authorization for the Iran War, the insufficiency of any justification for the huge, authorized increase in defense spending, the lack of any assurance of adequate Congressional oversight of that spending and the addition of the SAVE America Act.

KEY LEGISLATION

- H.R. 7454, the [United States-Mexico-Canda Agreement \(USMCA\) Travel and Tourism Resiliency Act](#), which would direct the US Trade Representative to prioritize the formation of a working group on travel and tourism during the next joint review conducted under the USMCA.
- H.R. 7507, the [Fiscal Harms of Federal Firings Act](#), which would require the Comptroller General of the United States to conduct a study of the impact of Federal reductions in force on State and local governments.
- H.R. 9370, the [Protect Local Funding Act](#), which would stop the Office of Management and Budget (OMB) from moving forward on a proposed rule that would overhaul the

federal grantmaking process and potentially allow overt partisanship in federal grantmaking.

- H.R. 8666, the [Vote by Mail Protection Act of 2026](#), which would provide that Executive order 14399 shall have no force or effect.
- H.R. 8955, the [Bipartisan Transparency for American Taxpayers Act](#), which would prohibit the use of federal funds for the payment of claims submitted to the Anti-Weaponization Fund.
- H.R. 8914, the [No Taxpayer-Funded Settlement Slush Funds Act of 2026](#), which would
- H.R. 9210, the [BLANCHE Act](#), which would establish certain requirements for compromise settlements between the President. It aims to prevent President Trump, and any sitting president, from accepting any settlements from the federal government that could be a conflict of interest or provide financial or non-financial gain.
- H.R. 5220, the [Congressional Power of the Purse Act](#), which would update the Impoundment Control Act of 1974 and Antideficiency Act to reaffirm that Congress, not the President, holds the power of the purse.
- H.J.Res. 115, which would have terminated the President's federalization of law enforcement in the District of Columbia.
- H.R. 17, the [Paycheck Fairness Act](#), which would strengthen the Equal Pay Act to address gender-based wage discrimination.
- H.R. 15, the [Equality Act](#), which would extend federal civil rights protections to LGBTQ+ Americans.
- H.R. 2881, the [COAST Anti-Drilling Act](#), which would prohibit offshore drilling on the East Coast Outer Continental Shelf.
- H.R. 2086, the [Rights for the Transportation Security Administration Workforce Act](#), which would ensure that all 65,000 Transportation Security Administration employees are afforded the same worker rights, protections and pay system afforded to other federal workers.
- H.R. 14, the [John R. Lewis Voting Rights Advancement Act](#), which would modernize and revitalize the Voting Rights Act by strengthening legal protections against discriminatory voting policies and practices.
- H.R. 2412, the [Indigenous Diplomacy and Engagement Act](#), which would create an Office for Indigenous Affairs at the Department of State promoting diplomacy and engagement with indigenous peoples.
- H.R. 1307, [Office of Gun Violence Prevention Act](#), which would legislatively create a gun violence prevention office to replace the one President Trump eliminated.
- H.R. 1101, the [Taxpayer Data Protection Act](#), which would ensure that anyone who accesses the federal government's central payment system with a personal financial conflict faces criminal penalties.
- [H.R. 5673](#), to reinstate all financial assistance awards terminated by the Department of Energy.
- [H.Res. 155](#), which would reaffirm the United States' unwavering support for Ukraine's sovereignty, independence and territorial integrity.

- [H.Res. 94](#), which would express support for our nation’s local public K-12 schools and condemning any actions that would defund public education or weaken or dismantle the USDOE.
- [H.J.Res. 80](#), which would allow for the ratification of the Equal Rights Amendment.
- H.R. 211, the [Equal Access to Contraception for Veterans Act](#), which would provide women veterans access to the same no-cost contraceptive care as their non-veteran counterparts.
- [H.Res. 68](#), which would express disapproval of the President's announcement to withdraw from the Paris Climate Agreement.
- H.R. 588, the [Boundary Waters Wilderness Protection and Pollution Prevention Act](#), which would permanently protect 234,328 acres of federal lands and waters within the Superior National Forest from risky sulfide-ore copper mining.
- H.R. 664, the [American Seabed Protection Act](#), which would prohibit mining activities on the deep seabed and Outer Continental Shelf.
- H.R. 585, the [Supporting Veteran Families in Need Act](#), which would provide financial assistance for supportive services for very low-income veteran families.
- H.R. 535, the [Inaugural Fund Integrity Act](#), which would establish limits on donations to presidential inaugural funds and require the disclosure of donations.
- H.R. 492, the [Saving the Civil Service Act](#), which would strengthen protections for our federal workforce.
- H.R. 562, the [BLUE Pacific Act](#), which would expand U.S. engagement in the Pacific Islands by building off the development framework developed by these countries.
- H.R. 1196, the [Protect U.S. National Security Act](#), which would prohibit any use of funds to eliminate the U.S. Agency for International Development (USAID).
- H.R. 3238, the [HABLA Act of 2025](#), would codify Executive Order 13166 which required federal agencies to examine the services they provide, identify any need for services to those with limited English proficiency and develop and implement a system to provide those services so limited English proficiency persons can have meaningful access to them. This executive order was revoked by President Trump on March 1, 2025.
- H.R. 1589, the [American Dream and Promise Act of 2025](#), would provide a pathway to citizenship for Deferred Action for Childhood Arrivals (DACA), Temporary Protected Status (TPS) and Deferred Enforcement Departure (DED) recipients.
- H.Res 473, a [resolution](#) calling for the urgent delivery and disbursement of humanitarian aid to address the needs of civilians in Gaza.
- H.Con.Res. 40, a [concurrent resolution](#) directing the President, pursuant to section 5(c) of the War Powers Resolution, to remove United States Armed Forces from hostilities with Iran.
- H.R. 2665, the [Trade Review Act](#), would require the President to notify Congress and seek approval for any new or increased import tariffs (excluding antidumping and

countervailing duties). If Congress doesn't approve the tariff within 60 days, it automatically expires.

- [H.J.Res. 73](#) would terminate the national emergency declared by President Trump on February 1, 2025 (E.O. 14194), which imposed tariffs on Mexico.
- [H.J.Res.72](#) would terminate the national emergency declared by President Trump on February 1, 2025 via Executive Order 14194, which triggered tariffs on Canada.
- [H.R. 2464](#), the Repealing Outdated and Unilateral Tariff Authorities Act, would repeal Section 338 of the Tariff Act of 1930, an unused provision that gives the President unilateral authority to impose up to 50% tariffs on foreign goods in response to “discriminatory” treatment of U.S. commerce.
- [H.R. 2250](#), the Protect America’s Workforce Act, would nullify President Trump’s Exclusions from Federal Labor-Management Relations Programs executive order which stripped collective bargaining rights from many federal workers. I also signed the discharge petition to bring this bill to a vote in front of the full House.
- [H.R. 4461](#), the Presidential Library Anti-Corruption Act, would require Presidents to wait until they are out of office to accept donations for Presidential libraries from for-profit organizations and establish cooling-off periods for donations from certain individuals.
- H.R. 4796, the [Restoring Essential Health Care Act](#) would repeal the “defund” Planned Parenthood provision in the recently enacted reconciliation budget bill, restoring access to essential reproductive health services for millions of low-income patients nationwide.
- [H.J.Res. 115](#) is a joint resolution terminating the emergency determined by the President on August 11, 2025 in the Executive Order titled “Declaring a Crime Emergency in the District of Columbia.”
- A resolution led by Congresswoman Nanette Barragán that would affirm the independence of the Federal Reserve System, its Chairman and its Board of Governors.
- [H.J. Res. 121](#), a joint resolution proposing a constitutional amendment that seeks to overturn the Citizens United v. FEC decision and limit the power that corporations have had in our politics.
- [H.R. 5220](#), the Congressional Power of the Purse Act, would update the Impoundment Control Act of 1974 (ICA) and Antideficiency Act to reaffirm that Congress, not the President, holds the power of the purse.
- [H.Res. 797](#), the *Banned Books Resolution* condemns censorship, supports free access to information and seeks to reverse federal and local restrictions on books.
- [H.R. 6056](#), the International Human Rights Defense Act, which would establish a permanent Special Envoy for LGBTQ+ Human Rights at the State Department, require the department to develop a strategy to prevent and respond to violence, criminalization, and discrimination against LGBTQ+ people, and require the annual country human rights reports to include information on LGBTQ+ rights.
- [H.R. 6517](#), the Legislative Branch Independence Act, modifies the appointment process for the Librarian of Congress, Government Accountability Office and Government

Printing Office to remove the President from the appointment process and instead utilize a commission structure similar to the existing structure for the Comptroller General. The bill also codifies that only Congress can remove the heads of these agencies.

- [H.R. 6575](#), the CommonGround for Affordable Health Care Act, this bill would extend the enhanced Affordable Care Act premium tax credits for two years with new guardrails while also requiring the House to vote on other measures to institute more significant reforms.
- [H.R. 6286](#), the Indo-Pacific Partner and Ally Tariff Repeal Act, would eliminate President Trump’s “emergency” tariffs on Indo-Pacific allies, reaffirming our nation’s commitment to our key economic partners.
- [H.Res.1035](#), the Protecting FEMA’s Workforce Resolution, condemning workforce reductions at FEMA that threaten our nation’s ability to prepare for, respond to and recover from disasters.
- [H.Res.996](#), Impeaching Kristi Lynn Arnold Noem, Secretary of Homeland Security, for high crimes and misdemeanors.
- [H.R. 8228](#), the Stop Global Tariffs Act, would strike down the 10% tariffs issued by President Trump under Section 122 of the Trade Act of 1974 and require that importers taxed under this policy be reimbursed.
- [H.R. 8914](#), the No Taxpayer-Funded Settlement Slush Fund Act, would prohibit federal funds from being used to create or finance the compensation fund that was created by the Trump, et al. v. the Internal Revenue Service (IRS), et al. settlement agreement.
- [H.R.2717](#), the Servicewomen and Veterans Menopause Research Act, would increase research for menopause and perimenopause for woman servicemembers and veterans.
- [H.R. 3184](#), PFAS Alternatives Act, would accelerate the development of PFAS-free firefighter turnout gear to protect firefighters from toxic “forever chemicals.”
- [H. Res.](#), 50 Years of Women at the Service Academies Day, would recognize the contributions of women who attended and graduated from the U.S. service academies. It also honors the service of past, present and future women in the U.S. Armed Forces.
- Voted against FY2027 Defense Appropriations bill in Appropriations Subcommittee due to its size compared to dramatic cuts to domestic spending in other parts of the budget.

KEY SPEECHES, MEDIA APPEARANCES AND OTHER PUBLIC STATEMENTS

- Speech: Senate hearing on Trump administration’s threat to rule of law ([September 24, 2025](#))
- Speech: Criticizing Trump trade/tariff impacts on AANHPI communities ([September 19, 2025](#))
- Speech: “Three-Year Anniversary of Russia's Brutal Attack on Ukraine,” addressing the negative effects of abandoning Ukraine ([February 25, 2025](#))

- C-SPAN Interview: Signalgate/breaches of national security ([March 27, 2025](#))
- Congressional Hearing: “@RepEdCase Questions Homeland Security Secretary Mullin on Appropriations” ([June 25, 2026](#))
- Congressional Hearing: “@RepEdCase in Appropriations Decries Discriminatory Firings in Military” ([June 24, 2026](#))
- Congressional Hearing: “@RepEdCase Questions Golden Dome Budgeting in Appropriations” ([June 24, 2026](#))
- Congressional Hearing: “@RepEdCase in Defense Appropriations Questions Costs of Iran War” ([May 12, 2026](#))
- Congressional Hearing: “@RepEdCase in Appropriation-Defense Questions Army Secretary Driscoll on General George Firing” ([April 17, 2026](#))
- Congressional Hearing: “@RepEdCase challenges unregulated destructive deep seabed mining in House Science Committee” ([March 26, 2026](#))
- Congressional Hearing: Opposing NOAA funding cuts and administration withholding information about ICE use of prison in Hawai‘i ([September 10, 2025](#))
- Congressional Hearing: “@RepEdCase in House Appropriations urging support of Community Development Financial Institutions” ([September 3, 2025](#))
- Congressional Hearing: “@RepEdCase in Appropriations urging a GAO review of administration execution of Congress’ spending” ([September 3, 2025](#))
- Congressional Hearing: Speaking out against international aid funding cuts. ([July 25, 2025](#))
- Congressional Hearing: Speaking out against cuts to clear drinking water programs. ([July 23, 2025](#))
- Congressional Hearing: Responding to proposal to allow deep sea mining ([May 6, 2025](#))
- Congressional Hearing: Congressman Case questions leaders of National Guard and Reserves ([May 20, 2025](#))
- Congressional Hearing: Questioning the cost benefits of a border wall (May 19, 2025)
- Congressional Hearing: Responding to budget cuts at the Department of Homeland of Security ([May 16, 2025](#))
- Congressional Hearing: Congressman Case questions Director of U.S. Immigration & Customs Enforcement ([May 14, 2025](#))
- Congressional Hearing: Congressman Case questions Federal Emergency Management Agency ([May 7, 2025](#))
- Congressional Hearing: Congressman Case questions Department of Defense leaders ([May 6, 2025](#))
- Congressional Hearing: Congressman Case questions Homeland Security Secretary Kristi Noem on her decision to reduce funding for disaster preparedness ([May 6, 2025](#))
- Congressional Hearing: “Congressman Case Questions Secretary Noem’s Leadership of the Department of Homeland Security” ([May 6, 2025](#))

- Committee Hearing: “Congressman Case Questions CBP Head on Cost-Benefit of Proposed Border Wall” ([May 15, 2025](#))
- Committee Speech: “Congressman Case in Appropriations Questions Defense Funding Measure” ([June 24, 2026](#))
- Committee Speech: “Congressman Case Questions Golden Dome Budgeting in Appropriations” ([June 24, 2026](#))
- Committee Speech: “Congressman Case in Appropriations Decries Discriminatory Firings in Military” ([June 24, 2026](#))
- Social Media: Oppose calls to close Mauna Loa Observatory ([August 30, 2025](#))
- Social Media: Opposed defense spending bill that lacks coordinated Indo-Pacific strategy ([June 15, 2025](#))
- Social Media: Questioned the administration’s decision to not fully support Ukraine ([June 15, 2025](#))
- Social Media: Opposed veterans affairs and military construction bill that underfunds needs in the Indo-Pacific ([June 13, 2025](#))
- Social Media: Questioning Defense Secretary Hegseth about the lack of support for soft power and international assistance ([June 11, 2025](#))
- Social Media: Opposing efforts to undermine American international leadership in science ([May 31, 2025](#))
- Social Media: Opposing Republican reconciliation bill ([May 22, 2025](#))
- Social Media: Opposing misguided immigration enforcement budgetary decisions ([May 19, 2025](#))
- Social Media: Opposing assaults on our environment ([April 17, 2025](#))
- Social Media: Opposing cuts to Social Security workforce ([April 15, 2025](#))
- Social Media: Statement on Signalgate security leak ([March 25, 2025](#))
- Social Media: Statement opposing Trump/Republican budget resolution ([February 25, 2025](#))
- Social Media: Statement opposing effort to close USAID ([February 6, 2025](#))
- Social Media: Statement on call to impeach judges ([March 20, 2025](#))
- Press Release: “Case Leads Effort in Congress Calling on President to Rescind Executive Order Permitting Deep Seabed Mining” ([April 25, 2025](#))
- Press Release: “Case Decries Trump Attempt to Dismantle U.S. Department of Education” ([March 20, 2025](#))
- Press Release: “Case Questions Secretary of the Army on Deletion of Web Page Devoted to the Legendary 442nd Regimental Combat Team” ([March 14, 2025](#))
- Press Release: “Case Statement on President Trump’s Address to Congress” ([March 4, 2025](#))
- Press Release: “Case Statement on U.S. Actions in Venezuela” ([January 3, 2026](#))

- Social Media: Statement condemning ICE actions in Minnesota ([January 25, 2026](#))
- Press Release: “Case Statement On U.S. Strikes On Iran” ([February 28, 2026](#))
- Press Release: “Case Votes To Assert Congress' Exclusive Constitutional Authority To Authorize War” ([March 5, 2026](#))
- Press Release: “Case Opposes Fiscal Year 2027 Energy And Water Funding Bill That Hikes Energy Costs, Risks Natural Disaster Cleanup Efforts And Cuts Research Projects” ([May 20, 2026](#))

JOINT EFFORTS (FULL TEXT BELOW)

- Requesting Musk to brief the House on DOGE efforts
- Opposing “deferred resignation” offer to federal employees
- Firing of National Labor Relations Board Member Gwynne Wilcox
- Withdrawing from the World Health Organization
- National Institute of Health (NIH) public-facing work freeze
- IRA / Bipartisan Infrastructure Law funding freeze
- USAID shutdown
- USAID shutdown in the Pacific Islands
- Frozen access to public federal datasets and data-driven tools
- Decreased National Institutes of Health (NIH) reimbursement rates
- “What Did You Do” last week email
- Cuts to Tribal programs
- Supporting Office of Special Counsel’s mission to protect federal workers
- Mass layoffs at the National Oceanic and Atmospheric Administration (NOAA)
- Shipbuilding hiring freeze
- Department of Energy job cuts
- Brown Tree Snake program cuts
- IRA wildfire related funding freeze
- President’s Emergency Plan for AIDS Relief funding freeze
- Equal Employment Opportunity commissioner firing
- Workforce reduction at the Federal Advisory Committee for Science Quality and Integrity and U.S. Geological Survey
- Attack on U.S. Institute of Peace (USIP)
- Freezing educational and cultural exchange programs
- National Endowment for the Humanities (NEH) funding cuts
- USDOE workforce reductions in force
- Consumer Financial Protection Bureau shutdown impact on seniors
- Community Development Financial Institutions Fund elimination
- Institute of Museum and Library Services (IMLS) elimination
- Title X Family Planning Program funding freeze
- Limiting eligibility to the Public Service Loan Forgiveness Program

- Terminating collective bargaining at the Department of Defense Education Activity
- Effect on Impact Aid from dismantling the USDOE
- Eliminating Manufacturing Extension Program grant for INNOVATE Hawai'i
- Effect of TRIO Programs from dismantling USDOE
- Impact from Environmental Protection Agency (EPA) Deregulation on Climate Change Rules
- Termination of Fair Housing Grants
- Call to reinstate agricultural inspectors
- Frozen climate change funds (Greenhouse Gas Reduction Fund)
- Government Accountability Office access to database tracking IRA and Bipartisan Infrastructure Law funds
- Frozen Urban and Community Forestry Grants
- EPA cuts
- Potential conflicts of interest with Starlink and the Federal Aviation Administration
- NOAA layoffs
- Office of Community Development and Planning staffing reductions
- U.S. Forest Service staffing reductions
- Support for NOAA
- Frozen for wildfire mitigation funds
- USIP firings
- U.S. Agency for Global Media shutdown
- Citizenship and Assimilation Grant Program freeze
- National Fire Academy class cancellations
- Support for abortion access for veterans
- Removal of the history of various diverse men and women from military archives
- Public access to federal datasets and tools
- NIH indirect cost cuts
- Tribal self-determination executive order
- Ending federal collective bargaining executive order
- Office of Minority Health closure
- Dismantling of the Office of English Language Acquisition
- Withdrawal of grant funding opportunities for the Office on Violence Against Women
- Cancellation of international family planning and reproductive health programs
- Terminating grants and employees at the NEH, National Endowment for the Arts (NEA) and the IMLS
- Opposing deep sea mining
- Requesting the Speaker of the House fill the Office of Congressional Conduct vacancy
- USDA Restrictions on Terminology
- Opposing hiring freezes at military depots
- Terminating grants at the National Endowment for the Arts
- Opposing effort to undermine the Multilingual Emergency Alerts Rule
- Opposing efforts to stop all National Science Foundation funding actions
- Restore all appropriated Title X funding
- Letter condemning the forceful restraint of Senator Alex Padilla

- Job Corps support
- Language Access Services Support for 14 agencies
- Reinstate the Building Resilient Infrastructure and Communities program
- Administration decision to review funding for Emergency Food and Shelter Program
- Unused supplies from foreign assistance programs
- Roadless Rule Repeal
- Letter to AG Bondi Regarding Weakening of ATF
- Social Security Staffing Cuts Impact on Congressional Casework
- Opposing Incineration of International Food Aid
- Opposing EPA Proposal to Repeal the Endangerment Finding
- RIFs disrupting Congressional casework services
- Oppose visa integrity fee and the visa bond pilot program
- PSLF student loans placed into forbearance
- Oppose Abortion Ban for Veterans
- Opposing DOJ Guidance for Implementation of Executive Order 14224
- Firing of Administration for Community Living Regional Administrators
- Letter to AG Bondi and ATF Director Regarding Weakening of ATF
- Opposing Potential Censorship of Historic National Park Service Sites
- Urging Health and Human Services to Cancel Proposed 340B Pilot Program
- Opposing ECA Programs Funding Cuts
- Opposing FEMA Requiring Noem's Approval for Activities over \$100,000
- Opposing decision to rescind \$350 million in funding for several Minority-Serving Institutions, including Native Hawaiian-Serving Institutions and Asian American and Native American Pacific Islander-Serving Institutions
- Follow up Violence Against Women Act Letter to AG Bondi
- Opposing Recission of Funds for the Corporation for Public Broadcasting
- OMB on Backpay for Furloughed Federal Workers
- Condemning DOE's decision to cancel billions in clean energy projects
- Urging USDA to use SNAP Contingency Funds During Shutdown
- Opposing the President's withholding of SNAP contingency funds during shutdown
- Opposing the recent reduction in force (RIF) at the U.S. Department of Education (USDOE) during the shutdown
- Opposition to the Administration's decision to terminate the entire staff of the Treasury Department's Community Development Financial Institutions (CDFI) Fund.
- Rescind widescale Reduction in Force (RIF) termination notices sent to the Impact Aid Program (IAP) Office staff.
- Letter to OMB expresses concerns surrounding agency communications regarding backpay
- Call the House back into session to consider the Senate-passed bipartisan resolutions terminating the emergencies declared to justify President Trump's tariffs on Brazil, Canada and other global trading partners.
- Letter to FEMA to on FY 2026 Nonprofit Security Grant Program (NSGP) awards.
- Letter to Secretary Rubio to continue supporting aid to Gaza and requests clarity on the plan to get aid to Palestinian civilians.
- Letter to Bureau of Prisons Director urging them to reinstate recently cancelled union collective bargaining agreement.
- Letter to CDC Director Regarding Acceptance of Advisory Committee on Immunization Practices September 2025 Vaccine Recommendations
- Adopt commonsense policies to end the National Housing Emergency

- Requesting an updated timeline for the execution of the Advancing Markets for Producers Initiative
- Opposing the shortened timelines for Continuums of Care
- Provide economic relief to small and medium-sized farmers, family farmers and specialty crop farmers
- Extension of key deadlines under the Reimbursement Transportation Cost Payment Program
- Opposing recent cancellations of bike infrastructure projects
- Opposing Endangered Species Act Regulations Revisions
- Fair Farm Aid for Specialty Crop Producers
- Delegation letter to FEMA and DHS expressing concern about FEMA grant delays and challenges in Hawaii
- Urging Federal Cooperation with State and Local Law Enforcement Regarding the Minnesota Killings
- Letter to the House Committee on Transportation and Infrastructure overturning the Department of Defense (DOD) directive that restricts communication between the U.S. Army Corps of Engineers (USACE) and Members of Congress and their staff.
- Letter to the U.S. Department of Health and Human Services Secretary Kennedy to release Title X Family Planning Program continuation application guidance for grantees.
- Letter to Department of the Interior regrading erasure of accurate information about Native Americans at National Park units.
- Opposing the U.S. Forest Service Reorganization
- Opposing Onerous Additional Information Requirements for Visas to Visit the US
- Opposing Department of Justice Olmstead v. L.C. Slip Opinion
- Opposing H.R. 1 Medicaid Community Engagement Requirements Interim Rule
- Opposing Office of Management and Budget Federal Grants Proposed Rule
- Opposing Mass Reassignment of Social Security Administration Staff
- Opposing DOE Energy Efficiency Rollbacks
- Opposing HUD Rescission of the Equal Access Rule
- Letter to the FCC to Protect Broadband Access for Schools and Libraries
- Letter to the U.S. Trade Representative in light of the Administration's decision to not renew the United States-Mexico-Canada Agreement (USMCA) for another 16 years and support to continue the agreement
- Letter opposing the reopening of the Pacific Marine National Monuments to commercial fishing
- Transparency on the Iran War MOU
- Letter to President Trump on Iran War MOU.
- In strong support of the E-Rate program
- Opposing USPS' proposed rule on "Ballot Mail for Federal Elections"
- Protecting Minority-Owned Small Businesses
- Opposing the "Regulation for Federal Financial Assistance" Rule
- Opposing Roadless Rule
- Opposing Mail in Voting Restrictions

Musk Should Brief the House

Dear Speaker Johnson,

We write to urgently request that you arrange a briefing from Elon Musk for all Members of Congress regarding his role in the Trump administration and his actions as the head of the Department of Government Efficiency (DOGE). We request that this briefing include details on DOGE's actions to date, future plans, the authority Mr. Musk believes he has to take such actions, and details on whether or not he intends to adhere to court rulings.

Since the start of his tenure as head of DOGE, Elon Musk has used his new position to inflict significant damage on the federal government, withholding funds that have already been appropriated by Congress, firing thousands of federal employees, undermining and even attempting to dismantle entire agencies, accessing sensitive taxpayer data, and threatening devastating cuts to services and promised benefits that everyday Americans rely on and have earned. A number of court orders have already ruled these actions to be unlawful, or even likely unconstitutional in the case of USAID.

These actions have had a direct impact on people across the country, and our constituents are reaching out in record numbers to express their opposition and outrage over Musk's role in the federal government and the harm he is causing to their communities. Many are also asking for a public contact for DOGE so that they may register their concerns with Mr. Musk and his team directly. Unfortunately, there is no public contact for DOGE, and even Members of Congress are finding it extremely difficult, if not impossible, to get any straight answers for our constituents.

Therefore, in the interest of communication and transparency, we believe it is critical that Elon Musk come to Congress to provide a briefing and answer any and all questions that Members of Congress have regarding his role in the Trump administration and his actions as the head of DOGE. We appreciate your swift cooperation in facilitating this briefing.

Thank you for your time and we look forward to your quick response.

Deferred Resignation Offer

Mr. Charles Ezell
Acting Director
U.S. Office of Personnel Management
1900 E St, NW
Washington, DC 20415

Dear Mr. Ezell:

We write to request further information on the impacts of the U.S. Office of Personnel Management's (OPM) "deferred resignation" offer and to express grave concerns with those impacts on essential government services across the nation.

Recent reports have suggested that over 20,000 federal employees have opted in and accepted the "deferred resignation," which has also been called the "buyout" offer.¹ This blanket approach to federal personnel policy could have major negative impacts on critical government services and functions, leaving agencies unable to fulfill their responsibilities as charged by Congress. Depending on which federal employees choose to accept the offer and how OPM and respective agencies administer this policy, this approach risks creating severe disparities and gaps in federal services and functions across the country.

To better understand the potential impacts to essential government functions across the country, we request a full breakdown of the total number of federal employees who have accepted the offer by agency across states, territories, and congressional districts. Please provide this by **no later than the close of business on Wednesday, February 19, 2025.**

We remain deeply concerned by the Administration's ongoing attacks on federal employees who serve our communities across the country. They have sown unnecessary panic and fear among not just the federal workforce but also our constituents who depend on federal services for their basic needs.

Thank you for your consideration.

Sincerely,
[[SIGNATURES]]

National Labor Relations Board Firing

Dear President Trump:

We are writing to express our outrage at the unprecedented and illegal firing of National Labor Relations Board (NLRB or “the Board”) Member Gwynne Wilcox and the negative impact this will have on working people across the country. This firing violates the National Labor Relations Act (NLRA), renders the Board unable to effectively enforce federal labor law, and profoundly undermines the independence of the agency. We call on you to reverse this action and to immediately reinstate Member Wilcox.

Section 3(a) of the NLRA states that “Any member of the Board may be removed by the President, upon notice and hearing, for neglect of duty or malfeasance in office, but for no other cause.” Yet the firing of Member Wilcox was done without hearing and was not for neglect of duty or malfeasance, meaning that this action clearly violates the NLRA.

Furthermore, workers rely on the NLRB to safeguard their rights to organize and collectively bargain to better their working conditions. However, by firing Member Wilcox and leaving the five-seat NLRB with only two Members, you have left the Board without a quorum and effectively shut down its decision-making ability. This simply encourages bad employers to violate the law and trample on workers’ rights, while workers subjected to illegal union-busting will face significant delays in receiving the justice to which they are entitled.

The NLRB is already dealing with substantial understaffing in its field offices. If the Board is unable to enforce the law, the delays workers face in resolving unfair labor practices charges will only grow. Additionally, victims of unfair labor practices will be unable to obtain the remedy they are entitled to if the perpetrator refuses to settle the case.

Finally, merely nominating a replacement for Member Wilcox to restore a quorum will not remedy the damage done by this firing. This firing has compromised the NLRB’s independence. Congress created the NLRB, like other independent federal agencies, to be non-partisan, and to apply the trained judgment of a body of experts informed by experience to issues that arise under the NLRA. Congress provided NLRB Members staggered terms so that the agency could accumulate technical expertise, and avoid complete changes in leadership at any one time. For nearly nine decades, NLRB members have indeed interpreted and effectuated the NLRA following their own expertise and without fear of reprisals. It is necessary to reinstate Member Wilcox immediately to restore that independence.

Accordingly, we urge you to reverse your decision and to immediately reinstate Member Wilcox to the NLRB to ensure that working people are afforded the protections to which they are entitled under the law.

Leaving World Health Organization

Dear President Trump,

We are writing to express our concern about the ramifications of withdrawing from the World Health Organization (WHO) and encourage you to reconsider your decision.

On January 20, 2025, you signed an Executive Order to withdraw the United States from WHO. At a public event on January 25, 2025, you said you might reconsider that position. We hope that you will indeed reverse your decision so that the United States can retain its leadership in global health and continue to receive the benefits of being a member of WHO.

We are aware of your expressed concern of “unfairly onerous payments” by the United States to WHO. WHO is funded through assessed contributions and voluntary contributions. Assessed contributions, which account for approximately 20 percent of the World Health Organization’s funding, are the dues paid by member countries, which are based on a formula considers the country’s gross domestic product (GDP) and its population.^[1] In 2024, the United States’ GDP was 50% higher than that of the next highest country – China.^[2] Under the WHO formula, our country’s dues for WHO in 2024-25 of \$130 million per year are in line with China’s dues of \$90 million per year.^[3] The remaining funds WHO receives are voluntary contributions that come from member states, philanthropic foundations, nongovernmental organizations (NGOs) and private citizens. As of November 2024, voluntary donations from the United States totaled nearly \$700 million during the calendar year and are typically used to fund specific programs.^[4] This level of support speaks to the the leadership role that the United States has played in global health and the generosity of our country, especially that of the NGOs and private citizens. Our participation in WHO translates into incalculable goodwill in countries around the world. The United States has long been a leader in global health partnerships, and we should not cede that title.

WHO funding does not only support the organization and foreign countries. The United States receives 46 cents of every dollar we pay to WHO in assessed contributions in the form of procurement contracts that support American businesses and jobs.^[5] WHO supports research at 72 centers across eighteen states and Washington, DC to advance health research and innovation, allowing them and public health officials in the United States access to data that is invaluable and irreplaceable.^[6] Withdrawing from WHO would mean a loss of manufacturing jobs in the United States and less funding to support communities across the country that are partnering WHO in the search for treatments and cures.

In addition to the economic reasons to maintain membership, we ask that you consider the dramatic improvements to global health due to the United States’ participation in the World Health Organization. Since its founding in 1948, the World Health Organization has led wide-ranging initiatives such as controlling measles, reducing mother-to-child disease transmission, addressing maternal mortality, defeating meningitis, reducing malaria, and advancing childhood cancer treatment. Due to its collaboration, WHO was successful in eradicating smallpox in 1980.

After the launch of the Global Polio Eradication Initiative in 1988, the Americas were certified polio free in 1994, and the virus is now only endemic in two countries.[7] We are on the verge of eliminating this horrible virus as well. To withdraw the United States from WHO now may stop – or worse, reverse – the progress that has been made on so many fronts.

Withdrawing from WHO may also have implications for the health of American citizens due to the globalized world in which we live. According to the United States Travel Association, the United States welcomed nearly 67 million international visitors in 2023, or approximately 183,000 per day. Total U.S. citizen departures reached 98.5 million in 2023, or approximately 270,000 per day.[8] If the United States is no longer a member of WHO, Americans around the world would be more susceptible to disease, but they could also carry it back to the United States and infect multitudes. Further, health officials would have an unnecessarily difficult time tracing a new outbreak, whether a new strain of influenza or an unknown antimicrobial resistant bacteria. This could lead to increased illnesses, hospitalizations, and deaths anywhere in the world, including the United States.

We appreciate your openness to reevaluate your Executive Order and your consideration of the many benefits that membership in the World Health Organization brings to our citizens and the world.

[[CLOSING]]

[1] <https://www.who.int/about/funding>

[2] <https://www.forbesindia.com/article/explainers/top-10-largest-economies-in-the-world/86159/1>

[3] <https://www.who.int/publications/m/item/assessed-contributions-payable-summary-2024-2025>

[4] <https://open.who.int/2024-25/contributors/contributor?name=United%20States%20of%20America>

[5] <https://betterworldcampaign.org/wp-content/uploads/2025/01/HealthForUS-Campaign-1.pdf>

[6] <https://betterworldcampaign.org/health>

[7] <https://polioeradication.org/about-polio/history-of-polio/>

[8] <https://www.trade.gov/feature-article/ntto-releases-international-travel-statistics-2023>

NIH Research Public Work Freeze

Matthew J. Memoli, M.D., M.S.
Acting Director
National Institutes of Health (NIH)
9000 Rockville Pike
Bethesda, Maryland 20892

Dear Acting Director Memoli:

Every American has a family member or loved one who has been affected by cancer. No one should have their clinical trial, or research critical to a cure delayed or suspended because of politics. We are deeply concerned by the effort to shut down public-facing work at the NIH, which has long enjoyed bipartisan support.

We demand that you take immediate action to resume this public-facing work, which has broad ramifications that affect everyday Americans. We are particularly concerned about impacts to clinical trials. We understand that purchasing orders to outside suppliers have been widely disrupted. For example, researchers who have clinical trial participants staying at the NIH's on-campus hospital, the Clinical Trial Center, weren't able to order test tubes to draw blood as well as other key study components. We are also concerned about any freeze of funding for NIH, which could hamper key clinical trials, research designed to secure cures, infrastructure needed to support research and clinical trials, and researchers and necessary support staff.

It is unacceptable to delay reviews that are critical to the advancement of important work. These meetings and study sections help determine which research projects to fund and disruptions could delay critical research and interrupt grant funding. For example, review panels for major Alzheimer's clinical trials scheduled for early February have reportedly been cancelled. Any delays that impact clinical trials will cause delays in developing new treatments, a major concern of the Alzheimer's community.

Uncertainty in funding can also have career-altering consequences, particularly for young scientists, who could leave the field or go abroad. This is a time when we want to attract the best talent and not lose it to China, Germany, or Canada. It is imperative that you restore funding, meetings and study sections to ensure delays don't negatively impact research. We also strongly urge you to provide an exemption from the federal hiring freeze to ensure clinical trials and critical research is not delayed or unable to be done through lack of staff.

We also raise concerns about the removal of guidance documents related to participants for clinical trials. It's very important to have representative samples in clinical trials in order to improve our understanding of how different drugs and treatments impact different patient profiles. We ask that you please restore guidance for trials to better include diverse populations, because this is mission critical for the future of science and its impacts on the American public.

IRA/BIL Funding Freeze

Dear Directors Vaeth and Hassett,

We write to request an itemized list of programs, projects, and activities that have been put on hold because of President Trump's January 20, 2025, executive order pausing the disbursement of funds included in the Inflation Reduction Act of 2022 (IRA) and the Infrastructure Investment and Jobs Act (IIJA).

Section 7 of the order states that this pause goes into effect "immediately" for these two laws, "including but not limited to funds for electric vehicle charging stations made available through the National Electric Vehicle Infrastructure Formula Program and the Charging and Fueling Infrastructure Discretionary Grant Program..." This vague language has sweeping implications, potentially pausing everything from active highway and bridge construction projects to broadband and water infrastructure expansions that received IIJA funding.

A day after President Trump issued the executive order, you followed up with a memorandum that did little to clarify exactly which projects and programs the executive order paused. In the memorandum, you wrote, "this pause only applies to funds supporting programs, projects, or activities that may be implicated by the policy established in Section 2 of the order." Section 2 of the order, however, provides only a series of broad, subjective policy objectives, rather than detailed guidelines specifying which projects ought to be frozen. Additionally, your memorandum states that "agency heads may disburse funds as they deem necessary after consulting with the Office of Management and Budget."

Given the "immediate" nature of this pause and OMB's role in overseeing further disbursements, OMB must have a list of which programs are currently receiving disbursements and which are frozen. We ask that you be transparent with the American people and make this information available immediately.

This executive order is a source of great anxiety for communities and businesses across the country that use this funding to build new roads, fix bridges, replace lead pipes, expand broadband access, strengthen infrastructure against natural disasters, and much more. Work is already underway on tens of thousands of projects in both the public and private sector, but their completion depends on these funds, which were already approved by Congress and enacted into law.

As a businessman, President Trump ought to know that delaying an ongoing construction project comes at an immense dollar price. As a president, he ought to know that delaying these projects needlessly makes our government less efficient.

We urge you to clarify what specific funds this Administration is withholding unconstitutionally – funds that our laws require be invested in American communities. The American people

deserve an answer, and if President Trump's repeated claims that he cares about government transparency were honest, you will provide them with one.

USAID Shutdown

Dear Secretary Rubio:

We write with deep concern regarding recent actions taken by the Trump Administration at the United States Agency for International Development (USAID). Reports have surfaced that the Trump Administration has already taken steps to shut down USAID as an independent agency, without properly consulting Congress in advance and without seeking necessary statutory changes. Decisions including to stop work on all foreign assistance immediately without meaningful consultation with Congress and in contravention to the intent of appropriated funding, place senior leaders on administrative leave without cause, and furlough or fire thousands of contractors, have created a crisis that threatens our national security and undermines American credibility on the global stage.

The work of USAID is vital to our national security. USAID helps stabilize fragile states, reducing the risk of them becoming havens for terrorism. In Syria, USAID has been instrumental in providing humanitarian assistance to an estimated 16.7 million people and holding back the potential resurgence of ISIS. By funding education, job creation, and good governance initiatives, USAID addresses the root causes of extremism, making it harder for terrorist organizations to recruit from vulnerable populations. USAID strengthens America's alliances and global influence by promoting economic growth, transparency, and democratic governance. Humanitarian aid provided by USAID also plays a crucial role in helping alleviate crises before they lead to further mass migration, such as in Haiti.

Development assistance reduces the need for costly military interventions by addressing potential conflicts before they escalate. Economically, USAID fosters global stability by helping to create new markets for U.S. businesses and mitigate economic shocks that can lead to instability. USAID provides Ukraine with emergency energy assistance which is critical to maintain core economic functions and defend the country from further Russian advances. USAID also enhances global health security to combat pandemics and strengthen health systems, protecting both international and domestic populations from the spread of infectious diseases, like bird flu and a current Ebola outbreak in Africa. We are facing major humanitarian crises like the one in the Democratic Republic of Congo that has displaced over two million people within the last year.

USAID actively combats gender-based violence (GBV) by supporting prevention programs, survivor services, and legal protections worldwide. Through education, healthcare, and advocacy initiatives, USAID works to address the root causes of GBV, strengthen legal frameworks, and provide survivors with access to justice, safety, and economic opportunities, helping to break the cycle of violence and build more resilient communities.

Ending USAID will not only make Americans less safe, but it also compromises our ability to

compete with rivals like Russia, China, and Iran.

Moreover, the Administration did not notify or meaningfully consult with Congress on these decisions before taking unilateral action over the past two weeks, ignoring Congress's essential constitutional role in overseeing funding, personnel, and U.S. foreign policy. It is crucial to preserve an independent development voice and capability within the U.S. government. By law, USAID is an independent entity separate from the State Department, and any changes to that structure would require legislative approval from Congress.

In the face of great power competition, the U.S. cannot afford to retreat from USAID programs that have long advanced American foreign policy objectives. America must remain engaged and lead by example.

Thank you for your attention to this critical matter.

Sincerely,

USAID – Pacific Islands

Dear Secretary Rubio:

We write to you to express our grave concern regarding the impacts of the 90-day foreign assistance freeze, stop-work order and potential shutdown of the U.S. Agency for International Development (USAID) on U.S. national security interests in the Pacific. At a time when strategic competition in the Indo-Pacific is at a critical juncture, halting essential assistance to our Pacific partners risks undermining U.S. interests and ceding influence to the People's Republic of China (PRC).

For decades, the United States has been a steadfast partner to Pacific Island nations, reinforcing our shared commitment to democratic values, economic development and regional security. This relationship is further strengthened through agreements such as the Compacts of Free Association (COFA) and the Pacific Partnership Strategy, which underscore our enduring commitment to the prosperity and security of the region. However, freezes in fulfilling U.S. commitments are creating uncertainty among our Pacific partners—uncertainty that the PRC has been quick to exploit.

The PRC has intensified its economic, diplomatic and security engagement in the Pacific, leveraging investments, infrastructure projects and corrupt political influence to expand its strategic foothold. Freezing or reducing U.S. assistance that helps our partners counter Beijing's economic coercion and identify the harmful effects of China's Belt and Road Initiative not only erodes trust in our commitments but also provides Beijing with further opportunities to deepen its influence at the expense of our national interests and those of our Pacific partners. The United States must demonstrate that we are a reliable and enduring partner in the Pacific, committed to supporting our friends against coercive economic and security pressures.

We are already seeing the concerning impact of these foreign policy decisions. We have received reports of U.S. efforts to counter the PRC's attempts to exploit natural resources, fuel corruption, undermine the free and open internet and more all being halted. For example, U.S.-backed electoral reform and disaster recovery assistance in the Pacific's most populous nation, Papua New Guinea, has ceased. Rich in natural resources and at risk of becoming a foothold for PRC military expansion, Papua New Guinea is one example of a key battleground in countering Beijing's influence.

Another concrete example of the detrimental effects of these decisions is the halting of the State Department Conventional Weapons Destruction programs, which supports the humanitarian, life-saving removal of landmines and other unexploded ordinances around the world, including in the Indo-Pacific. The stop-work order has halted demining efforts in the Solomon Islands and delayed the opening of the demining program in Papua New Guinea, which was set to begin on February 1, 2025. Programs to address unexploded ordinances in the COFA nations of the Republic of Palau and the Republic of the Marshall Islands have also been affected.

Finally, we are extremely concerned about reports that USAID is preparing to recall all American staff from missions around the world, including the two USAID missions covering 12 Pacific Island countries based in Suva, Fiji and Port Moresby, Papua New Guinea. U.S. presence in the region has increased over the last several years in response to urgent calls from Pacific Island nations for the need for a more intentional U.S. foreign policy presence, particularly in the context of the PRC's efforts to undermine the rules-based international order. Removing our personnel from the region now would break the trust and undo all of the progress we have made in recent years with Pacific Island governments and citizens.

We urge the State Department to take immediate action to ensure that all appropriated funds for the Pacific Islands are expeditiously disbursed. Furthermore, we request a briefing on the status of U.S. assistance and personnel changes in the region, so that Congress may work with the Trump Administration to address potential challenges.

At a time of intensifying geopolitical competition, U.S. leadership in the Pacific is more vital than ever. We look forward to your swift response and to working together to reinforce the United States' long-standing commitment to the Pacific Islands.

Public Access to Data

Russell Vought
Director
Office of Management and Budget
Eisenhower Executive Office Building
1650 17th St. NW
Washington, DC 20006

Dear Director Vought:

We write to urge you to immediately restore public access to federal datasets and data-driven tools, which are essential to government accountability, public and private sector research, and the work of businesses and non-profits. Those datasets have been created pursuant to Congressional direction and funded by American taxpayers. We therefore expect that data to remain publicly available, both out of duty to American taxpayers and out of economic common sense. Analyses have found that publicly-available federal health data alone adds more than \$300 billion to the U.S. economy every year. Accurate, detailed and relevant data can help save lives, create jobs, and lower public and private sector costs.

We are deeply concerned that those expectations are not being met. Among others, the following datasets and data-driven tools are currently unavailable to the public, or have been made unavailable to the public for a prolonged period in recent weeks:

- Health data, including the Centers for Disease Control and Prevention's (CDC) Behavioral Risk Factor Surveillance System (BRFSS) survey data, which is "sometimes the only source of state or territory-specific risk behavior data," and the Health Resources and Services Administration's (HRSA) Area Health Resource Files, which include more than 80 years of data to track healthcare staffing, hospital spending, and healthcare gaps in states and localities across the country.^{4,5}
- Energy data, including the Department of Energy's (DOE) Energy Affordability Resource Map, which allowed American homeowners and renters to find federal programs to reduce their energy bills, based on geographic location and eligibility.
- Census data, including File Transfer Protocol (FTP) access to the American Community Survey (ACS) Public Use Microdata Sample (PUMS), which allows the American public to create custom tables to analyze Census Bureau data rather than relying only on premade Census Bureau products.
- More than 1,000 other datasets, as the number of open datasets available to the public via Data.Gov has fallen from 307,851 on January 19, 2025,⁹ to 306,796 as of February 3, 2025.¹⁰

Urgently restoring access to these and other datasets and data-driven tools is critical to government accountability and to our nation's economic well-being. We therefore seek clarity on the Administration's plans to do so. Please provide answers to the following questions:

1. What datasets and data-driven tools has the Administration removed from public-facing websites?
2. Which, if any, does the Administration plan to restore public access to? Please provide a specific plan and timeline for restoring that access.
 - a. Of those restored or planned to be restored, please identify which have had research parameters changed or data modified to comply with recent executive orders.
 - b. Of those restored or planned to be restored, has any metadata or functionality that researchers depend on to use the data been modified or eliminated?
3. Which, if any, does the Administration not plan to restore public access to?
 - a. If any, please provide written explanations, specific to each dataset and data-driven tool, for why American taxpayers will be denied access going forward.
 - b. Additionally, please attach copies of all datasets to which American taxpayers will be denied access going forward.

Given the urgency of restoring access to these critical datasets, we request a response to these questions by February 19, 2025. We thank you for your attention to this matter and look forward to receiving those responses.

NIH Reimbursement Rates

Matthew J. Memoli, M.D., M.S.
Acting Director
National Institutes of Health (NIH)
9000 Rockville Pike
Bethesda, Maryland 20892

Dear Acting Director Memoli:

The United States is a global leader in biomedical research and innovation due to National Institutes of Health (NIH) funding. That is why we are alarmed by NIH's illegal decision to slash the reimbursement rate for indirect research costs to 15 percent across the board.

Because of the NIH, grantee institutions, and a vibrant life sciences sector, the United States has made significant strides in medicine, improving and saving lives with each breakthrough. From 1991 to 2022, the cancer mortality rate in the United States decreased by 34 percent. Annual HIV infections fell by two-thirds from the height of the HIV epidemic, and 65 percent of individuals diagnosed with HIV in 2022 achieved viral suppression. The life expectancy of someone born with cystic fibrosis today is multiple decades longer than it was 30 years ago. Each of these achievements was driven by research conducted at or funded by NIH.

The dramatically lower indirect cost rate cap will have far-reaching consequences for institutions and researchers nationwide, reducing their capacity to conduct cutting-edge research. Slashing this funding means cutting financial support for the construction and maintenance of laboratories and high-tech facilities; energy and utility expenses; and the essential safety, security, and other support services researchers need to perform their work. Indirect costs make research possible. Without fair reimbursement for indirect costs, research institutions may be forced to close laboratories, lay off staff, stop clinical trials, and pause research programs. This will force Americans to go without lifesaving and life-extending treatments.

The supplemental guidance for this misguided and detrimental announcement states that the "United States should have the best medical research in the world." Cutting vital funding for indirect costs accomplishes the exact opposite. Instead of supporting efforts to cure disease, this policy will severely compromise the United States' ability to conduct lifesaving research. A recent Washington Post article described how a researcher who studies how cells communicate faced a setback when the lab's "cold room" broke down. This cold room is essential for conducting experiments critical to advancing our understanding of colon cancer and developing potential cures. The expenses associated with maintaining cold rooms represent the kind of funding that would be slashed under NIH's policy, compromising the infrastructure that allows researchers to carry out their vital work.

Research universities generate significant economic activity in communities throughout the country. In 2024, the NIH supported work at over 2,500 institutions in all 50 states. In Fiscal Year 2023, each dollar of NIH funding generated \$2.46 in economic activity. The economic pain caused by slashing NIH research funding will not be contained to university campuses. It will reverberate into communities throughout the country, hurting hardworking families already struggling to keep up with rising costs.

The Further Consolidated Appropriations Act, 2024 was passed by Congress on a bipartisan basis and contains a provision to prevent NIH from unilaterally making changes to how the agency pays for indirect costs. We are encouraged that a federal judge has issued a temporary order halting this controversial decision. However, the uncertainty and disruption caused by these irrational decisions highlight the need for the NIH to immediately rescind this guidance on indirect costs and refrain from taking unilateral action on payment for indirect costs in the future. With this in mind, we request answers to the following questions:

1. What measures has the NIH taken to thoroughly assess the impact of capping indirect cost payments?
2. Were alternative solutions considered that would allow for budgetary savings without compromising research institutions' ability to conduct research?
3. How does the NIH plan to address concerns from research institutions about potential layoffs and halted studies caused by the new indirect cost rate?
4. How will significantly reducing funds available to maintain critical laboratory infrastructure impact the overall quality and progress of biomedical research and innovation in the United States?

Thank you for your prompt attention to this important matter. We ask that you provide responses to these questions no later than February 28, 2025.

Department of Veterans Affairs Staffing Cuts

Dear Mr. Secretary:

The Administration's late-night actions on February 13, 2025, to terminate over 1,000 dedicated federal civil servants at the Department of Veterans Affairs (VA) directly contradicts your recent testimony before the U.S. Senate, where you said, "I want to strengthen VA so it works better for America's heroes, and I will embrace your oversight and seek your counsel as we work together to do just that." Yet, rather than seeking the counsel of Congress, you took unilateral action to abruptly dismiss service-disabled veterans, military spouses, medical researchers, and countless others without any apparent justification—undermining the very mission of VA. There is nothing strengthening about gutting the workforce with the sacred mission to serve veterans, caregivers, and survivors.

It defies logic that you would terminate employees who are veterans themselves and who are serving veterans daily, all without regard to their performance or the devastating consequences of these firings. We know this to be the case because, on February 14, 2025, when congressional staff requested these justifications from your Office of Congressional and Legislative Affairs, the official currently performing the delegable duties of the Assistant Secretary for Congressional and Legislative Affairs claimed no one in that office had knowledge of these actions until VA's press release was issued the night of February 13, 2025, at 9:06 p.m. This admission underscores the reckless, ill-planned nature of these firings, as well as a complete lack of transparency in how they were executed.

Adding to our concerns, this mass firing follows a directive from the Office of Personnel Management instructing federal agencies, including VA, to provide justifications for retaining probationary employees. The sequence of events strongly suggests that the OPM directive was nothing more than a hollow exercise, ignored in favor of an ideological purge. This lack of meaningful review casts serious doubt on your claim that "these moves will not negatively impact VA health care, benefits or beneficiaries."

Given these serious concerns, we demand that you personally brief Members of Congress by no later than February 26, 2025, and that at this briefing you be prepared to thoroughly answer Members' questions and to produce documentation and other evidence to support your claims.

This Administration may believe it can run government agencies the way Elon Musk gutted Twitter—by arbitrarily slashing staff and expecting operations to somehow function seamlessly—but VA is not a tech startup, and veterans are not an experiment. We will not allow reckless political games to undermine the care and benefits our veterans have earned.

We look forward to your prompt response

What Did You Do Email

Dear Agency and Department Heads,

We write regarding the email that the Office of Personnel Management (OPM) transmitted to federal employees on the evening of Saturday, February 22, 2025, and its apparent direct relationship to Elon Musk's public threat to dismiss any employees who do not respond.

Mr. Musk's threat is reckless, cruel, unlawful, and unenforceable. You must take immediate action to clarify that the federal employees at your agency are not obligated to respond to this ill-conceived email stunt and that nonresponse cannot constitute resignation.

On February 22, 2025, Elon Musk tweeted that "all federal employees will shortly receive an email requesting to understand what they got done last week. Failure to respond will be taken as a resignation." Just hours later, OPM sent an email instructing federal employees all across the government to "please reply to this email with approx. 5 bullets of what [they] accomplished last week and cc [their] manager."

Whether Mr. Musk understands it or not, America is a nation of laws, our government is a system of checks and balances, and federal agencies will not be reorganized by social media post. This stunt is yet another example of the cruel and arbitrary chaos Mr. Musk inflicts on the American people by carelessly 'taking a chainsaw' to the people's government and the dedicated public servants who keep it running. Mr. Musk's consistent refusal to take any amount of care before disrupting operations across the federal government imposes far greater costs than it will legitimately save.

The nature of Mr. Musk's employment is opaque, likely unlawful, and has been cloaked in secrecy since day one of this Administration. What is clear and reflected in the cruel dismissal-threat tweet and ham-handed OPM email that followed, is that Mr. Musk lacks a basic understanding of how the federal government works. For example, the OPM email was sent to individuals who do not even work in the Executive Branch—including sitting federal judges.

Neither Musk's tweet nor the email account for the fact that many federal workers will not be receiving this email in time to respond by the deadline as they may be away from their secure workstation, on medical leave, or away from their email for completely justifiable reasons. He also, disturbingly, appears to be unaware that many federal employees are locked out of their systems due to DOGE's ongoing intrusion into federal information technology infrastructure. Finally, neither Musk nor OPM has explained to the public how OPM and the agencies would even review and process potentially two million responses from across the government—which are duplicative of existing performance management procedures—without diverting resources and costing the American people money and services.

The OPM email and Mr. Musk's social media post unleashed chaos throughout the federal government leaving millions of public servants unclear how to respond and agency leaders scrambling to determine how to proceed. Various federal agencies, including the Department of State and National Security Agency, have already appropriately informed federal employees not to respond to the email.⁵ Even Kash Patel, the Administration's new Director of the Federal Bureau of Investigation (FBI) clarified that OPM and Mr. Musk do not control agency staff, including in a message sent to FBI employees that, "the FBI, through the Office of the Director, is in charge of all of our review processes and will conduct reviews in accordance with FBI procedures."

Saturday's actions are a clear attempt by the Trump Administration to force the departure of dedicated civil servants who resoundingly refused to take the bait on Mr. Musk's scam "deferred resignation" offer. It won't work. Federal workers are committed to serving the American people. Indiscriminate online bullying will not advance any serious effort to ensure that the federal workforce is efficient, well-qualified, motivated, and deployed to maximize the effectiveness of government for the American people.

To this day, despite repeated inquiries from Congress, we do not know Mr. Musk's official status in government, we do not know what his financial conflicts of interest may be, and we do not know what—if any—control President Trump actually has over his actions. The capricious dismissal threatened in Mr. Musk's post would be illegal and cannot be tolerated. We urge you to immediately inform federal workers at your agency that his missives do not constitute official orders and that federal employees should not interrupt their service to the public to respond to OPM's mass email. You must also make clear that Mr. Musk's threat of dismissal due to nonresponse to OPM's email is invalid.

Sincerely,

Cuts to Tribal Programs

Dear President Trump, Secretary Burgum, and Secretary Kennedy:

We write to you today to urge you to take immediate action to halt, exempt, and reverse from existing or future executive actions any federal offices, services, or funding that serve Indian Country, as these positions and programs are essential to the administration of legally mandated Tribal programs and services.

We are gravely concerned about the implementation of recent Executive Orders (EO), including EO 14210 entitled *“Implementing the President’s “Department of Government Efficiency” Workforce Optimization Initiative,”* and the implications of reductions in the federal workforce and funding for Indian Country. As you know, the U.S. government has both trust and treaty responsibilities to Tribal Nations. These responsibilities are implemented by agencies including the Bureau of Indian Affairs (BIA), Bureau of Indian Education (BIE), Indian Health Services (IHS), and others, providing critical healthcare, education, and social services to Tribal communities. Your administration’s recent executive actions undermine legally required commitments to sovereign Tribal Nations, existing federal law, and the federal-Tribal government-to-government relationship.

In the past month, your administration has taken aim at thousands of federal workers across various government agencies. Reports indicate that this includes more than 2,600 federal employees at the Department of Interior, including more than 100 Bureau of Indian Affairs employees, more than 40 Bureau of Indian Education employees, several employees at the Office of Indian Affairs, as well as social workers, firefighters, and police that work on behalf of Indian Country, plus some 950 Indian Health Service employees at the Department of Health and Human Services. There have also been reports of layoffs at Tribal Colleges and Universities, including dozens of educators at both Haskell Indian Nations University and Southwestern Polytechnic Institute which are operated by the Bureau of Indian Education.

Independent federal oversight entities, such as the Office of the Special Counsel, have already deemed some of these firings to be unlawful. Beyond the legal questions surrounding the ability to fire employees without specifying performance or conduct issues, any unilateral attempts to disrupt existing services administered or funded by the BIA, BIE, IHS, or other Tribal-serving entities would directly violate the trust and treaty obligations of the United States to Tribal Nations. Tribal Nations are sovereign governments with a unique legal and political relationship to the United States.

The inherent sovereignty of Tribes is recognized in the U.S. Constitution, in treaties, and across many federal laws and policies, and it has been consistently upheld by the U.S. Supreme Court. These trust and treaty obligations in some cases predate both the establishment of all of the agencies in question as well as the United States itself. Pursuant to those legal obligations, the

U.S. must adequately fund and staff agencies that provide these essential services and programs, including at BIA, BIE, and IHS.

We have many concerns about the legality of the administration's recent actions and, importantly, the ways in which those actions impact the sovereignty, self-determination, and trusty and treaty obligations for Indian Country. The implementation of these obligations is a vital, non-discretionary part of federal law and the federal budget. This is not a partisan issue. We urge your administration to immediately halt, exempt, and reverse any federal workforce or federal funding reductions for Tribal programs or services and to engage in formal consultation with affected Tribal Nations at the government-to-government level. Any attempts to unilaterally dismantle or undermine these programs violates trust and treaty obligations, the U.S. Constitution, and centuries of legal precedent.

Protecting Probationary Workers

Mr. Hampton Dellinger
U.S. Office of Special Counsel
1730 M St. NW
Washington, D.C. 200036

Dear Special Counsel Dellinger:

We write to applaud the Office of Special Counsel for its recent decision to recommend halting the termination of probationary federal workers. This recommendation has profound implications for the livelihoods of nearly 200,000 federal government employees and the essential services they provide to the American public. In response to the ongoing assault on our federal government, we strongly encourage the Office of Special Counsel to ensure all unfairly fired civil servants are immediately rehired and protected from greater abuse.

The Office of Special Counsel (OSC) was created by Congress in 1979 as an independent and nonpartisan agency responsible for protecting federal employees from prohibited personnel practices that violate the merit system. These violations include employment discrimination, whistleblower retaliation, coercing political activity, and failure to adhere to laws, rules, or regulations. While this mission is often accomplished in partnership with inspectors general (IGs), President Trump unlawfully fired IGs in seventeen agencies across the executive branch during his first week in office. The brazen attack on the federal government's oversight infrastructure is alarming and emphasizes the importance of OSC.

Since Trump's inauguration, nonpartisan civil servants have been intimidated, threatened, traumatized, and fired for no legitimate reason. An estimated 10,000 employees have already been terminated with no regard to their performance or conduct, including at the Department of Veteran Affairs, the National Institutes of Health, the Small Business Administration, the Department of Agriculture, and the Department of Energy. There has never been a more cruel and baseless attack on our civil service in the history of our nation.

We urge you to continue fulfilling OSC's mission and ensure federal workers are protected from abuse. While your recent recommendation specifically applies to named complainants, it must be broadened and finalized to cover every impacted government worker. Additionally, the agency officials who carried out the illegal scheme must face serious disciplinary action. Congress has empowered OSC and the Merit Systems Protection Board with the investigatory, prosecutorial, and enforcement authority necessary to counter the unlawful abuses of power, and we stand ready to assist in that effort.

NOAA Layoffs

Dear Secretary Lutnick,

We write to express our profound outrage regarding the recent mass layoffs at the National Oceanic and Atmospheric Administration (NOAA). The termination of hundreds of dedicated scientists, meteorologists, and ocean experts, particularly from the National Weather Service, is a reckless decision that puts American lives at risk, undermines critical climate research now and in the future, and threatens the economic well-being of communities across the nation.

NOAA's work is the backbone of public safety and economic resilience. The agency's accurate and timely weather forecasting is the first line of defense against hurricanes, wildfires, floods, and severe storms. Without NOAA's real-time data and predictive models, emergency responders are left without the critical information they need to respond to impending disasters, putting millions at risk. For example, the 2020 Labor Day wildfires in Oregon, which burned more than one million acres and forced tens of thousands to evacuate, demonstrated the life-or-death importance of precise weather modeling. NOAA's meteorologists were instrumental in providing critical early warnings that saved lives—warnings that are now endangered by these irresponsible cuts.

Beyond public safety, NOAA is an economic engine for industries that depend on reliable weather and climate data. The U.S. commercial fishing industry generated an estimated \$321 billion in 2022 and supported more than 2.3 million jobs. They rely on NOAA's oceanographic assessments and climate predictions to sustain operations. In 2024, NOAA's drought monitoring and seasonal forecasts helped American farmers save crops when nearly 37 percent of the country was confronting extreme drought. Importantly, the tourism and outdoor recreation industries need NOAA's ability to predict and mitigate extreme weather events. Gutting NOAA's workforce jeopardizes these industries as well.

The assertion that these layoffs will somehow improve "efficiency" is not only misleading but outright dangerous. Efficiency is not only measured in dollars saved but more importantly in lives protected and disasters mitigated. NOAA saves money and American lives. In 2020, NOAA's hurricane forecasting saved approximately \$5 billion per major hurricane landfall. NOAA's mission is to provide accurate, science-driven information that helps communities prepare for and respond to environmental threats. A reduction in personnel cripples the very infrastructure that Americans depend on to withstand climate-driven catastrophes.

Given the gravity of this situation, we demand immediate and comprehensive responses to the following questions:

1. What specific criteria and assessments were used to determine the necessity and scope of these layoffs, and what alternative cost-saving measures were considered?

2. What evaluations have been conducted to understand the potential consequences of these layoffs on public safety, particularly concerning severe weather forecasting and emergency response?
3. How do you justify these layoffs in light of NOAA's significant contributions to the national economy, including the agriculture, fisheries, and tourism sectors?
4. With this significant reduction in staff, what measures are being implemented to guarantee that NOAA can maintain its current level of service and fulfill its mission without interruption?
5. Were industry stakeholders, state governments, and local communities consulted prior to executing these layoffs? If so, what feedback was received, and how was it incorporated into the decision?
6. Why was there no transparency and prior notification to Congress regarding these severe workforce reductions in a federal agency of such national importance?
7. To what extent are these layoffs aligned with the objectives outlined in Project 2025, which advocates for the privatization of certain NOAA functions?
8. What are the long-term plans for NOAA's core operations? Is there an intention to outsource or privatize critical services that are important to Americans?
9. What provisions are in place to support the displaced employees, and is there a plan to rehire or replace critical staff to prevent service disruptions?
10. Have all legal and contractual obligations been met in the execution of these layoffs, and how does the Department plan to address any potential legal challenges arising from this action?

The abrupt and ill-considered purging of NOAA's workforce is an affront to the dedicated public servants who work tirelessly to protect our nation's economy and natural resources, and to the people, industries and communities that rely on the information NOAA provides. We demand an immediate halt to these layoffs, reinstatement of employees terminated in these mass layoffs, and a full review of the decision-making process that led to this reckless action.

We expect your prompt and detailed response to the questions outlined above no later than March 14, 2025. The safety and economic stability of millions of Americans depend on it.

Shipbuilding Hiring Freeze

Dear President Trump and Secretary Hegseth,

We write today with extreme concern over the impact that the freeze on federal hiring may have on shipbuilding. The United States today requires a Navy that is larger, more capable, and ready for future conflict anywhere across the globe. For decades, the U.S. has underinvested in American shipyards, both public and private, which has led to a diminished ability to produce and maintain ships at the rate that is required for this ever-changing world. Our adversaries have watched and taken advantage of our reduced shipbuilding capacity, both from an industrial base perspective, and from our severe shortage in skilled laborers needed to weld steel, engineer hulls, and install complex electrical systems.

Over the last four years, we have worked in a bipartisan effort to enable shipyards to address the critical shortage in labor. We've supported the American workforce by investing in training programs, collaborating with educational institutions to create pathways in shipbuilding, and providing additional funding to support hiring more Americans to work in our great shipyards. These efforts have revitalized our American heritage of building the world's best ships and providing good paying, stable jobs for hard working Americans. These investments are not only in our constituents' and economy's best interest, but they are also in the best interest of our national security.

Our shipbuilders have a daunting task ahead of them. In 2024, China was estimated to have a shipbuilding capacity 230 times greater than that of the United States. That means China is producing more ships, much faster than we can keep up with. Our Navy and Coast Guard must compete with our adversaries across the globe, including China in the Pacific, and Russia in the Atlantic and Arctic. They must protect shipping and deter terrorism off the coast of Africa and in the Red Sea. They protect our shores from Alaska, to the waters bordering Mexico, and up to our Eastern Seaboard from drug smugglers, human traffickers, and nefarious activity. Without continued investment in shipbuilding and our shipbuilders, we cannot hope to enable our Navy and Coast Guard in achieving their mission critical objectives.

On January 20, President Trump signed an Executive Order to freeze federal hiring and require federal workers to return to in-person working—without explicitly exempting shipbuilding efforts. Over the last couple of weeks, DOGE's job cuts and threats of further cuts have forced some of our shipyards to cancel hiring events and put their own hiring pauses in place. The chaos and uncertainty caused by these actions is unproductive and harmful to the important growth that is needed at our shipyards. The impact that these orders have on our country's ability to build ships, compete with our adversaries on the seas, and hire Americans for good paying jobs, will be catastrophic to our country's safety. We implore you to lift the moratorium on federal hiring freeze, stop cutting jobs for critical industries, and allow employees to work where they are most effective, whether that be at home or in-person.

Our country does not have the luxury of pausing global events and China will not stop ramping up its naval forces to out compete ours. Hiring the required laborers for ship building is a matter of strategic, national, and military necessity. Fully supporting the shipbuilding workforce must be a priority for this Administration. We appreciate your attention to this matter.

Department of Energy Job Cuts

The Honorable Chris Wright
Secretary of Energy
Department of Energy
1000 Independence Avenue, SW
Washington, D.C. 20585
Dear Secretary Wright:

We are writing to demand an end to the Trump Administration's illegal firings of public servants, including those at the Department of Energy (DOE). The affected individuals at the DOE are responsible for managing our nuclear weapons arsenal, ensuring affordable and reliable energy for all Americans, managing factory investments that have created tens of thousands of jobs, and helping the United States compete with China in the global market for next-generation energy technology. These are essential public services brushed aside in the chaotic disruption of vital government functions that has become a central feature of this Administration.

On February 14th, the Administration reportedly terminated at least 1,800 employees at the DOE.^[1] These firings are illegal. Congress enacted merit system principles to protect all federal employees from arbitrary action and coercion for partisan political purposes. Congress also made clear that federal employees must be treated with due regard for their privacy and constitutional rights.^[2] The Administration's actions fall far short of these standards and instead are the precise types of actions that Congress has consistently legislated against, in accordance with Congress's Article I powers to regulate executive agencies.

A federal employee still in their probationary period, moreover, may only be terminated if their work performance or conduct does not demonstrate their fitness or qualifications for continued employment,^[3] and not for made-up arbitrary reasons or partisan political reasons. Additionally, federal law requires that, if a probationary employee is terminated, they must receive information in their termination notice that "shall as a minimum, consist of the agency's conclusions as to the inadequacies of his performance or conduct".^[4] These requirements were implemented to prevent partisan politics from influencing the decision to replace a public servant—partisan politics of the kind that appear to motivate the current administration.

DOE probationary employees covered by unions have further rights that were ignored in the illegal firings. For example, the Collective Bargaining Agreement (CBA) that covers employees at the DOE Headquarters requires supervisors to meet with probationary employees every six months and to share whether an employee needs to improve their performance for continued employment.^[5] Yet most of the employees covered by the CBA received termination letters from the political appointees of their office that simply stated their continued employment is "not in

the public interest.” Immediate supervisors who provided probationary employees with superior performance reviews were given no say or recourse in the illegal firing decisions.^[6]

If not reversed, these firings could constitute an impoundment in that the president would be attempting to do unilaterally by fiat what he cannot pass through Congress – an attempt to seize a power clearly assigned to Congress in the U.S. Constitution.^[7] Congress, with bipartisan support, has consistently allocated funding to the DOE to ensure America’s security and prosperity by addressing its energy, environmental, and nuclear challenges through transformative science and technology solutions. By illegally ignoring the will of Congress, these mass firings are harming critical bipartisan objectives and causing chaos within the offices that address these critical national challenges. Moreover, future layoffs would severely limit the department's ability to meet its core missions of ensuring nuclear security, providing affordable energy, and promoting economic development.

One of Congress’s key objectives with regard to the DOE is to manage our nation's nuclear weapons arsenal, which has been fundamental to our national security since the end of World War II. Yet 325 of the recently dismissed probationary employees work for the National Nuclear Security Administration (NNSA),^[8] which is responsible for safeguarding our nation’s nuclear arsenal while also working to reduce the global threat associated with nuclear weapons.^[9] The scientists and other experts in the NNSA hold some of the most critical positions in the field of nuclear weaponry. Dismissing these essential employees not only undermines our national security but also jeopardizes the fragile pipeline of future nuclear experts.

We acknowledge that you are attempting to rehire these NNSA employees, but the violations remain, and significant damage has already been done. Additionally, your administration reportedly cannot contact these nuclear employees to try to rehire them.^[10] This is concerning and demonstrates a shocking level of incompetence.

Your mass firings are also disrupting programs that make energy more affordable for all Americans and deploy investments for clean energy manufacturing that supports tens of thousands of jobs. Dozens of employees were fired who deployed funding through the Home Energy Rebates and Weatherization Assistance Program, which reduce energy bills by hundreds of dollars each year for low-income households.^[11] Roughly 60 employees were also fired from the Loans Program Office,^[12] which has provided funding to support 32 manufacturing facilities that will employ nearly 47,000 Americans.^[13] Ironically, a \$465 million loan from the DOE Loan Programs Office went to Elon Musk to help him build his first mass-market factory.^[14] Yet Musk is now trying to gut the program, which appears to us an attempt to quash potential competition from other electric vehicle manufacturers.

During your confirmation hearing before the Senate Energy and Natural Resources Committee on January 15, you stated, “My mission would be to inspire people in the department, in the labs, and across the network to focus on what’s most important for Americans, which is growing the

supply of affordable, reliable, and secure American energy.”^[15] These politically motivated mass firings run contrary to that goal.

In response to another question about how you would respond to an order to commit impoundment, you responded, “My mission, the only way I roll, would be to follow the laws and statutes of the United States of America.”^[16] In light of these firings, it is hard not to view that statement, made just weeks ago, as a deliberate evasion.

To better understand these actions, which have made America weaker, we request answers to the following questions by March 13th, 2025:

1. Was it your plan to fire these employees?
2. Alternatively, were you directed to fire these employees, and if so, by whom were you directed?
3. Prior to issuing these termination actions, did you or your department conduct any analysis or prepare any report, memorandum, or other document analyzing the positions subject to termination and/or the effects of those terminations on your department’s operations or mission?
4. What criteria were used to determine which positions and employees would be subject to termination?
5. Did you conduct any individualized review of employees’ performance or conduct prior to the issuance of employee termination notices?
6. Were any of the employees who were fired identified for termination as the result of previously-documented deficiencies with their work performance or conduct?
7. Were any terminated employees or putatively-terminated employees notified in writing of performance- or conduct-related cause for their termination before their termination or attempted termination?
8. Prior to issuing termination actions, did you develop a plan for the agency-wide terminations and/or for the continuance of department operations?
9. Were any classified or sensitive department systems accessed in connection with these terminations by individuals without the requisite security clearances or approvals necessary to access such systems?
10. Will you commit to reviewing all future interventions by outside entities in the department's work, including those of the Department of Government Efficiency?
11. Will you oppose any such interventions that do not comply with the law, do not comply with the DOE’s Collective Bargaining Agreement, or do not align with the testimony you provided during your confirmation hearing?
12. Do you plan to make another attempt to fire probationary employees?
13. If so, will the department follow the legal requirements by only terminating employees for specific performance- or conduct-related reasons and with the cause provided to each such employee in writing?
14. Is the department planning reductions in force?

15. If so, does the department plan to follow the legal requirements that constrain reductions in force?
16. Do you plan to implement the laws Congress has imposed on the department, including annual appropriations under which Congress has specified the obligations and current funding of the Department of Energy?
17. How do you propose to “inspire the people in the department” now that your firings have put every one of its public servants in fear for their livelihood?

Thank you for your immediate attention to this critical matter.

Brown Tree Snake

Dear Secretary Rollins and Acting Administrator Ehikian,

We, the undersigned Members of Congress, write to express my deep concern regarding the recent termination of the lease for the USDA APHIS Wildlife Services office in Guam (WS-Guam). This termination has the potential to significantly disrupt mission-critical activities that are essential for biosecurity in the Pacific. WS-Guam's biosecurity mission not only protects Guam's ecosystems, but also protects the biosecurity of our regional allies, Pacific territories, Hawai'i, and beyond. I urge your immediate attention to this matter and request that the lease be reinstated to ensure the continuity of these vital operations.

The WS-Guam program plays a critical role in safeguarding public safety, national security, and environmental integrity through its work in:

1. **Brown Tree Snake (BTS) Control and Interdiction:** This initiative protects both military and civilian infrastructure, preventing the spread of BTS to other Pacific islands, where they could cause ecological devastation and economic harm. BTS control directly supports military readiness in the Indo-Pacific region.
2. **Bird Air Strike Hazard (BASH) Management:** This program is essential for reducing wildlife-related aviation risks, ensuring the safety of military and civilian flights. Similar efforts are conducted on military bases in Japan and the Republic of Korea.
3. **Feral Swine Control:** This activity mitigates risks associated with wildlife disease transmission to both humans and livestock, protecting agricultural and environmental resources.
4. **Predator Control for the Department of the Navy (DON):** These efforts are crucial for maintaining military readiness and national security objectives in INDOPACOM.

The WS-Guam facility currently houses 47 full-time employees (FTEs), firearms storage, a variety of sensitive field equipment, and specialized equipment, including a USDA-owned OH-6A Cayuse helicopter. The space occupied is critical for operational efficiency and effectiveness given the scale of the programs managed from this location. Without the recission of the lease termination, WS-Guam will face significant challenges in carrying out its mission, risking Pacific biosecurity.

Recently, it has come to our attention that GSA has been terminating leases across multiple agencies in an effort to consolidate office space. However, the unique operational requirements of WS-Guam, along with limited space, make relocation within other civilian agency spaces impractical. Additionally, Department of Defense (DOD) in-kind facilities are already under significant strain as Guam becomes a strategic focal point in national security efforts, with an expected increase in 36,000+ DOD personnel over the next 10 years.

Without an alternative facility, WS-Guam's ability to carry out its mission will be severely hampered, potentially leading to increased ecological and economic threats across the Pacific

region. Given the critical nature of WS-Guam's work and the lack of feasible alternatives, we respectfully request that the lease termination be reconsidered and rescinded. Preserving this lease is vital to ensuring continued biosecurity and safety across the region. Your immediate intervention is needed to prevent disruptions to these essential programs.

Thank you for your time and attention to this urgent matter. Your leadership and commitment to responsible stewardship of the United States' resources is admirable, and we look forward to your prompt response.

Wildfires/IRA Funding Freeze

Dear Secretary Rollins, Secretary Burgum, and Secretary Noem:

The United States is grappling with a wildfire crisis. We no longer face wildfire seasons but wildfires year-round, as evidenced by the ongoing wildfires in Southern California, which occurred far outside of the traditional fire season. These fires highlight the need for a renewed, year-round, and comprehensive focus – paired with significant investments – in wildfire mitigation and community defense.

We are concerned about the implications of President Trump’s recent Executive Order “Unleashing American Energy,” that paused wildfire mitigation and other spending from the Bipartisan Infrastructure Law and the Inflation Reduction Act, along with other orders that unlawfully halt Congressionally-appropriated programs across the federal government.

In the past several years, Congress invested more than \$15 billion through the Bipartisan Infrastructure Law and the Inflation Reduction Act to keep communities safe by restoring healthy forest ecosystems, reducing hazardous fuels that increase the intensity and speed of wildfires, providing planning resources to at-risk communities, and increasing pay for federal wildland firefighters. Any efforts by the federal government to illegally withdraw these investments in community safety and wildfire preparedness are a massive disservice to our constituents, ecosystems, watersheds, national security, and wildland firefighters on the frontlines.

The ongoing pause in federal disbursements is particularly alarming for federal, state, local, and other collaborative efforts to manage hazardous fuels, suppress and mitigate wildfires, and strengthen community resilience and preparedness. We are already hearing reports about the impacts of President Trump’s funding pause on our ability to prepare for catastrophic wildfire—especially now as our federal firefighters attempt to staff up for the upcoming fire season. One official warned that, “the inability to have workforce onboarded and ready to respond is going to have a negative impact on suppression efforts across the West... It’s having immediate impacts.”

The potential consequences of the President’s efforts to withhold these critical investments to the communities and lands that need them in a timely manner and as directed by Congress are grave. Without urgent corrective action from this administration, we will be less safe, less prepared, and more vulnerable to extreme wildfire threats.

Therefore, by February 15, 2025, please provide the following:

1. An inventory of all the federal funding and assistance programs across the Departments of Agriculture, Interior, and Homeland Security that the Administration has currently paused that are related to:
 - Hazardous fuels management or other wildfire mitigation activities;

- State, local, tribal, and community collaboration on wildfire mitigation;
 - Community resilience and preparedness activities, including home hardening and defensible space;
 - Firefighter training, enhanced benefits, or casualty assistance programs;
 - Wildfire research and science associated with managing wildland fire, fuels, and fire impacts to ecosystems and communities;
 - Any other programs related to wildfire;
2. A list of projects related to the programs listed in question #1 whose implementation or operation was altered in any way after the release of OMB's now-rescinded January 27, 2025 memo; physical addresses or geographic coordinates for each project; an explanation of how implementation of those projects was changed after January 27, 2025; the number of people that resigned, refused job offers, or were laid off from the projects after January 27, 2025; the total number of acres that were not treated or for which treatment was delayed after January 27, 2025; a list of programs that resumed implementation after the memo was rescinded; and a list of the programs that continue to be paused;
 3. An explanation of how your agency, in collaboration with other impacted Federal agencies described in question #1, is monitoring how the President's Executive Orders are impacting wildfire readiness, community preparedness, or hazardous fuels management goals; and
 4. A timeline for your plans to resume implementation and disbursement of agency processing and funding for programs described in question #1.

The urgent and timely need for action on wildfire preparedness and mitigation cannot be overstated. Any delay in funding and implementation of critical programs threatens the safety and resilience of our communities, ecosystems, and firefighters. We look forward to your prompt response and remain ready to work together to address this escalating crisis with the necessary resources and commitment.

PEPFAR

Dear Secretary Rubio,

We write to express deep concern about the impact of the foreign aid funding pause on global health programs, particularly the President's Emergency Plan for AIDS Relief (PEPFAR). We urge that essential HIV and AIDS services continue uninterrupted; a halt in these services threatens millions of lives, undermines decades of progress, and diminishes U.S. leadership in global health security and diplomacy.

PEPFAR operates in 54 countries, primarily across Africa, delivering life-saving care to millions through a network of over 190,000 full-time clinical and support staff.^[1] These health professionals, including 1,422 doctors, 13,577 nurses and nursing assistants, and more than 108,000 community health workers — earning an average of just over \$3,000 per year — provide essential HIV treatment, testing, and prevention services. Building and sustaining this public health infrastructure further supports pandemic preparedness against future emerging infectious diseases and other global health threats to U.S. security.

The scope of PEPFAR's impact is staggering: each day, over 222,000 people collect antiretroviral therapy to stay healthy; more than 90% of pre-exposure prophylaxis (PrEP) initiates globally; more than 224,000 HIV tests are conducted, diagnosing 4,374 new cases, including pregnant women in antenatal care; 17,695 orphans and vulnerable children affected by HIV receive support; 7,163 cervical cancer screenings are performed, diagnosing and treating hundreds of women with pre-cancerous or cancerous conditions; and 3,618 women experiencing gender-based violence, including 779 cases of sexual violence, receive care and support.^[2]

These are not just numbers. They represent real people whose lives are at risk from any pause or suspension in U.S. foreign assistance. Globally, HIV remains a crisis, with 1.3 million new infections annually — 3,500 every day. In Sub-Saharan Africa, 3,100 young women and girls aged 15 to 24 are newly infected with HIV every week.^[3]

While we acknowledge that PEPFAR has received a limited waiver to restart critical HIV services, including antiretroviral treatment and prevention of mother-to-child transmissions, other activities not explicitly mentioned in the PEPFAR waiver will remain suspended until further notice, including programs for prevention, key populations, adolescent girls and young women, and orphans and vulnerable children. Even short funding pauses jeopardize the ability of health workers and aid programs to provide services, with catastrophic consequences for those dependent on them.

PEPFAR's success in preventing and treating HIV is not only essential to global health but also a key component of U.S. diplomatic "soft power" and a testament to America's forward thinking. Suspending these essential services creates openings for adversaries such as China and Russia to expand their influence in regions critical to U.S. strategic interests, including Sub-

Saharan Africa and Southeast Asia, potentially costing American jobs and diminishing our technological edge in healthcare innovations. This aid freeze endangers both health outcomes and our country's credibility as a global leader.

Given the severity of these concerns, we request your response to the following inquiries:

1. **Impact on Global Progress:** What assessments have been conducted on how the pause in foreign aid will affect PEPFAR's progress in preventing new HIV infections and expanding access to treatment and services for key populations?
2. **Service Continuity Plans:** What measures are being implemented to ensure that essential HIV services — including testing, prevention, treatment, and support for vulnerable populations — are maintained during the funding pause?
3. **Mitigation Strategies:** Given the recent limited guidance on implementing the PEPFAR waiver, will the Administration expand the waiver to include PEPFAR HIV prevention services and other PEPFAR programs essential to saving lives?
4. **Program Disruption Monitoring:** What steps are being taken to track the immediate and long-term impact of the aid pause on HIV service delivery and outcomes?
5. **Implications for Key Populations:** How will the aid pause impact the availability and effectiveness of HIV programming for key populations?

PEPFAR is a cornerstone of global health progress and U.S. diplomacy, with bipartisan support spanning decades. This highly successful and impactful bilateral aid program represents the monumental goodwill of the American people. We urge the Administration to take swift action to prevent disruptions in these essential services. PEPFAR is the single best example of U.S. foreign assistance that makes America safer, stronger, and more prosperous. The lives of millions of people — and America's standing in the world — depend on it continuing.

Sincerely,

[1] The Andelson Office of Public Policy. *Impact of Stop Work Orders for PEPFAR Programs*. January 2025. <https://www.amfar.org/wp-content/uploads/2025/01/Impact-of-Stop-Work-Orders-for-PEPFAR-Programs-2.pdf>

[2] U.S. Department of State. *Results and Impact – PEPFAR*. 2024. <https://www.state.gov/results-and-impact-pepfar>

[3] UNAIDS. *Global HIV Statistics, Fact Sheet 2024*. 2024. https://www.unaids.org/sites/default/files/media_asset/UNAIDS_FactSheet_en.pdf

Equal Employment Opportunity Commission

The Honorable Donald J. Trump
President
The White House
1600 Pennsylvania Ave. NW Washington, D.C. 20500
Dear President Trump:

We write to express our **outrage** at your unprecedented dismissal of Commissioners Charlotte Burrows and Jocelyn Samuels of the bipartisan U.S. Equal Employment Opportunity Commission (“EEOC” or “the Commission”).¹ This **unlawful abuse of presidential power** undermines the EEOC’s historic independence, harms U.S. workers, and unduly politicizes the Commission’s work. It also impedes the Commission’s ability to fully carry out its critical mission on behalf of the American people. We urge you to swiftly reinstate Commissioners Burrows and Samuels.

Congress established the EEOC with strong bipartisan support in 1964 to advance equal opportunity for all.² The independent, bipartisan, multi-member commission is the primary federal law enforcement agency dedicated to preventing and addressing employment discrimination on the basis of race, color, religion, sex (including pregnancy, childbirth, or related conditions, gender identity, and sexual orientation), national origin, age, disability, and genetic information.³ Workers experiencing discrimination rely on the EEOC to be a fair and independent body that protects everyone’s rights, not one controlled by the political prerogatives of the executive.

From 2014-2024, the EEOC recovered \$5.6 billion for workers who were discriminated against under these laws, ⁴ significantly more than the agency’s appropriations during that time period. For FY 2024, the EEOC secured a record \$700 million for workers who experienced discrimination.⁵ The EEOC's role in enforcing these protections is essential to ensuring that all workers have a fair chance to obtain employment, provide for their families, and contribute to our economy.

The Administration’s firing of Commissioner Burrows and Commissioner Samuels is unprecedented and an **intrusion into Congress’ Article I constitutional authority**. The appointment of EEOC Commissioners is governed by statute and is designed to ensure the agency’s independence from the executive.⁶ The President appoints Commissioners and the Senate confirms them. That is the beginning and end of the executive’s role in determining who can sit on the Commission and for how long. The law not only expressly requires the Commission to be bipartisan, but it also sets out five-year terms, a design that ensures that Commissioners’ terms run between presidential terms, another purposeful action by Congress to ensure the Commission’s independence.⁷

Longstanding Supreme Court precedent also confirms that multi-member independent commissions such as the EEOC enjoy protection from “coercive influence” of the executive.⁸ In *Humphrey’s Executor v. United States*, 295 U.S. 602 (1935), the Supreme Court made clear that members of independent commissions like the EEOC cannot be removed at will by the President.⁹ Prior Presidents have agreed; no Commissioner of the EEOC has ever been removed prior to the expiration of their term in the Commission’s 60-year history.

The removal of Commissioner Burrows and Commissioner Samuels also undermines the Commission’s independence. Both Commissioner Burrows and Commissioner Samuels had been confirmed by bipartisan votes of the Senate prior to the start of their terms, with Commissioner Burrows’ term not set to expire until July 2028 and Commissioner Samuels term not set to expire until July 2026. ¹⁰

Workers deserve to earn a living free from discrimination and feel confident that when they are harmed, they can count on an independent EEOC, not a politicized body, to protect their rights. We urge you to reinstate Commissioner Burrows and Commissioner Samuels, and we look forward to your urgent response.

Federal Advisory Committee for Science Quality and Integrity (FACSQI) and broader workforce reductions at the U.S. Geological Survey (USGS)

Dear Secretary Burgum:

We write to express deep concern over the abrupt elimination of the Federal Advisory Committee for Science Quality and Integrity (FACSQI) and broader workforce reductions at the U.S. Geological Survey (USGS). These decisions undermine the agency's ability to uphold scientific integrity, provide reliable data, and fulfill its critical mission to protect public safety, natural resources, and environmental health.

The Advisory Committee for Science Quality and Integrity was established to provide independent guidance to the USGS Director on scientific integrity, research oversight, and data reliability. It was poised to play a vital role in:

1. Scientific Integrity – Enhancing policies to uphold ethical research practices, safeguard against misconduct and prevent political interference.
2. Laboratory Oversight – Strengthening quality control measures to maintain rigorous scientific standards.
3. STEM & Workforce Development – Cultivating the next generation of scientists through education and mentorship.
4. Tribal Partnerships & Research Advancement – Expanding collaboration with Indigenous communities and other key research partners.

The committee was created, in part, to address systemic failures identified by the Inspector General in a 2024 report², including serious lapses in laboratory oversight and scientific integrity. A notable example of this occurred at the National Water Quality Laboratory in Colorado, where quality control values were falsified. This incident was driven by pressures on analysts, compounded by heavy workloads and a lack of adequate oversight and support. FACSQI was designed to provide the necessary external oversight to prevent such failures and protect our drinking water testing—yet its elimination removes these essential safeguards, increasing risks to public health and safety.

This decision is part of a broader, troubling pattern at the Department of the Interior, which has also dismantled advisory panels on climate adaptation, conservation, and even the review of racially insensitive place names. Interior officials claim these cuts “streamline operations” and “reduce redundancies,” but in reality, they weaken the government's scientific capacity, erode public trust, and leave communities more vulnerable to environmental and natural hazards. The damage extends beyond FACSQI's elimination. The loss of 240 USGS positions further weakens the agency's ability to effectively:

5. Provide real-time earthquake and hazard monitoring.
6. Conduct essential groundwater and water quality assessments.
7. Maintain geologic mapping crucial for disaster preparedness.

8. Ensure sustainable management of mineral and energy resources critical to national security.
9. Support public lands conservation and outdoor recreation.
10. Build the strong domestic STEM workforce necessary for American innovation and competitiveness.

Given these concerns, we request responses to the following questions by April 8th, 2025:

1. How will USGS ensure scientific integrity without the advisory committee?
2. What steps is USGS taking to address challenges identified in the 2024 Inspector General report?
3. How will USGS maintain its ability to monitor natural hazards, water resources, and environmental changes given current staffing reductions?
4. What alternative mechanisms will be implemented to ensure independent scientific review and accountability?
5. How will USGS continue to support STEM workforce development and youth engagement?
6. How will USGS, as the primary source of information on domestic critical minerals supply chains, maintain up-to-date information on American geological resources?
7. What steps is USGS taking to ensure continued public access to its data, widely used for safety, outdoor recreation, resource management, and scientific advancements?
8. What steps is USGS taking to ensure continued protection of sensitive data, including proprietary information from industry surveys and sovereign tribal data on special and sacred sites?

USGS data and research have served as a cornerstone of national preparedness and environmental stewardship. The elimination of FACSQI and the loss of over 240 positions puts that legacy at serious risk. We expect a full explanation for these decisions and a clear plan for preserving the integrity, independence and capacity of USGS science moving forward. The American public, policymakers, and the scientific community deserve nothing less.

U.S. Institute of Peace

Dear Mr. President:

We write with grave alarm regarding the recent unlawful actions of your administration against the U.S. Institute of Peace (USIP). These include illegal trespass by personnel of the Department of Government Efficiency (DOGE) on USIP property, the purported removal of USIP Board members, and ongoing efforts to reduce and ultimately shut down USIP. We demand that your administration immediately restore control of USIP property to the USIP Board, cease unlawful actions against USIP, and respect USIP's role and status as an independent, nonprofit organization consistent with the law and Congress's direction.

The U.S. Institute of Peace was created in 1984 by Congress thanks to the bipartisan work of Senators Mark Hatfield and Spark Matsunaga. President Ronald Reagan signed the United States Institute of Peace Act (22 USC Ch. 56), formally establishing USIP as "an independent, nonprofit corporation." Congress explicitly laid out its intent for USIP to be an independent entity numerous times in this statute. In addressing the new USIP Board of Directors on February 26, 1986, President Reagan recognized USIP as "a valuable source of scholarly research and information on ways in which we can promote peace with freedom."¹

Instead of adhering to Congress's intent and the law, your administration has launched an unprecedented and unlawful assault on USIP. Your Executive Order 14217 includes USIP on a list of federal entities to be "eliminated to the maximum extent consistent with applicable law," even though USIP is not a federal agency.² On or about March 14, 2025, your White House Presidential Personnel Office attempted to terminate certain members of the USIP Board. Shortly thereafter, DOGE personnel presented a resolution purporting to remove USIP's president and install an acting president, Mr. Kenneth Jackson.

These actions run contrary to the USIP Act, which states that members of the USIP Board may only be removed by the President either "(1) in consultation with the Board, for conviction of a felony, malfeasance in office, persistent neglect of duties, or inability to discharge duties; (2) upon the recommendation of eight voting members of the Board; or (3) upon the recommendation of a majority of the members of the Committee on Foreign Affairs and the Committee on Education and Labor of the House of Representatives and a majority of the members of the Committee on Foreign Relations and the Committee on Labor and Human Resources of the Senate."³ None of these conditions have been met in your administration's attempt to purge the USIP Board.

We also strongly object to your administration's use of federal law enforcement to trespass on USIP property. Attempts by DOGE personnel to unlawfully remove USIP Board members on March 14, 2025, were accompanied by other individuals who identified themselves as special agents of the Federal Bureau of Investigation (FBI).⁴ According to public reporting and court documents, DOGE officials on March 17, 2025, threatened to target federal contracts held by

USIP's former security contractor, Inter-Con, if Inter-Con did not permit DOGE personnel to enter USIP's headquarters.⁵ The March 17th trespass of USIP's headquarters culminated in the removal of USIP's president and other personnel from the building at the direction of or with the assistance of the Office of the U.S. Attorney for the District of Columbia, the FBI, and the Metropolitan Police Department.

These actions are both unacceptable and unlawful, and they reflect your administration's weaponization of federal law enforcement to target and infringe on constitutionally protected rights and protections. We demand that you direct the U.S. Attorney for the District of Columbia and the FBI to immediately cease their trespass of USIP physical and personal property and restore access and control of all USIP property to the duly appointed USIP Board.

Lastly, we demand that you cease your administration's unlawful actions against USIP by respecting the authority of the duly appointed USIP Board members and recognize USIP's status as an independent, nonprofit organization established by Congress. For over 40 years, USIP has advanced our country's understanding of and commitment to peace around the world. Days after your inauguration, you echoed that same commitment to global peace and prosperity in your address to the World Economic Forum.⁶ We believe that USIP has played and can continue to play a crucial role in our nation's and your foreign policy.

We look forward to your swift response.

Educational and Cultural Exchange Program Freeze

Dear Secretary Rubio:

We write to express our deep displeasure with the Department of State's ongoing grant disbursement freeze for educational and cultural exchange programs and ask that you immediately unfreeze funding intended for grant distribution in the Payment Management System (PMS). Without a release of funding and clearly defined process, American citizens run the risk of being stranded overseas with no resources to support their stipends, housing, or logistics to bring them home.

On February 12, 2025, the Department of State announced a temporary pause on payments with absolutely no advanced notice to grant recipient organizations. Programs that cover educational and cultural exchange programs are funded in Title I of the Department of State, Foreign Operations, and Related Programs Appropriations Act and are not a part of the 90- day foreign assistance review process. The 15-day pause of grant distribution ended on February 27, 2025. However, despite the end of the distribution pause, exchange program funding has not resumed, putting current American exchange students and faculty at risk abroad.

There are at least 3,500 American high school, college, and professionals abroad on Bureau of Educational and Cultural Affairs (ECA) programs outside of the United States. A further 9,100 American students and professionals are set to participate in exchange programs and 17,500 international students expected to arrive in the United States in the next six months. More than 700 Americans working with Department of State educational and cultural exchanges have already been furloughed or laid off. Without lifting the freeze on grant disbursements more than 8,000 Americans who work on program administration will be at risk of losing their livelihoods.

Programs like the renowned Fulbright, Gilman, and Critical Language Scholarship (CLS) programs are impacted by the funding pause. Professional exchange programs including the International Visitor Leadership Program (IVLP), and young leader's initiatives such as YALI, YSEALI, and YLAI are seeing major impacts by the freeze. High school exchange program freezes on the Kennedy-Lugar Youth Exchange and Study (YES), Future Leaders Exchange (FLEX), and Congress-Bundestag Youth Exchange (CBYX) programs limit our high schoolers from experiencing new cultures and world politics. Even virtual exchanges like the J. Christopher Stevens Initiative are unable to continue without the funding pause being undone.

Your Department's educational and cultural exchange programs are a major part of our investment in young Americans and relationship building with future leaders abroad. The Department of State's exchange programs are an important component of U.S diplomacy, more than 40 foreign participants have gone on to hold important leadership positions, including former and current heads of state or government. These exchange programs strengthen bilateral relationships, enhance national security and alliances, and make America stronger.

About 90% of State Department funding dedicated to these programs is either spent on Americans or on American soil. International visitors who come to the U.S. on federally funded exchange programs bring critical resources to communities across the U.S. Many foreign governments financially contribute to these bilateral programs, ensuring shared responsibilities with the United States. In addition, the economic contributions of foreign students to the United States between 2022-2023 was more than \$40 billion. These exchanges have a long track record of making America stronger, safer, and more prosperous.

On any exchange program, participants' health, safety, and welfare is paramount. We cannot leave students who are already overseas – many of them Pell grant recipients – without funding to sustain their day to day lives. We cannot leave exchange participants currently on program in the U.S. in limbo without access to the grant funding that allowed them to come here in the first place. It is unsafe for this prolonged slowdown of funds to continue to negatively impact American exchange participants abroad and international exchange participants in the U.S. when the 15-day pause has already expired. We urge you to release funds in their entirety, to communicate transparently with implementers about any new review proves in place to ensure the safety and security of American citizens overseas, and to preserve key bilateral relationships throughout the entire world.

Additionally, we request that the Department of State explain why grant funding has not resumed along with explanations to the following questions.

1. What kinds of reviews have been happening during this pause, and to what end?
2. When do you expect this temporary pause to be lifted, and when will grantee reimbursements and payments begin to again be made?
3. What are your plans to ensure that the participants currently on ECA programs – including the 3,500 Americans who are abroad right now – are supported and their health, safety, and welfare is not put at risk?
4. If there is a waiver process or processes underway, what are the criteria for receiving a waiver?
5. Have any exchange grants been terminated? And if so, which ones?

Thank you for your attention to this matter. We look forward to a prompt reply.

National Endowment for the Humanities Cuts

Dear President Trump & Acting Chair McDonald,

We write to express our deep concern about the future of the National Endowment for the Humanities (NEH). Overnight, on April 2, 2025, the NEH terminated all current five-year General Operating Support grants awarded to state and jurisdictional humanities councils. This funding provides the majority of operating support for state humanities council partners of NEH. The administration is also targeting NEH with the aim of terminating more than 600 other grant awards, substantially reducing its staff, and eliminating many of the agency's previously announced grant programs. Such cuts will have a devastating impact on communities throughout our nation.

NEH was created by an act of Congress in 1965 and reaffirmed by Republican and Democratic Presidents and legislators over the following 60 years.¹ Congress has repeatedly supported the NEH and its state humanities councils and their effective service and distribution of federal dollars across the country. NEH funding has been instrumental in advancing groundbreaking research at universities, enriching our shared cultural experiences— from the King Tut exhibition to Ken Burns's award-winning documentaries—and uncovering our nation's history, including excavations at Jamestown, Virginia, and the preservation and publication of Mark Twain's writings.

A shift in the federal government's "fiscal priorities," as NEH's message to grantees states, does not justify withdrawing these funds. Congress has already appropriated them, and federal law requires that grantees receive support for the full duration of their grants, absent proof of misuse. We urge the NEH to abide by federal law and honor their agreements with grantees and humanities councils.

The NEH is the only federal agency that provides operating support for our nation's 56 state and jurisdictional humanities councils, which provide vital cultural services and critical funding to local nonprofit organizations nationwide. NEH funds, allocated to state humanities councils, are for local use and allow councils to leverage \$2 in private investment for every federal dollar spent.² The loss of NEH funding to humanities councils will decimate the ability of these nonprofits to serve communities in their states, eliminating programs that are essential to each state's cultural infrastructure. This will lead to significant job loss in communities that are the most vulnerable to the lack of federal support.

¹ <https://www.neh.gov/about/history/national-foundation-arts-and-humanities-act-1965-pl-89-209>

² <https://www.statehumanities.org/>

Libraries, museums, historic sites, and community centers in rural communities and small towns face particularly dire financial futures without grant funding from state humanities councils and the NEH. Small and midsize organizations are especially in need of additional programmatic support. These organizations are the backbone of our communities' unique cultures, reinforcing civic participation, community engagement, historic preservation, tourism infrastructure, and economic development. In short, they articulate a deep sense of place essential for a high quality of life.

The NEH and the state humanities councils are also an integral part of our nation's plans to celebrate the 250th anniversary of the Declaration of Independence in 2026. They will give families and individuals an opportunity to participate in our national celebration in their own communities and highlight local stories and contributions. Without NEH's leadership and investment, the scope and impact of this national milestone will be dramatically diminished, leaving many regions without the resources needed to meaningfully take part.

NEH's budget for the Fiscal Year of 2025 is \$211 million, a tiny fraction of the federal budget. These cuts will not provide significant savings for the federal government or the American taxpayer, but they will directly harm millions of American citizens – veterans, students, educators, seniors, and lifelong learners – who benefit from the diverse and far-reaching programs supported by the agency. We urge the Administration to reconsider this decision. Supporting the NEH is not merely an investment in cultural preservation; it is also a crucial investment in community health, education, social development, and economic vitality.

Thank you for your attention to this important matter. We look forward to working with you to ensure sustained federal support for the NEH.

Sincerely,

Department of Education workforce reductions in force

March 13, 2025

The Honorable Linda McMahon
Secretary of Education
U.S. Department of Education
400 Maryland Ave, SW
Washington, DC 20003

RE: Urgent Meeting Request to Discuss the Drastic Reduction of the Department of Education Workforce

Dear Secretary McMahon,

As Members of Congress, we are requesting an urgent meeting as soon as possible with you regarding the Trump Administration's gutting of the Department of Education's (the Department) workforce. As Members vested with oversight power, we demand an immediate discussion of why over 1,300 staff were terminated, how the essential services the Department oversees will be delivered with such a drastically reduced staff, and the projected impact of those changes on Americans across the country.

As many of the offices which have been stripped of their workforce were established by Congress, Congress has a role in the discussion of such drastic reductions of force and how it will affect the functions of the Department and, by extension, impact the millions of students, parents, families, educators, support staff and school districts in every Congressional district. Any changes involving the closure of the Department or its functions must not be done without the consultation of Congress and the Congressional committees tasked with the Department's oversight.

We request a response within 48 hours to this urgent inquiry. Please reach my office through my staffer Mieko Kuramoto (mieko.kuramoto@mail.house.gov).

Sincerely,
[[SIGNATURES]]

CFPB shut down impact on seniors

March 14, 2025

The Honorable Scott Bessent
Secretary
United States Department of Treasury
1500 Pennsylvania Avenue NW
Washington, D.C. 20220

The Honorable Russell Vought
Acting Director
Consumer Financial Protection Bureau
1700 G St. NW
Washington, DC 20552

Dear Secretary Bessent and Acting Director Vought:

We write to express our alarm with the steps you and Elon Musk, the head of the Department of Government Efficiency (DOGE), are taking to unlawfully close the Consumer Financial Protection Bureau (CFPB). Firing the Director, closing the main office, ordering staff to stop working, and removing portions of the CFPB website prevents the Bureau from meeting its mandate to protect consumers.

The CFPB provides a public service as the only federal agency exclusively focused on defending consumers in the financial marketplace. Created in response to the 2008 financial crisis, the CFPB protects consumers from unfair, deceptive, and abusive financial products and services. As Federal Reserve Chair Jerome Powell confirmed in a hearing last month, the CFPB is the only agency guarding consumers against deceptive practices by big banks.¹ The CFPB has been incredibly effective, returning over \$21 billion to consumers who were victims of illegal or abusive activities since its creation. The CFPB provides another vital consumer protection function: protecting seniors from fraud. In 2023, senior fraud complaints rose by 14 percent, with losses to seniors increasing by 11 percent to \$3.4 billion². Seniors are disproportionately targeted by fraud compared to other age groups. The CFPB participates in the Scams Against Older Adults Advisory Group and partners with other federal government agencies, advocacy groups, and private industry stakeholders. Their goals include expanding consumer education and outreach efforts, improving industry training on scam prevention, identifying innovative or high-tech methods to detect and stop scams, and reviewing research on effective messaging to prevent scams. Additionally, the CFPB's Office for Older Americans provides resources on how seniors can be protected from unfair and deceptive practices.

¹ <https://www.reuters.com/world/us/feds-powell-no-agency-other-than-cfpb-tasked-with-consumer-protection-2025-02-11/>

2 https://www.ic3.gov/AnnualReport/Reports/2023_IC3ElderFraudReport.pdf

Your efforts to shut down the CFPB will do irreparable harm to seniors in our communities by placing our constituents at an increased risk of becoming victims of fraud. Preventing the CFPB from enforcing consumer protection laws will have an outsized harm on our constituents because seniors are already disproportionately hurt by fraud. Additionally, closure of the CFPB will deprive seniors of the tools they need to defend themselves from fraud.

With this in mind, we request answers to the following questions:

1. What steps are you taking to ensure the CFPB's work to prevent senior fraud continues, including the agency's participation in the Scams Against Older Adults Advisory Group?
2. How much money has the CFPB returned to seniors who were victims of fraud since the creation of the CFPB, and how will the agency continue to use its enforcement actions to return money to seniors who were victims of fraud?
3. You have attempted to pull down the home page of the CFPB website. What steps will you take to ensure that resources, including webpages with information on preventing senior fraud, remain available to the public?
4. How does shutting down the CFPB's website, firing the Director of the CFPB, and ordering CFPB employees to stop working, prevent senior fraud?

We ask that you provide responses to these questions no later than March 21, 2025. We also acknowledge that these answers will not stop the immense harm that will occur to consumers of all ages should you continue to prevent the CFPB from operating or shut down the agency. Therefore, we remind you that only an act of Congress can legally close the CFPB and demand that you return the CFPB to its essential, and statutorily mandated, work.

Sincerely,

[[SIGNATURES]]

Community Development Financial Institutions Fund elimination

March 27, 2025

The Honorable Scott Bessent Secretary
U.S. Department of the Treasury
1500 Pennsylvania Ave., NW
Washington, D.C. 20220

Secretary Bessent,

We write to express our strong concerns with a recent Executive Order issued by President Trump to reduce “elements of the Federal bureaucracy that the President has determined are unnecessary,” requiring that the “non-statutory components and functions of the following governmental entities shall be eliminated to the maximum extent.”¹ One of the governmental entities listed is the Community Development Financial Institutions (CDFI) Fund, which is fully authorized and appropriated by Congress and administered by your Department. We, along with industry and community stakeholders,² reject the premise that anything about the CDFI Fund and the CDFIs it supports is “unnecessary,” and we request the Administration immediately exempt the CDFI Fund from this harmful order.

For more than 30 years, across Republican and Democratic Administrations, the CDFI Fund has been a bipartisan success, providing grants, technical assistance, and other support to community banks, credit unions, and loan funds across the country that are certified as CDFIs. These CDFIs leverage a relatively small amount of Federal funds to provide financial access to underserved communities that traditional financial institutions ignore. Currently, there are 1,432 CDFIs located in all 50 states, D.C., Guam, and Puerto Rico, and they offer a range of financial products and services to consumers and small businesses in rural, urban, native, and other communities.³ According to the latest data, CDFIs have over 19 million loans outstanding totaling more than \$300 billion.⁴ These CDFIs are relatively small, with banks and credit unions holding \$577 million and \$567 million in assets, respectively, and CDFI loan funds have \$67.8 million in total assets.⁵

During the pandemic and the Trump Administration’s first term, Democrats and Republicans worked with your predecessor, former Secretary Mnuchin, to provide historic support to CDFIs because they serve as lifelines for underserved communities and play a pivotal role in helping small businesses keep the lights on and to pay the workers they employ. We appreciate that you have characterized CDFIs as “very important,” and that the new Secretary of

<image002.png>

¹ White House, *Continuing the Reduction of the Federal Bureaucracy* (Mar. 14, 2025).

² See Letter from CDFI Trades to Senate CDFI Caucus (Mar. 18, 2025); Letter from Depository Institution Trades to Senate CDFI Caucus (Mar. 18, 2025); NCRC, Mistake To Attack The Bipartisan CDFI Fund (Mar. 17, 2025)

³ See Treasury, CDFI Certification (accessed Mar. 19, 2025).

⁴ Treasury, CDFI Annual Certification and Data Collection Report (ACR): A Snapshot for Fiscal Year 2023 (Dec. 2024).

⁵ *Id.*

Housing and Urban Development (HUD) claimed CDFIs had “value.”⁶ Moreover, we appreciate your recent clarification that, “This Administration recognizes the important role that the CDFI Fund and CDFIs play in expanding access to capital and providing technical assistance to communities across the United States.”⁷

Your words, however, are in direct conflict with the plain language of the President’s Executive Order characterizing the CDFI Fund as “unnecessary.” Further, there remain unaddressed concerns that the Administration could use the Executive Order as the basis to seek deep funding cuts or staff reductions at the CDFI Fund. In fact, a senior Treasury official did not rule out that possibility and the HUD Secretary made remarks that changes were indeed coming to the CDFI Fund, saying, “This is really a tightening and a streamlining.”⁸ More troublingly, staff at the CDFI Fund has been left with the impression that they would be engaging in “minimal operations,” while the staff was apparently relocated in January to a building outside of the main Treasury building that has no Internet connection, and that service has yet to be connected.⁹

We ask that you immediately clear up this confusion. To the extent the President agrees with your recent statement and wants to support CDFIs, the appropriate thing to do would be to promptly update the Executive Order to exempt the CDFI Fund from its application, ensure that the staff has access to the Internet to do their jobs, and work with Congress to strengthen and expand the work of the CDFI Fund. It would be a shame if this becomes the first Administration to forsake the long bipartisan tradition of collaborating with Congress to support our CDFIs and the communities they serve. We look forward to your response and prompt attention to this important matter.

Sincerely,

[[SIGNATURES]]

Institute of Museum and Library Services elimination

March 31, 2025

The Honorable Donald J. Trump
President
The White House
1600 Pennsylvania Ave NW
Washington, D.C. 20500

Dear President Trump,

We write to express our deep concern over the proposed elimination of the Institute of Museum and Library Services (IMLS) and the devastating impact such cuts would have on communities throughout the country. ¹The IMLS is the only federal agency dedicated to supporting America's museums and libraries. Operating in all 50 states and U.S. territories, it plays a vital role in strengthening these institutions which serve as essential educational, cultural, and economic pillars in our communities. From early literacy programs and STEM education initiatives to high-speed internet access and job training resources, funding for the IMLS enables libraries and museums to provide critical services to millions of Americans. The loss of this funding would be particularly devastating for rural, tribal, and other underserved communities that rely heavily on these institutions for access to learning resources, workforce development, and technological infrastructure.

Beyond their valuable contributions to education and social development, museums and libraries also serve as significant economic drivers. The American Alliance of Museums reports that museums alone contribute more than \$50 billion to the U.S. economy each year and support over 726,000 jobs. Museums have immense power to draw tourism and foot traffic to other local businesses and revitalize communities. For every \$1 that museums and other nonprofit cultural organizations receive in government funding, they return more than \$5 in tax revenue. They also have broad public support, with 96% of Americans wanting to maintain or increase federal funding for museums. ² Libraries similarly generate economic returns through workforce training programs, small business support, and research services. Nearly all of the approximately 17,000 public libraries across the nation offer Wi-Fi access at no charge, and in 2019, Americans accessed the Internet using library computers close to 224 million times.³ This includes millions of students who lack adequate broadband access at home and rely on libraries to complete their homework.⁴ Despite this, IMLS funding accounts for a mere 0.0046% of the federal budget, an incredibly modest investment relative to the immense benefits these institutions provide.

Eliminating the IMLS would not only jeopardize these essential services but also dismiss the everyday needs of millions of Americans who rely on libraries and museums for learning, job opportunities, and community engagement. We urge the Administration to reconsider this decision and recognize the far-reaching impact of IMLS funding. Maintaining and strengthening

federal support for museums and libraries is not just an investment in cultural preservation, it is an investment in education, innovation, and economic growth.

Thank you for your attention to this important matter. We look forward to working with you to ensure that America's libraries and museums continue to thrive and serve the public.

Sincerely,

[[SIGNATURES]]

1 <https://www.whitehouse.gov/presidential-actions/2025/03/continuing-the-reduction-of-the-federal-bureaucracy/>

2 <https://www.aam-us.org/programs/about-museums/museum-facts-data/>

3 <https://www.ims.gov/research-evaluation/surveys/public-libraries-survey-pls>

4 <https://www.ims.gov/our-work/priority-areas/workforce-development>

Title X Family Planning Funding Freeze

April 3, 2025

The Honorable Robert F. Kennedy Jr.

Dear Secretary Kennedy,

We write to express our grave concern at the recent actions by the Department of Health and Human Services (HHS) to freeze tens of millions of dollars in funding for the Title X program (Title X), the nation's only federal program dedicated to family planning. Freezing these funds will unquestionably result in the loss of health care for many of the millions of people that Title X supports annually, making our country less healthy.

For almost 50 years, Title X has served as a cornerstone of safety-net care. Championed by then-Congressman George H.W. Bush and signed into law by the President Nixon, Title X allows a diverse network of providers to deliver high-quality care to low-income, uninsured, or underinsured individuals confidentially. Title X health centers served 2.8 million people in FY 2023, administering high-quality family planning and sexual health care, including cancer screenings, testing and treatment for sexually transmitted infections, contraceptive services and supplies, pregnancy testing, and other essential health care services. These centers offer care to populations that often face severe structural and systemic barriers to accessing quality health care, including individuals with no or insufficient insurance and rural and underserved communities.

Freezing funds for this essential program will harm communities that otherwise may not have access to care. In 2016, 60% of the women who received birth control from a Title X health center shared that it was their only source of health care the previous year. These health centers are also an essential resource for preventative care in the communities they serve. In 2023, the program provided cervical cancer screenings for more than 430,000 people, and for every dollar spent, these preventive and family planning services save at least seven dollars in later Medicaid expenses.¹ In addition to direct clinical care, Title X also supports critical infrastructure needs for health centers, including new medical equipment and staff training that are not reimbursable under Medicaid and commercial insurance. This infrastructure is vital to ensuring safe, high-quality care at health centers which serve and provide basic health services to underserved populations.

¹ Lord-Biggers, M. & Friedrich-Karnik, A. (2025, February). Features and Benefits of the Title X Program. Guttmacher Institute

We are outraged that reports suggest that this funding is being frozen because of claims that it might support “diversity, equity, and inclusion.” This is another way of saying that this program is used to help people of color access care. Nearly half of the people served each year by Title X are people of color, the vast majority are people with low-incomes and most Title X users are women.² A federal program's ability to provide care to people from historically marginalized and

underserved communities does not make it wrong or illegal. To suggest otherwise implies that HHS would determine who is worthy of taxpayer dollars based on the color of their skin. Congress created Title X to address the needs of underserved populations across our country, regardless of background, and it has demonstrated success in doing so for 50 years.

We urge you to restore all appropriated funding for Title X providers and instead invest fully in the program which has helped people access essential health care for almost 50 years.

On behalf of our 2.8 million constituents and women across the country who depend on Title X's services, we also request a prompt reply to coordinate a meeting on this matter. We look forward to introducing you to the providers, community leaders, and patients from our districts who understand better than anyone else the importance of this program. We hope your agency will not be so reckless as to upend nearly half a century of bipartisan achievement and place Title X on the DOGE chopping block without hearing firsthand the consequences of that action.

Sincerely,

[[SIGNATURES]]

PSLF Executive Order

Dear Secretary McMahon:

We write to express our strong opposition to the Department of Education's (Department) order to initiate the formal rulemaking process to limit eligibility for the Public Service Loan Forgiveness (PSLF) program. Since March 7, 2025, our dedicated public service workers have faced immense uncertainty and anxiety due to President Trump's Executive Order #14234,^[1] which directed the Secretary of Education and the Secretary of Treasury to redefine "public service" to align with the administration's political agenda. This move contradicts the core tenets of public service and the original intent and purpose of the PSLF program.

PSLF was established under the *College Cost Reduction and Access Act of 2007* under President George W. Bush with bipartisan support and provides student loan forgiveness to individuals who work in qualifying public service jobs. The program aims to support those in roles such as government employees, teachers, nurses, active-duty service members, veterans, and non-profit workers by offering them loan forgiveness after they make 120 qualifying monthly payments under an eligible repayment plan. PSLF was established to encourage professionals to dedicate their careers to public service, easing their financial burden while contributing to the well-being of our communities. However, navigating the program's requirements has proven complex, and many borrowers have encountered challenges in applying for or receiving the forgiveness they are due.

The program has long been plagued with challenges. In 2017, less than one percent of the first cohort was eligible for forgiveness.^[2] Under President Trump's first term, fewer than 7,000 applicants were approved for forgiveness, less than three percent of total applicants. President Biden took steps to streamline the process, and under his administration, over one million applicants have been approved for forgiveness.^[3] The program has over 2.4 million cumulative PSLF borrowers with eligible employment and open loans.^[4] Under Executive Order #14234, this framework reverses the previous administration's efforts to administer the PSLF program more effectively after years of unnecessary roadblocks.

The PSLF program supports local, state, and federal government employees and those at tax-exempt nonprofits under 501(c)(3) of the Internal Revenue Code. However, certain nonprofits, like labor unions and partisan political groups, do not qualify. This order's vague and arbitrary restrictions on which organizations qualify for PSLF are deeply troubling. Under the guise of national security, it unfairly targets organizations that serve marginalized communities, such as those advocating for immigrants or protecting vulnerable children, with no evidence of illegal activity. Furthermore, the broad language of the order could lead to political repression and the chilling of free speech, where organizations or individuals deemed "non-conforming" to the administration's views could be stripped of the very support they rely on to carry out their public service missions. We have already seen what can happen when the President targets organizations for doing the right thing for the country. We are fearful this is yet another tool for

President Trump to go after any group or organization that does not show loyalty to his political, partisan agenda.

At your nomination hearing on February 13, 2025, you testified in front of the Health, Education, Labor, and Pensions (HELP) Committee that you would fully implement existing public service loan forgiveness programs because they “have been passed by Congress ... That is the law.”^[5] Your statement reinforced a commitment to upholding the law and supporting individuals who dedicate their careers to public service. It’s time to back up your words, follow the law, and step up as a true champion of the PSLF program.

We request your immediate action and assurance on the following: Ensure that all eligibility criteria are strictly followed under the law passed by Congress. There should be no exceptions or compromises regarding compliance with the established statute. And prioritize processing PSLF applications that are eligible for forgiveness immediately. The severe reduction of employees at the Federal Student Aid office gives us grave concerns that these eligible borrowers will not be processed in a timely manner.^[6] Regardless of the Trump and Elon Musk administration, these borrowers have met the criteria, done the work, and are entitled to the relief they were promised.

Revoking PSLF eligibility for public service workers who serve across communities nationwide is both reckless and harmful. We urge you to uphold the law, adhere to Congressional intent, and protect PSLF from future attacks. We look forward to your response on this critical matter.

^[1] <https://www.whitehouse.gov/presidential-actions/2025/03/restoring-public-service-loan-forgiveness/>

^[2] <https://studentaid.gov/data-center/student/loan-forgiveness/pslf-data/archived-reports>

^[3] https://protectborrowers.org/wp-content/uploads/2025/01/IDR-AA-ED-Release-Email_01-16-2025.pdf

^[4] <https://studentaid.gov/data-center/student/loan-forgiveness/pslf-data/archived-reports>

^[5] <https://www.help.senate.gov/hearings/nomination-of-linda-mcmahon-to-serve-as-secretary-of-education>

^[6] <https://edreformnow.org/2025/03/12/three-charts-showing-who-secretary-mcmahon-fired-at-the-department-of-education/>

DoDEA EO exemption terminating collective bargaining

The Honorable Pete Hegseth
Secretary of Defense
U.S. Department of Defense
1000 Defense Pentagon
Washington, DC 20301-100

Dear Mr. Secretary:

We write regarding the Department of Defense's (DoD) implementation of the President's Executive Order of March 27, 2025, entitled, Exclusions from Federal Labor-Management Relations Programs, and its application with regards to the Department of Defense Education Activity (DoDEA). Specifically, we urge you to exercise your authority to exempt DoDEA employees from the President's Executive Order and maintain their existing collective bargaining protections given the critical work they do in supporting the recruitment, retention, and readiness of our military.

As one of only two federally operated school systems, DoDEA oversees and runs 161 accredited schools in 9 school districts across 11 foreign countries, 7 states, and the territories of Guam and Puerto Rico. Over 67,000 children of our service members and DoD civilians attend these schools served by over 14,000 employees dedicated to providing these students with a world-class education. In 2024, DoDEA schools once again ranked best in the country in both reading and mathematics under the National Assessment of Educational Progress, scoring 14 to 25 points higher than the corresponding national average scores.¹

DoDEA's success not only provides military families with the best available education for their children but also contributes directly to the recruitment, retention, and readiness of our service members and our military at large. DoDEA's educators and educational support staff work hard to educate and care for military children in academic environments designed and equipped to meet the unique challenges faced by military families, including deployments, relocations, and more. This ensures that warfighters, knowing that their children are well taken care of, can focus on their own service to the nation.

The President's Executive Order of March 27, 2025, delegates to the Secretary of Defense the authority to suspend the application of the order to subdivisions of the Department of Defense. We believe that DoDEA qualifies for such an exemption because it does not have a primary function related to "intelligence, counterintelligence, investigative, or national security work." Given the fact that DoDEA schools are not located in the frontlines of any conflict and because DoDEA educators and personnel do not have security clearances or handle sensitive military information, we also believe that federal collective bargaining protections can be applied to DoDEA in a manner consistent with national security requirements and considerations.

Ensuring that DoDEA educators and personnel retain collective bargaining protections will ensure that DoDEA can continue to recruit and retain the best staff in support of its mission. Collective bargaining safeguards the public interest, and its history in DoDEA has demonstrated better outcomes for mission readiness, and stronger connections between military-connected families and those who serve them. We believe that granting DoDEA an exemption from the President's Executive Order ultimately supports the warfighter and our military families. Given the President's 15-day deadline for such a certification, we respectfully request your response by **no later than Thursday, April 10, 2025.**

Thank you for your consideration.

Sincerely, [[SIGNATURES]]

1 "DoD Schools Ranked Best in the United States Again on Nation's Report Card," Department of Defense Education Activity, January 29, 2025, <https://www.dodea.edu/news/press-releases/dod-schools-ranked-best-unitedstates-again-nations-report-card>.

Impact Aid EO to dismantle USDOE

The Honorable Linda McMahon
Secretary
United States Department of Education
400 Maryland Avenue, SW
Washington, DC 20202

[[DATE]]

Dear Secretary McMahon,

We write to you with deep concern about how the President's recent Executive Order to dismantle the Department of Education will affect the disbursement of Impact Aid. As you know, public schools are funded through state and local property taxes. However, in school districts where there is a significant amount of federal land, schools lose funding because federal lands are exempt from paying state and local property taxes.

Recognizing the importance of public education as the foundation of our society and to ensure that all students receive a fair education, the Impact Aid program was signed into law by President Harry Truman in 1950. It is the nation's oldest K-12 federal education program.

As established by law, funds are appropriated by Congress and administered by the Department of Education. Impact Aid is one of the only major federal education programs that is not forward funded, meaning that funds are used in real time to pay staff and keep schools operating.

Impact Aid is disbursed to over 1,000 school districts across the country, and it reaches nearly 8 million students.^[1] School districts that have military installations, Indian Trust and Treaty lands, federal low-rent housing facilities, Veterans Affairs facilities, national parks, and other U.S. government-owned properties located within their bounds miss out on thousands of taxpayer revenue every year, and Impact Aid helps to fill these gaps.

We are seeking clarification on how this program will be affected by the recent mass Reduction in Force (RIF) at the U.S. Department of Education, signed by the President on March 20, 2025. The reality is that the President has no right to eliminate the Department of Education as he is attempting to do without Congressional approval. These major staffing changes and potential disruption in program funding will adversely impact the educational outcomes of all students.

Impact Aid dollars are especially necessary for our nation's military families. The U.S. maintains at least one military installation in all 50 states.^[2] While supplemental Department of Defense Education Activity (DoDEA) Impact Aid is distributed separately, DoDEA relies on data

provided by the Federal Impact Aid Program at the Department of Education.^[3] For these military-connected school districts, class sizes will rapidly increase, and low-income students and students with disabilities will be stripped of the resources they need to learn if funding is no longer distributed in a timely manner.

As stated in the President's Executive Order, the intention of dismantling the Department of Education is to "return education authority to the States."^[4] Impact Aid is a prime example of a federal program that skips bureaucratic tape as money is sent directly to school districts for their discretion to target funds wherever needs are the greatest.^[5] Ending this program or preventing its implementation directly contradicts the President's intentions to give local communities and states more flexibility and freedom.

We are also concerned that the Department's recent RIF saw a near total elimination of staff at the National Center for Education Statistics (NCES), which the Impact Aid office relies upon to generate annual Local Contribution Rates (LCR). Without this data, recent progress in paying out final payments in a timely manner could be erased, with final payments possibly delayed by several fiscal years.

We demand the immediate reversal of any Executive Orders that would halt the disbursement of Impact Aid funds through the Department of Education.

Additionally, we request your answer to the following questions:

1. Have Impact Aid staff through the Department of Education been let go? If so, who plans to oversee the Impact Aid program in their absence?
2. Once the Department of Education is no longer operational, will Impact Aid be moved to the jurisdiction of another federal department?
3. School districts currently have to apply for Impact Aid through the Department of Education. If the Department is closed, where will districts send their applications?
4. Where will DoDEA get their data from for the Supplemental Impact Aid Program to eligible Local Education Agencies (LEAs) since they've previously relied on the Department of Education for this information?
5. When will FY 2025 funds be made available to the Impact Aid Program Office to disburse directly to eligible school districts?
6. FY 2026 grant applications were submitted with a deadline of January 31, 2025. How will the International Activities Program (IAP) receive the LCR data that NCES provides to determine how much funding school districts will receive?

Students are the future leaders of our nation. It is the federal government's job to ensure the needs of all students are met so that public education can remain a stable and accessible foundation for everyone to succeed, no matter their background or where they live. We look forward to your prompt response and explanation of how Impact Aid will continue to serve its important mission for students across the country.

[[CLOSING]]

[[SIGNATURES]]

^[1] <https://www.nafisdc.org/wp-content/uploads/2025/03/Impact-Aid-Overview-Infographic-FY25.pdf>

^[2] <https://installations.militaryonesource.mil/view-all>

^[3] <https://www.dodea.edu/education/partnership-and-resources/dod-impact-aid>

^[4] <https://www.whitehouse.gov/fact-sheets/2025/03/fact-sheet-president-donald-j-trump-empowers-parents-states-and-communities-to-improve-education-outcomes/>

^[5] <https://www.nafisdc.org/impact-aid-resources/about-impact-aid/>

DOC Manufacturing Extension Program grant for INNOVATE Hawaii elimination

April XX, 2025

Howard Lutnick
Secretary
U.S. Department of Commerce
14th St and Constitution Ave NW
Washington, DC 20230

Dear Secretary Lutnick:

We write today to express our strong concerns about the abrupt decision by the National Institute of Standards and Technology (NIST) to immediately discontinue funding for Hollings Manufacturing Extension Partnership (Hollings MEP) centers in Hawaii and several other states. Hollings MEP centers play a critical role in helping states provide support for manufacturers in every state and Puerto Rico. This recent decision will impact small and medium-sized manufacturers in states that were up for renewal on April 1, 2025.

As you well know, Hollings MEP centers have continued to receive bipartisan support as the nation's only network of public-private partnerships that supports small and medium-sized manufacturers in every state and Puerto Rico – with 51 centers nationwide. Through these centers, manufacturers are connected with resources that help them improve and expand the U.S. manufacturing base – promoting competitiveness abroad. Discontinuing funding for these centers threatens to undo years of investments in manufacturers that would undermine the President's stated goal of strengthening manufacturing in the United States.

These centers are effective. Despite only receiving \$175 million in Fiscal Year 2024, MEP supported an estimated \$15 billion in new and retained sales, \$5 billion in new client investments, and 108,000 in jobs created or retained. In Hawaii, INNOVATE Hawaii was able to help XXX businesses retain X,000 jobs through its center. Future investments in this center and others like it are incredibly critical to supporting the continued growth of the manufacturing sector and will provide returns for American taxpayers.

On Tuesday, April 1, 2025, our offices were notified that NIST would not renew its MEP cooperative agreement with INNOVATE Hawaii, even as the agency was discussing renewal plans with the center earlier that day. We later learned that NIST had sent similar notices to several centers in other states. The stated reason for the decision to discontinue the cooperative agreement was that the award no longer effectuated program goals or agency priorities with respect to new technologies. But given its proven track record of success, the track record of success of other centers throughout the country, and the overall effectiveness of the program, we strongly urge you to reconsider this decision not to renew the cooperative agreements for INNOVATE Hawaii and the other centers that were affected.

TRIO Programs EO to dismantle USDOE

April 4, 2025

The Honorable Secretary Dr. Linda McMahon
U.S. Department of Education
400 Maryland Ave SW
Washington, DC 20202

Dear Secretary McMahon,

We write to express serious concerns regarding the Administration's recent actions to dismantle the Department of Education. This decision raises significant concerns about the continuity and effectiveness of federally funded educational programs, particularly the Federal TRIO Programs (TRIO).

For more than half a century, TRIO has served as a cornerstone of the Department's efforts to remove barriers to education for students from disadvantaged backgrounds. Specifically, the eight TRIO programs help low-income, first-generation students, and students with disabilities successfully navigate the academic pipeline from middle school to postgraduate programs. Today, nearly 3,500 TRIO programs operate in all 50 states, Washington, D.C., the Pacific Islands, and Puerto Rico, serving nearly 900,000 students annually with the support of more than 1,000 colleges, universities, and community-based organizations.

TRIO participants consistently achieve higher rates of high school graduation, college enrollment, retention, and degree attainment compared to peers from similar backgrounds who do not receive TRIO services. Any disruption to these programs risks derailing the progress of students who already face significant barriers to academic success due to factors beyond their control.

The proposed dissolution of the Department, significant restructuring, and redistribution of core agency functions to other federal agencies undoubtedly creates considerable uncertainty about the future of TRIO. The lack of a centralized federal agency to coordinate efforts to fill gaps in state and local educational systems seriously risks exacerbating those gaps and existing disparities in students' access to education programs and services. The Administration's proposed changes raise important questions about the funding, administration, and support of TRIO moving forward.

To that end, we request detailed responses to the following questions by April 25, 2025, regarding the continuation, funding, and administration of TRIO programs across the country in light of the Administration's plans to close the Department.

1. Will another federal agency assume the functions of administering and funding TRIO programs across the country, and if so, which one?

2. What specific measures is the Administration taking to ensure that TRIO programs and services remain uninterrupted during the Department's restructuring?
 3. Will existing grantees retain their funding, and how will future grant competitions be managed during the transition?
 4. Will the Administration affirm that it will not delay, withhold, or reprogram Congressionally appropriated TRIO funds, in accordance with its obligations under the Congressional Budget and Impoundment Control Act of 1974?
 5. With educational functions being transferred to other entities, how will the Administration ensure TRIO Programs maintain rigorous standards of accountability and effectiveness?
-
6. What frameworks will the Administration establish to monitor and evaluate program outcomes across potentially disparate administrative bodies?
 7. Has the Department conducted assessments of the potential impacts of its closure on TRIO Programs, grantee institutions, and student beneficiaries?

We strongly oppose any efforts to restructure, redistribute, or dismantle the Department of Education. TRIO represents one of the many vital investments in our nation's commitment to educational access and equity. Without an Act of Congress, any further attempts to abolish this federal agency or any of its programs—endangering the academic success of millions of students—would constitute a clear overreach of executive authority and a breach of trust with the communities these programs are designed to serve.

We urge the Administration to halt any unilateral actions that could disrupt the delivery of critical educational services like TRIO and instead work in partnership with Congress to strengthen, not weaken, the infrastructure that supports student success.

Sincerely,

[[SIGNATURES]]

EPA Deregulation on Climate Change Rules

April 9, 2025

The Honorable Lee M. Zeldin
Administrator
Environmental Protection Agency
1200 Pennsylvania Avenue NW
Washington, DC 20460

Dear Administrator Zeldin:

It has been more than 50 years since the Environmental Protection Agency (EPA) was established under a Republican president with the mission to protect human health and the environment. For most of that history, the agency has worked hard to ensure that major polluters are kept in check so that our communities have access to clean air and clean water. In just two months as EPA Administrator, you have demonstrated a complete disregard for the central mission of the agency you were appointed to lead. Instead of protecting the environment – as the agency name directs – you are protecting the special interests of big polluters. We urge you to halt your egregious attacks on the public health and well-being of the American people.

Your announcement on March 12 to launch the “biggest deregulatory action in U.S. history” and overturn over 30 federal climate and health protections will come at a huge cost to the American people and our economy.¹ While you stated these rollbacks of protections had the goals of “Unleashing American Energy,” “Lowering the Cost of Living for American Families,” and “Advancing Cooperative Federalism,”² in reality your proposals will fail on each of these three counts.

You falsely proclaim that these rollbacks will unleash American energy but the only thing these actions will “unleash” is more pollution. As a result of these rollbacks, communities and families will be exposed to more mercury and air toxics from coal-fired power plants³, and more polluted wastewater from oil and gas producers.⁴ While countries around the world are clamoring for cleaner, cheaper, and more innovative technologies, you are actively hamstringing

¹ U.S. Environmental Protection Agency, *EPA Launches Biggest Deregulatory Action in U.S. History* (March 12, 2025), <http://www.epa.gov/newsreleases/epa-launches-biggest-deregulatory-action-us-history>.

U.S. Environmental Protection Agency, *Our Mission and What We Do* (last accessed March 18, 2025), www.epa.gov/aboutepa/our-mission-and-what-we-do.

² *Id.*

³ U.S. Environmental Protection Agency, *Trump EPA to Reconsider Biden-Harris MATS Regulation That Targeted Coal-Fired Power Plants to be Shut Down* (March 12, 2025), <http://www.epa.gov/newsreleases/trump-epa-reconsider-biden-harris-mats-regulation-targeted-coal-fired-power-plants-be>.

⁴ U.S. Environmental Protection Agency, *EPA Will Revise Wastewater Regulations for Oil and Gas Extraction to Help Unleash American Energy* (March 12, 2025), <http://www.epa.gov/newsreleases/epa-will-revise-wastewater-regulations-oil-and-gas-extraction-help-unleash-american>.

America's homegrown clean energy industry, which has already injected \$422 billion and 400,000 jobs into our economy in just the past two and a half years.⁵ This is anything but unleashing American energy.

At the same time, instead of lowering costs for American families, your actions will result in the opposite. Americans' medical expenses will increase because your Polluters First agenda will allow particulate matter and other hazardous air pollution to go unchecked. For every \$1 the country spends to reduce air pollution, it's estimated to yield \$30 in economic benefits in return.⁶ Yet, you chose to unleash more air pollutants that are linked to Alzheimer's,⁷ miscarriages,⁸ and childhood asthma,⁹ as well as other public health concerns. Your actions will needlessly increase American families' exposure to the pollution that can make them sick and stick them with the bill for their care.

By doing the bidding of the polluters, you are putting your thumb on the scale against cheaper and cleaner alternatives. At a time when utility bills are surging, your actions only serve to drive electricity prices higher. Similarly, your attacks on clean transportation will result in Americans forking over thousands of extra dollars to Big Oil in the form of increased fuel costs.

Lastly, your assault on rules limiting carbon pollution will drive grocery bills and homeowners and auto insurance premiums ever higher. Even the Chair of the Federal Reserve is warning that insurance – and mortgages – will become impossible to find in coastal and wildfire-exposed regions of the country.¹⁰

Then, in the guise of giving power back to the states, you are giving power to President Trump's big polluting donors, who are more than happy to find the state with the weakest environmental protection laws and pollute without consequence. The resulting air pollution

does not care about state boundary lines, and neither do the American families whose health will suffer and whose bank accounts will be stretched.

The most flagrant lie of all was when you stated during your confirmation hearing that you would respect the science and “leave the science to the scientists,” yet you have chosen to undertake a crusade against the fundamental scientific finding that planet-warming emissions are

⁵ Climate Power, *State of the Clean Energy Boom* (January 14, 2025), <https://climatepower.us/wp-content/uploads/2025/01/January-2025-Clean-Energy-Boom-Report.pdf>.

⁶ U.S. Environmental Protection Agency, *The Benefits and Costs of the Clean Air Act from 1990 to 2020, Final Report – Rev. A*. (April 2011), https://www.epa.gov/sites/default/files/2015-07/documents/fullreport_rev_a.pdf

⁷ Xu Zhang, et. al., “S-Nitrosylation of CRTCL1 in Alzheimer’s disease impairs CREB-dependent gene expression induced by neuronal activity,” *Proc. Natl. Acad. Sci. U.S.A.* 122(9) e2418179122, (2025) <https://doi.org/10.1073/pnas.2418179122>.

⁸ Youn Soo Jung, et. al., “Impact of air pollution exposure on cytokines and histone modification profiles at single- cell levels during pregnancy,” *Sci. Adv.* 10, eadp5227 (2024) <http://www.science.org/doi/10.1126/sciadv.adp5227>. ⁹ Antonella Zanobetti, PhD, et. al., “Early-Life Exposure to Air Pollution and Childhood Asthma Cumulative Incidence in the ECHO CREW Consortium,” *JAMA Netw Open* (2024) <https://jamanetwork.com/journals/jamanetworkopen/fullarticle/2815586>.

¹⁰ *The Semiannual Monetary Policy Report to the Congress: Hearing Before the Sen. Comm. on Banking, Hous., and Urban Aff.*, 118th Cong. (Mar. 7, 2024) (statement of Jerome H. Powell, Chair, Board of Governors of the Federal Reserve System), https://www.banking.senate.gov/imo/media/doc/powell_testimony_3-7-231.pdf.

a threat to the American public.¹¹ Your attempt to roll back the EPA’s landmark “Endangerment Finding” is the pinnacle of unscientific hubris.¹² It’s shocking that anyone in the year 2025 could look around and honestly say that climate change is not *already* harming Americans. Just look at the victims of the records-smashing Los Angeles wildfires¹³ or the residents of Asheville that are still cleaning up after Hurricane Helene.¹⁴ Trying to overturn the Endangerment Finding is simply the new face of a decades-long climate denial campaign that continues to threaten the health and prosperity of our children’s future. And your purported commitment to being guided by EPA’s talented scientists is belied by reports that you plan on firing more than 1,000 scientists, who are responsible for driving scientific research and progress at the agency.¹⁵

Sincerely,

Fair Housing Grants

Dear Secretary Turner,

We write to express our strong opposition to the sudden termination of Fair Housing grants that threaten our country's fair housing infrastructure. The funding cuts to the organizations enforcing the statutory requirements of the Fair Housing Act, coupled with significant staffing reductions within the Department of Housing and Urban Development (HUD), pose a serious risk to the progress we have made in combating housing discrimination and will increase housing insecurity among our constituents.

Reports¹ indicate that HUD's Fair Housing Initiatives Program (FHIP) has terminated approximately 78 grants - nearly half of its 162 active grants – undermining crucial fair housing services nationwide. While HUD has made multiple grant announcements for FY2023 and FY2024, it remains unclear exactly which grantees have been affected. Some of the organizations appear in multiple announcements due to possible grant extensions or multiple awards, making it difficult to determine the full scope of the funding cuts on the critical organizations that defend the nation's commitment to fair housing.

Fair Housing Centers serve as the frontline defense against discriminatory practices in the housing market. These organizations are responsible for investigating complaints, conducting audits, providing legal assistance to victims of housing discrimination⁵, leading enforcement actions against those who break Fair Housing laws, and using settlement awards to expand services to help more constituents find housing, free from housing discrimination. They ensure compliance with the Fair Housing Act, which prohibits discrimination by direct providers of housing, such as landlords, real estate companies, banks and lending institutions, and homeowners' insurance companies, based on an individual's race or color, religion, sex, national origin, familial status, or disabilities. Through this work, Fair Housing Centers promote equitable housing practices and play a pivotal role in fostering inclusive communities.

The impact of the proposed funding cuts will be felt nationwide. There are over 160 organizations around the nation that depend on federal housing funding to serve vulnerable communities⁶. In Illinois, 11 organizations were listed in HUD's recent FHIP grant

announcements. In Indianapolis, there are 20 grantees listed in the FHIP grant announcements, with one organization indicating they will lose approximately \$50,000 in funding after the Administration abruptly terminated one of their grants⁷. Additionally, there are at least two grantees— one in Idaho⁸ and one in Florida⁹—that have already reported partial grant terminations. Given the uncertainty surrounding these cuts, made more difficult by the Administration's deletion of thousands of government websites¹⁰, it is critical to clarify which organizations have been impacted and to assess how these changes will impact fair housing enforcement at the state and local levels.

Fair Housing Centers contribute to the creation of equitable and fair access to housing. The services provided by fair housing centers are indispensable to a large and diverse set of Americans, including but not limited to:

1. African Americans, Latinos, Asian Americans, and other racial and ethnic minorities who have historically faced systemic discrimination in housing.
2. Persons with disabilities seeking accessibility and reasonable accommodation in housing under the Americans with Disabilities Act (ADA).
3. Families with children who have been denied access to housing because they have children.

The reported funding cuts to FHIP and staffing reductions at HUD threaten significant consequences for our communities:

1. Discrimination may increase and proliferate due to a lack of adequate enforcement, undermining decades of progress paid for with taxpayer dollars.
2. Limitations on legal recourse would make it increasingly challenging for victims of discrimination to seek justice, leading to a decline in reported cases, an increase in unsolved grievances, and a lack of accountability for bad actors.
3. Erosion of public trust may lead communities to lose faith in the government's commitment to uphold their civil rights in housing.

Additionally, proposed staffing cuts at HUD would severely impact the Department's ability to process discrimination complaints and enforce Fair Housing laws. Specifically, these drastic cuts would have catastrophic consequences for Fair Housing Assistance Programs (FHAP), public housing operations, and mortgage insurance programs that millions of people rely upon. These proposed staffing cuts threaten to dismantle vital housing support systems and put countless lifelines for working families in jeopardy.

Given these concerns, we urge HUD to reconsider the termination of any FHIP grants previously allocated by appropriations laws, reinstate terminated grants, and provide transparency regarding the affected grants. We request a detailed response no later than Friday, April 4th, 2025, detailing which organizations have been impacted, an assessment of the expected consequences of these cuts, and what grants will be reinstated to ensure fair housing enforcement remains strong and accessible. Fair and equal housing is a fundamental human right, and we must take action to safeguard it.

We appreciate your attention to this urgent matter and look forward to your response.

USGS Workforce Reductions and FACSQI Elimination

Dear Secretary Burgum:

We write to express deep concern over the abrupt elimination of the Federal Advisory Committee for Science Quality and Integrity (FACSQI) and broader workforce reductions at the U.S. Geological Survey (USGS). These decisions undermine the agency's ability to uphold scientific integrity, provide reliable data, and fulfill its critical mission to protect public safety, natural resources, and environmental health.

The Advisory Committee for Science Quality and Integrity was established to provide independent guidance to the USGS Director on scientific integrity, research oversight, and data reliability. It was poised to play a vital role in:

1. Scientific Integrity – Enhancing policies to uphold ethical research practices, safeguard against misconduct and prevent political interference.
2. Laboratory Oversight – Strengthening quality control measures to maintain rigorous scientific standards.
3. STEM & Workforce Development – Cultivating the next generation of scientists through education and mentorship.
4. Tribal Partnerships & Research Advancement – Expanding collaboration with Indigenous communities and other key research partners.

The committee was created, in part, to address systemic failures identified by the Inspector General in a 2024 report², including serious lapses in laboratory oversight and scientific integrity. A notable example of this occurred at the National Water Quality Laboratory in Colorado, where quality control values were falsified. This incident was driven by pressures on analysts, compounded by heavy workloads and a lack of adequate oversight and support. FACSQI was designed to provide the necessary external oversight to prevent such failures and protect our drinking water testing—yet its elimination removes these essential safeguards, increasing risks to public health and safety.

This decision is part of a broader, troubling pattern at the Department of the Interior, which has also dismantled advisory panels on climate adaptation, conservation, and even the review of racially insensitive place names. Interior officials claim these cuts “streamline operations” and “reduce redundancies,” but in reality, they weaken the government's scientific capacity, erode public trust, and leave communities more vulnerable to environmental and natural hazards. The damage extends beyond FACSQI's elimination. The loss of 240 USGS positions further weakens the agency's ability to effectively:

5. Provide real-time earthquake and hazard monitoring.
6. Conduct essential groundwater and water quality assessments.
7. Maintain geologic mapping crucial for disaster preparedness.

8. Ensure sustainable management of mineral and energy resources critical to national security.
9. Support public lands conservation and outdoor recreation.
10. Build the strong domestic STEM workforce necessary for American innovation and competitiveness.

Given these concerns, we request responses to the following questions by April 8th, 2025:

1. How will USGS ensure scientific integrity without the advisory committee?
2. What steps is USGS taking to address challenges identified in the 2024 Inspector General report?
3. How will USGS maintain its ability to monitor natural hazards, water resources, and environmental changes given current staffing reductions?
4. What alternative mechanisms will be implemented to ensure independent scientific review and accountability?
5. How will USGS continue to support STEM workforce development and youth engagement?
6. How will USGS, as the primary source of information on domestic critical minerals supply chains, maintain up-to-date information on American geological resources?
7. What steps is USGS taking to ensure continued public access to its data, widely used for safety, outdoor recreation, resource management, and scientific advancements?
8. What steps is USGS taking to ensure continued protection of sensitive data, including proprietary information from industry surveys and sovereign tribal data on special and sacred sites?

USGS data and research have served as a cornerstone of national preparedness and environmental stewardship. The elimination of FACSQI and the loss of over 240 positions puts that legacy at serious risk. We expect a full explanation for these decisions and a clear plan for preserving the integrity, independence and capacity of USGS science moving forward. The American public, policymakers, and the scientific community deserve nothing less.

Reinstate Agricultural Inspectors

Dear Madam Secretary,

We write to urge your swift compliance with the orders issued by the United States District Court for the Northern District of California order in *American Federation of Government Employees et al. v. United States Office of Personnel Management et al.* (25-1780) and by the U.S. Merit Systems Protection Board (MSPB) in *Special Counsel ex rel. John Doe v. Department of Agriculture* (CB-1208-25-0020-U-2) to reinstate terminated probationary employees at the Department of Agriculture (USDA), with specific emphasis on reinstalling agricultural inspectors with the Animal and Plant Health Inspection Service (APHIS). APHIS inspectors perform critical work protecting public health, ensuring food safety, and maintaining the integrity of the agricultural industry and economy, and we strongly urge every action to return USDA's animal and plant inspection processes to their full capacity.

APHIS agricultural inspectors work diligently to enforce Federal regulations and prevent the introduction of pests and diseases that have the potential to destabilize local ecosystems and threaten agricultural production. The negative economic and environmental impact of invasive species is well documented, especially in the Pacific region and in coastal communities that are at heightened risk of invasive species due to maritime trade.^{1, 2} APHIS agricultural inspectors are critical to facilitating the secure exchange of agricultural goods while safeguarding against the significant threat posed by invasive species.

Following recommendations provided by the Department of Government Efficiency (DOGE), the USDA terminated 5,692 probationary employees across the country.³ Reports indicate that APHIS experienced significant cuts to its workforce with over 200 employees with the plant protection and quarantine program dismissed from their posts.⁴ Even a temporary decrease in inspector capacity places our agricultural resources and food supply at increased risk of irreparable harm from invasive species, diseases, and other threats.

These terminations were challenged in court and other administrative proceedings, and we appreciate your efforts to comply with recent decisions. On March 5, 2025, the U.S. Merit Systems Protections Board issued a 45-day stay on the termination of probationary employees. USDA subsequently announced plans to “place all terminated probationary employees in pay status and provide each with back pay from the date of termination,” and to develop a phased plan for return-to-duty for terminated employees.⁵ Since USDA's statement on March 11 complying with the MSPB's order, the U.S. District Court for the Northern District of California further issued a preliminary injunction on March 13 and ordered the immediate reinstatement of employees at USDA, among other departments.

As USDA works to reinstate terminated employees, we strongly urge USDA to address vulnerabilities in our animal and plant inspection programs at APHIS by expediting the return of

agricultural inspectors to their duty stations. Additionally, we urge you to ensure robust standards and staffing for agricultural inspections as USDA continues with its stated objective to pursue “an aggressive plan to optimize its workforce.” To that end, we respectfully request your response to the following questions in writing by no later than April 11, 2025:

1. How many APHIS employees, both probationary and non-probationary, were terminated on or after February 14, 2025? Please provide a breakdown by region and duty station.
2. What is the status of USDA’s efforts to reinstate all terminated probationary APHIS employees in pay status and provide each with back pay, as indicated in USDA’s press release of March 11, 2025?
3. What measures will you implement to ensure USDA will maintain sufficient and robust agricultural inspection operations as part of any future Reduction in Force plans?

We appreciate your attention to this matter and look forward to working with you to reinstate APHIS agricultural inspectors and protect American agriculture across the nation.

Sincerely, [[SIGNATURES]]

CC: Dr. Michael Watson, Administrator, Animal and Plant Health Inspection Service

Frozen Climate Funds (Greenhouse Gas Reduction Fund)

Dear Administrator Zeldin:

We write to you in response to the Trump Administration's persistent and shocking attempts to undermine the Greenhouse Gas Reduction Fund (GGRF). For weeks, Citibank has withheld congressionally authorized GGRF funding at your direction without any justification, and now, despite failing to produce any evidence of wrongdoing, the Trump Administration has requested that GGRF awardees turn over records to the FBI and appear in federal court. And last week, you further escalated EPA's inappropriate attack on the program by announcing the termination of existing GGRF contracts without any evidence that the grantees were in breach of the terms of their agreements. We are stunned by this unprecedented campaign of intimidation, and we call on the Environmental Protection Agency (EPA) to direct Citibank to immediately release these legally obligated funds.

The GGRF is a catalytic financing program designed to unlock a historic wave of public and private investments for projects across America. These projects boost local economic development, help communities deploy cost-saving technologies, and improve the quality of life for everyday Americans – particularly those in low-income and underserved communities. This program injects billions of dollars into economic growth for communities that stand to benefit the most, all while enhancing U.S. energy independence and bolstering American-made manufacturing.

Blocking the payment of GGRF funds is an attempt to rob the American people of those billions of dollars in essential investments. Those investments are contractually obligated to go towards projects that include:

1. Building the largest commercial solar project in Arkansas, which will cut energy costs by \$120 million and create over 1,500 jobs over the next 25 years;
2. Constructing affordable multifamily housing projects in Oregon and New York that ensure Americans have attainable, healthy, and resilient homes to live in; and
3. Supporting American small trucking businesses that want to reduce their operational costs while improving air quality in port communities.

These are just some of the many examples of how GGRF-funded projects will create jobs, lower costs, and improve health outcomes.

The Administration's directions to Citibank and announcement of the termination of contracts undermine a highly-effective and efficient program that was carefully designed to ensure that funds are delivered specifically to the communities that need them most. EPA designed GGRF to utilize highly experienced lenders who understand their local communities and have a proven track record of making high-impact investments that lower the cost of living for hard-working Americans. EPA selected awardees under the National Clean Investment Fund (NCIF) and Clean Communities Investment Accelerator (CCIA) to deploy low-cost, high-impact capital in communities throughout the country. Citibank was then chosen as the financial agent to hold and

disburse these funds because of its reputation as a responsible steward of public and private funds. EPA and the Department of the Treasury opted for this financial structure because it would allow NCIF and CCIA awardees to leverage private capital for their investments – a statutory requirement for GGRF awardees and the projects they fund. Thanks to that requirement and the agreement with Citibank, every public dollar invested through GGRF is expected to catalyze seven dollars of private investment.

Since you were sworn in as Administrator, GGRF awardees have experienced what could only be described as a witch hunt by the White House and your agency to claw back the congressionally mandated \$20 billion dedicated to low-income and underserved communities. After you launched baseless claims to justify attempts to rescind this program's funding, NCIF and CCIA funding has now been frozen since mid-February, with recipients unable to access their contractually obligated allocations from Citibank. Despite the magnitude of this freeze, Citibank has offered no explanation to awardees for why their funds remain frozen.

This situation escalated further on March 2nd when EPA Acting Deputy Administrator W.C. McIntosh sent a letter to EPA's Office of Inspector General that contained several false and misleading statements about information contained on EPA's own website – including purported evidence not associated with GGRF at all. Five days later, the Trump Administration requested the awardees turn over records to the FBI and appear in federal court later this month. A top federal prosecutor in Washington already resigned because they refused to launch a criminal investigation without sufficient evidence. And then on March 11th, you announced the termination of the GGRF grants, claiming "well documented incidents of misconduct, conflicts of interest, and potential fraud" without actually producing any documentation, evidence, or proof that wrongdoing has occurred.

We find it extremely troubling that GGRF funds continue to be the target of a political witch hunt without any justification or evidence of wrongdoing. The EPA's actions have unnecessarily spurred great economic uncertainty, and now, the eight nonprofit recipients of NCIF and CCIA funding are at risk of going bankrupt and some have already begun to furlough their workers. In the absence of a clear explanation to awardees for why these funds continue to be frozen, we urge EPA to direct Citibank to release these funds without further delay so that these federal dollars, as intended by law, can help American families and businesses begin to lower their energy bills, spur local economic development, and work towards healthier, safer communities across the country.

GAO Database to Track IRA and IIJA Funds

Dear Mr. Dodaro:

We write to request that the Government Accountability Office (GAO), with support from its Federal Budget, Grants, and Contracting and National Security Acquisitions teams, among others, establish an accessible database to systematically track disbursement of funds appropriated through the Inflation Reduction Act¹ and the Infrastructure Investment and Jobs Act². The Trump Administration's disruptive January 20, 2025 Executive Order 14154³ sowed chaos and confusion across the country for Federal funding recipients, and the Administration's subsequent actions, such as the clarifying guidance issued by the Office of Management and Budget (OMB) in memorandum M-25-11 on January 21, 2025,⁴ the notice of court order distributed by the Department of Justice on February 3, 2025⁵, and many of the Administration's subsequent actions have been insufficient to provide certainty for our constituents.

Many of the aforementioned executive actions have caused federal agencies to halt the disbursement of funds for a wide range of energy and environmental programs, including initiatives that support clean energy deployment, grid modernization, electric vehicle infrastructure, and energy efficiency upgrades for low-income communities.

The freezing of IRA and IIJA funds has already had immediate and measurable consequences, jeopardizing national and state climate initiatives and harming communities that rely on this funding. Some real-world examples of the impact that the funding pause has had are:

1. School districts in Illinois that received \$15 million in funding from the DOE could not access funds to deploy zero-emission school buses that are integrated with on-site battery systems to help school buildings keep the lights on during power outages and improve air pollution.
2. States have been denied access to funding intended to help low-income communities install residential solar panels, reducing energy costs for vulnerable households. ⁶
3. A Missouri school district has been blocked from accessing a \$9.45 million EPA grant intended to transition its school bus fleet to electric vehicles, a move that would reduce refueling costs and lower student exposure to harmful air emissions.
4. Grid modernization projects in Georgia are at risk, threatening regional energy reliability and increasing costs for ratepayers.

These are only a few examples of the widespread impact of this funding freeze. The lack of transparency around the executive order's implementation has made it difficult for impacted communities, businesses, and state governments to plan effectively, creating unnecessary uncertainty, financial hardship, and disruption to critical infrastructure projects.

Federal courts have weighed in on this matter. On January 31 and February 3, 2025, two separate federal court rulings found that the funding freeze raises constitutional concerns and issued temporary injunctions blocking any efforts to "pause, freeze, impede, block, cancel, or

terminate” these appropriated funds.[9](#)[10](#) Despite these rulings, on February 10, 2025, a judge in federal court found that the Trump administration had defied its order to release federal grant money, directly disobeying a judicial mandate.[11](#) Grant recipients have also reported continued difficulties with payments.[12](#) In addition, Members of Congress have received little clarity on how federal agencies are responding and whether funding is now flowing as required by law, with many agencies even preventing building access.[13](#)

While there is anecdotal and journalistic evidence of these funding disruptions, no comprehensive, publicly accessible database currently exists to track these potential violations systematically. As Members of Congress, we cannot effectively serve our constituents if we cannot see the full extent of the problem. Without transparency, we lack the tools necessary to advocate for communities that depend on these funds. The currently available public reporting on awards and disbursements is insufficient and outdated, making it difficult for us to provide effective and timely information to our constituents – especially those who are most vulnerable and may be afraid to speak out.

We urge the appropriate officers within the GAO to establish a publicly accessible database that tracks the status of IRA and IJA funds, in particular a database that provides details on the awards, obligations, and disbursements of those funds. To the extent practicable, this database should also delineate any funds, awards, obligations, or disbursements affected by the aforementioned or similar Executive Orders and administrative actions. This database would help Congress effectively monitor the status of these historical investments and communicate with our constituents to better navigate a complicated and opaque budget execution process.

We appreciate your prompt attention to this matter and look forward to your response.

Urban and Community Forestry Grants Frozen

Dear Secretary Rollins,

It has come to our attention that hundreds of grantees of the United States Department of Agriculture's (USDA) Forest Service (USFS) are unable to fully access their Urban and Community Forestry Grant awards.

In September 2023, the Forest Service announced more than \$1 billion in funding for 385 grant proposals from entities working to combat extreme heat, improve air quality, and promote food security, public health and safety. Communities in all 50 states, the District of Columbia, and several U.S. territories and Tribal Nations received grant funding. We now understand the distribution of these grants has been illegally paused, causing considerable harm to our communities and creating chaos for the hundreds of organizations who were already carrying out spending on these approved projects in every corner of the country.

National grant pass-through partners and grantees have not received appropriate guidance from USFS, leaving community organizations in an uncertain limbo as they are left to decide whether to risk implementing their projects with no guarantee of reimbursement. Some pass-through partners have advised their grantees to pause project implementation and many organizations are facing the possibility of cutting jobs and shutting down operations in light of this funding uncertainty. Congressional office inquiries to the USDA and USFS have been ignored.

The Urban and Community Forestry Program is the only federal government program dedicated to enhancing and expanding the nation's urban forest resources. These grants support projects that make all of our states healthier, more resilient, and economically stronger. These awards also create jobs, enhance job training initiatives, and create economic opportunity in our communities.

The Department of Agriculture must immediately restore all Urban and Community Forestry Grants. In the meantime, USFS must provide clear guidance to grantees to allow them to continue this critical work while payment systems are restored.

We stand ready to work with the Department of Agriculture and Forest Service to enhance the quality of life in all of our communities.

Sincerely,

EPA Cuts

Dear Administrator Zeldin:

We are writing to demand clarification on your intended budget and personnel reductions at the Environmental Protection Agency. We collectively represent thousands of the over 15,000 civil servants across the country currently employed at the Environmental Protection Agency, and millions of constituents who rely on the EPA to ensure their water is safe to drink, their air is safe to breathe, and their health is protected. We are the credible reports suggesting that you and the President have discussed cutting up to 65% of spending at the EPA. This comes after the President said during a February 26th cabinet meeting, “He thinks he’s going to be cutting 65% or so percent of people from Environmental” and had to be corrected by a White House official. This anecdote is another example of the chaotic and unorganized nature of this Administration, and is leaving our civil servants, constituents, and environmental protections in a state of disarray.

The EPA is not just a regulatory body; it is a frontline defender of public health, environmental safety, and economic stability. Its science-driven programs ensure that the water we drink is free from harmful contaminants like PFAS and lead, that the air we breathe is not laced with toxic pollutants, and that hazardous chemicals are controlled before they endanger human health. The EPA holds polluters accountable, cleans up toxic waste left by negligent actors, and safeguards our food from dangerous pesticides. Every community, from urban to rural, industrial to agricultural, depends on the EPA’s expertise to prevent environmental crises before they spiral into public health disasters. Gutting the agency through drastic budget cuts would cripple its ability to respond to emerging threats, dismantle decades of scientific progress, and put millions of lives at risk. At a time when climate change and pollution are intensifying, weakening the EPA by cutting its budget and firing its invaluable civil servants is not just irresponsible. It is a direct threat to the well-being of every American. The value of the work conducted by the civil servants at EPA cannot be overstated, and Americans agree. Recent polling found that 86% of voters oppose attempts to weaken the EPA, including 76% of Trump voters.¹ Significant cuts to this vital agency are in direct opposition to what this country wants.

In addition to the damage proposed cuts would have on Americans, the current uncertainty and instability poses a direct threat to the integrity of the scientific community, which could reverberate for years to come. Slashing the EPA’s funding would cripple its ability to provide essential protections, drive innovations in environmental science, and respond to emerging threats. Beyond the immediate damage, this instability discourages top scientists and experts from joining or remaining at the agency, jeopardizing its ability to safeguard public health and the environment for future generations.

We strongly urge you to faithfully fulfill your duties as Administrator and uphold the mission of the Environmental Protection Agency to protect human health and the environment by

maintaining funding and personnel levels at your agency, thereby enabling the EPA to continue its vital work in safeguarding public health and the environment.

Consequently, we respectfully request responses to the following questions clarifying your plans by March 20, 2025:

1. Does the Administration plan to reduce EPA funding or staffing by 65%, as has been reported?
2. If significant funding or staffing cuts are intended, which specific programs, projects, and offices within the agency will be affected by these cuts, and what criteria will be employed to make that determination?
3. How many EPA employees across the country are expected to be fired as a result of these proposed cuts, and what criteria will be used to determine which individuals lose their jobs?
4. What EPA functions are expected to be disrupted due to these budget cuts? Can you guarantee that the disruptions caused by cuts to the EPA budget will not compromise drinking water quality, air quality, or public health?
5. Has EPA conducted a risk assessment to evaluate the short- and long-term risks to the environment, human health, and the economy that would result from these proposed cuts?
6. What is the expected timeline for implementing these budgetary and staffing cuts?

Thank you for your immediate attention to this matter, and we look forward to your response.

Starlink and the FAA

Dear Acting Administrator Rocheleau,

We write to express our concern regarding recent reports that the Federal Aviation Administration (FAA) is considering cancelling its existing, long-term communications system modernization contract with Verizon, in favor of starting a new contract with Starlink in violation of fair and proper procurement processes.¹

In 2023, Verizon was awarded a fifteen-year \$2.4 billion contract (known as the FAA Enterprise Network Services or “FENS” Program) to, among other things, “provide required system resources to support FAA-defined telecommunications and information management service needs...within FAA facilities and required field locations.”² While we understand if FAA may have concerns with certain aspects of the current contract’s implementation, reports that the agency is considering imminently terminating the Verizon contract for a new venture with Starlink without the appropriate safety or legal reviews are deeply troubling.

Though many of us have been vocal about the need for the federal government to modernize the software and IT systems that are instrumental to managing the National Airspace System (NAS),³ we are concerned about how the conversation surrounding this particular effort has unfolded in the past week. It is vital that the American taxpayer has confidence in the inherent fairness and efficiency of the FAA procurement processes. Current reporting has led Members of Congress and the general public to question whether Mr. Musk’s current role in the Trump Administration is unfairly influencing the FAA’s modernization efforts. Moreover, there are then further concerns that his role is allowing his holdings to obtain insider and proprietary information in order to gain a competitive advantage.

We certainly assume that the FAA will follow all applicable federal acquisition laws if the agency is indeed considering both the cancellation of Verizon’s current contract and the potential award of a new contract to Starlink or another company. As this process unfolds, it is critical that the FAA follow the law impartially and be transparent in what information is guiding these decisions and how sensitive information is being protected while the procurement process plays out.

Considering Mr. Musk’s role as a “special government employee” for the Department of Government Efficiency (DOGE), we request answers to the following questions:

1. Are any DOGE employees currently supporting or consulting with the FAA regarding FENS or similar initiatives? If so, in what capacity?
2. Are there any employees of a company owned or run by Mr. Musk, that are currently supporting or consulting with the FAA regarding FENS or similar initiatives? If so, in what capacity?

3. Is your agency aware of Mr. Musk, or a DOGE or SpaceX employee, accessing any Source Selection Sensitive, Proprietary, or any other financial data related to the FAA in general, and/or the existing Verizon contract specifically?
4. Has Mr. Musk or any DOGE employee notified your agency of any potential personal, professional or organizational conflict of interest ?
5. What due diligence has your agency conducted to determine whether any conflicts of interest exist or could reasonably be assumed to exist with any of Mr. Musk's companies and his work with the government, specifically for DOGE?
6. Has your agency enacted any mitigation measures to ensure that Mr. Musk's leadership of companies involved in contracts with your agency does not cause a procurement conflict of interest or cause undue pressure on regulators?
7. Has your agency enacted any mitigation measures to ensure that Mr. Musk or agents of his companies do not illegally obtain access to competitor proprietary information held by the FAA?
8. Has your agency issued any waivers related to conflicts of interest involving Mr. Musk's companies?
9. Has the Competition and Contracting Act been followed in this process? If so, have any exemptions been cited? If urgency has been cited as a reason for an exemption, what was the reason given for such urgency?
10. Have any employees of a company owned or run by Mr. Musk been given FAA logins and credentials? If so, please provide how many employees from each of the companies?

It is vital to the American people that our federal contracts are enacted with the necessary oversight and sufficient transparency to give the taxpayers confidence that the law is being followed, and the competitive environment is being preserved for everyone.

We request written responses to the following questions and requests for information as soon as possible, but no later than Monday, March 14, 2025. We look forward to your prompt response.

NOAA layoffs

Dear Secretary Lutnick,

We write to express our profound outrage regarding the recent mass layoffs at the National Oceanic and Atmospheric Administration (NOAA). The termination of hundreds of dedicated scientists, meteorologists, and ocean experts, particularly from the National Weather Service, is a reckless decision that puts American lives at risk, undermines critical climate research now and in the future, and threatens the economic well-being of communities across the nation.

NOAA's work is the backbone of public safety and economic resilience. The agency's accurate and timely weather forecasting is the first line of defense against hurricanes, wildfires, floods, and severe storms. Without NOAA's real-time data and predictive models, emergency responders are left without the critical information they need to respond to impending disasters, putting millions at risk. For example, the 2020 Labor Day wildfires in Oregon, which burned more than one million acres and forced tens of thousands to evacuate, demonstrated the life-or-death importance of precise weather modeling. NOAA's meteorologists were instrumental in providing critical early warnings that saved lives—warnings that are now endangered by these irresponsible cuts.

Beyond public safety, NOAA is an economic engine for industries that depend on reliable weather and climate data. The U.S. commercial fishing industry generated an estimated \$321 billion in 2022 and supported more than 2.3 million jobs. They rely on NOAA's oceanographic assessments and climate predictions to sustain operations. In 2024, NOAA's drought monitoring and seasonal forecasts helped American farmers save crops when nearly 37 percent of the country was confronting extreme drought. Importantly, the tourism and outdoor recreation industries need NOAA's ability to predict and mitigate extreme weather events. Gutting NOAA's workforce jeopardizes these industries as well.

The assertion that these layoffs will somehow improve "efficiency" is not only misleading but outright dangerous. Efficiency is not only measured in dollars saved but more importantly in lives protected and disasters mitigated. NOAA saves money and American lives. In 2020, NOAA's hurricane forecasting saved approximately \$5 billion per major hurricane landfall. NOAA's mission is to provide accurate, science-driven information that helps communities prepare for and respond to environmental threats. A reduction in personnel cripples the very infrastructure that Americans depend on to withstand climate-driven catastrophes.

Given the gravity of this situation, we demand immediate and comprehensive responses to the following questions:

1. What specific criteria and assessments were used to determine the necessity and scope of these layoffs, and what alternative cost-saving measures were considered?

2. What evaluations have been conducted to understand the potential consequences of these layoffs on public safety, particularly concerning severe weather forecasting and emergency response?
3. How do you justify these layoffs in light of NOAA's significant contributions to the national economy, including the agriculture, fisheries, and tourism sectors?
4. With this significant reduction in staff, what measures are being implemented to guarantee that NOAA can maintain its current level of service and fulfill its mission without interruption?
5. Were industry stakeholders, state governments, and local communities consulted prior to executing these layoffs? If so, what feedback was received, and how was it incorporated into the decision?
6. Why was there no transparency and prior notification to Congress regarding these severe workforce reductions in a federal agency of such national importance?
7. To what extent are these layoffs aligned with the objectives outlined in Project 2025, which advocates for the privatization of certain NOAA functions?
8. What are the long-term plans for NOAA's core operations? Is there an intention to outsource or privatize critical services that are important to Americans?
9. What provisions are in place to support the displaced employees, and is there a plan to rehire or replace critical staff to prevent service disruptions?
10. Have all legal and contractual obligations been met in the execution of these layoffs, and how does the Department plan to address any potential legal challenges arising from this action?

The abrupt and ill-considered purging of NOAA's workforce is an affront to the dedicated public servants who work tirelessly to protect our nation's economy and natural resources, and to the people, industries and communities that rely on the information NOAA provides. We demand an immediate halt to these layoffs, reinstatement of employees terminated in these mass layoffs, and a full review of the decision-making process that led to this reckless action.

We expect your prompt and detailed response to the questions outlined above no later than March 14, 2025. The safety and economic stability of millions of Americans depend on it.

HUD Office of Community Development and Planning Staffing Reductions

Dear Mr. Secretary:

We write to express our deep concern with your administration's proposed cuts to the Office of Community Planning and Development (CPD) within the Department of Housing and Urban Development (HUD). Reducing the staff of this office by 84 percent, from 936 employees to just 150, would severely limit the ability of our nation to recover from devastating disasters such as hurricanes, wildfires, and other large-scale catastrophes.

As disasters become more frequent and severe, HUD's disaster recovery program has become central to the nation's response to these disasters. Historically, HUD has been given billions in funding at the direction of Congress to help rebuild homes and infrastructure and provide job training in the aftermath of disasters, filling critical gaps not covered by FEMA's efforts. This includes rebuilding homes for those that are uninsured or underinsured and vital infrastructure like private roads and bridges, which were heavily impacted by disasters such as Hurricane Helene in North Carolina.

Given the severity of recent disasters, HUD staff are already stretched thin, with each employee managing, on average, over \$1 billion in grants. The department's staff work hard to ensure that federal funds are used efficiently and effectively, preventing waste, fraud, and abuse while coordinating disaster recovery efforts with other federal programs, as well as local, state, and non-governmental partners.

Cutting these essential staff and resources would hinder recovery in disaster-stricken areas and delay efforts to rebuild communities that are already facing significant challenges. We urge you to reconsider these cuts and prioritize the long-term recovery of our communities, ensuring that the federal government continues to provide the support they need to recover and rebuild.

Thank you for your consideration.

USFS Staffing Reductions

Dear Secretary Rollins and President Trump:

We write to express our deep concern regarding the recent decision to lay off thousands of employees from the

U.S. Forest Service and the potentially catastrophic consequences this will have on wildfire prevention efforts across the country. These cuts, compounded by the decision to freeze federal funding for a long list of critical programs and grants, could leave our public lands more vulnerable than ever to the threat of wildfires, which are becoming more frequent and severe due to climate change.

Last month, Southern California experienced the most catastrophic wildfires in its history. Since January 7, a series of wildfires have ravaged Los Angeles County, consuming 55,082 acres due to strong Santa Ana winds and severe dry conditions. The Palisades and Eaton Fires were the most destructive, burning more than 23,400 and more than 14,000 acres, respectively. To date, the fires have claimed at least 28 lives and destroyed over 16,240 structures.

These tragedies underscore the urgent need for ongoing community risk reduction and wildfire mitigation strategies that the U.S. Forest Service is tasked with carrying out. The recent layoffs at U.S. Forest Service, which reportedly amount to 10 percent of its entire workforce, directly jeopardize this critical work. For example, in the weeks before the recent Southern California wildfires began, the agency ordered and positioned multiple hand crews, engines, water tenders, dozers and patrols strategically throughout the Angeles National Forest in preparation for critical fire weather. These resources were essential to Initial Attack on fire starts and the overall response to major fires across the region.

Southern California is a prime example of how ecosystem restoration and science-based forest management work can be critical to reducing wildfire risk. Since 2023, thanks to investments included in the Infrastructure Investment and Jobs Act (IIJA) and the Inflation Reduction Act (IRA), the U.S. Forest Service and its partners have treated over 50,000 acres across the Southern California Fireshed Risk Reduction Strategy Landscape. The agency has also obligated over \$46 million in funding included in IIJA and IRA across the four southern California National Forests including the Angeles, Cleveland, Los Padres, and San Bernardino National Forests as part of the Forest Service's larger Wildfire Crisis Strategy. Halting or delaying these projects risks undermining the progress we've made to ensure the safety and well-being of our communities.

The loss of skilled employees, many of whom possess specialized training in modern wildfire prevention techniques, will have lasting effects on the U.S. Forest Service's ability to respond to the growing threat of wildfires. It is particularly concerning that many of those laid off were probationary employees who were actively involved in these critical projects. Their departure, along with the broader staff reductions, leaves the agency dangerously understaffed as we head into another wildfire season.

Given the recent devastation in Southern California and the broader wildfire crisis affecting our country, we are requesting responses to the following questions regarding how your administration plans to address these challenges moving forward:

1. How many U.S. Forest Service employees have been terminated since January 20, 2025? Please include each terminated employee's job title, reason(s) for termination provided to the employee, their occupational categories as determined by the U.S. Office of Personnel Management, their station of duty, and the USFS region in which their duty station resided?
2. What specific steps will you take to restore critical wildfire mitigation programs that have been disrupted by these terminations and the freeze on funding?
3. How do you intend to support the efforts of the Forest Service and other federal agencies tasked with managing our public lands as they face the growing challenges posed by climate change and the escalating risk of catastrophic wildfire?
4. In light of the recent Southern California wildfires, which demonstrated the urgent need for proactive wildfire risk mitigation, how will you prioritize funding for community-based risk reductions efforts in the coming year?
5. How will your department ensure that the billions of dollars allocated in IIJA and IRA for wildfire prevention and firefighter support are fully utilized to protect communities from the growing threat of wildfires?

We urge you to reconsider these cuts and to ensure that U.S. Forest Service and other agencies are fully equipped to handle the current moment. Our nation's public lands and surrounding communities deserve the attention, resources, and leadership required to safeguard them for future generations.

Thank you for your attention to this critical issue. We look forward to your response.

Support NOAA

Dear Vice Admiral Hann:

As Members of Congress who represent congressional districts with facilities and employees of the National Oceanic and Atmospheric Administration (NOAA), we are alarmed by reports of President Trump and Elon Musk's efforts to unlawfully dismantle NOAA. We demand complete answers for the chaos they are causing inside the agency.

Over the past decade, President Trump, his MAGA cheerleaders inside Congress, and their oil and gas-funded allies have stoked fear and conspiracy theories about NOAA's workforce and the agency's science. NOAA provides cutting-edge research and services to keep American families safe and bolsters a sustainable blue economy. These years of unfounded vilification and conspiracies have laid the groundwork for Elon Musk and his DOGE personnel to terrorize NOAA employees, threatening mass layoffs. There have been credible reports of these personnel disregarding security checkpoints, rifling through personal belongings, demanding access to computers, emails, and other sensitive information, and adding employees' names to lists on their clipboards if they are perceived to have resisted. While this is happening at core NOAA facilities in the Washington, D.C. region, our constituents who work at NOAA labs and regional facilities across the nation fear for their jobs and their families' futures.

Project 2025 outlines further steps President Trump's administration will take to "dismantle NOAA," spinning off key scientific programs and functions and eliminating others entirely. Many of these actions are illegal.

Our constituents and the American people deserve answers from the Trump administration as to what their plan is and what authorities the administration is using to bully and intimidate NOAA employees with the ultimate goal of dismantling the agency.

Therefore, we request an in-person meeting with you by February 12, 2025, to receive your answers to the following questions:

1. What authorities are Elon Musk and DOGE personnel using to gain access to NOAA facilities and systems?
2. Are Musk's DOGE personnel removing data from NOAA systems? If so, what data are they taking, and what are they doing with it?
3. How are Musk's DOGE personnel ensuring compliance with data privacy, classification, and other laws protecting sensitive or classified information? Do all those with access to classified data have the appropriate security clearance?
4. Many Trump administration allies have discussed plans to dismantle NOAA, and NOAA employees have reportedly been told to expect a reduction in staff by 50 percent and a 30 percent budget cut. What is the timeline for such action, how does the Administration plan to notify staff, how much warning will staff receive,

and what are the plans for carrying out NOAA's critical science and safety functions if such dismantling occurs?

5. What authorities does the Trump administration plan to use to carry out reductions in force?
6. What authorities does the Trump administration plan to use to dismantle NOAA?
7. What authorities does the Trump administration plan to use to cut 30 percent of the budget?
8. How will the Trump administration ensure that the functions NOAA performs pursuant to law will continue to be executed?
9. Many communities nationwide rely on the services NOAA provides, including the National Weather Service, fishery management activities, and providing real-time information on coastal hazards. How does the Trump administration plan to minimize disruptions to the products and services these communities rely upon?
10. What steps is NOAA taking to safeguard its climate research, environmental monitoring programs, and scientific data from political interference, manipulation, or suppression under the Trump administration's reported efforts to dismantle the agency?
11. Have there been any directives—formal or informal—related to limiting NOAA's role in climate research, restricting data collection, or altering scientific findings? If so, what are they?

Please contact the Democratic staff of the House Natural Resources Committee to arrange this meeting. Thank you for your attention to this urgent request.

Funds Frozen for Wildfire Mitigation

Dear Secretary Rollins, Secretary Burgum, and Secretary Noem:

The United States is grappling with a wildfire crisis. We no longer face wildfire seasons but wildfires year-round, as evidenced by the ongoing wildfires in Southern California, which occurred far outside of the traditional fire season. These fires highlight the need for a renewed, year-round, and comprehensive focus – paired with significant investments – in wildfire mitigation and community defense.

We are concerned about the implications of President Trump’s recent Executive Order “Unleashing American Energy,” that paused wildfire mitigation and other spending from the Bipartisan Infrastructure Law and the Inflation Reduction Act, along with other orders that unlawfully halt Congressionally-appropriated programs across the federal government.

In the past several years, Congress invested more than \$15 billion through the Bipartisan Infrastructure Law and the Inflation Reduction Act to keep communities safe by restoring healthy forest ecosystems, reducing hazardous fuels that increase the intensity and speed of wildfires, providing planning resources to at-risk communities, and increasing pay for federal wildland firefighters. Any efforts by the federal government to illegally withdraw these investments in community safety and wildfire preparedness are a massive disservice to our constituents, ecosystems, watersheds, national security, and wildland firefighters on the frontlines.

The ongoing pause in federal disbursements is particularly alarming for federal, state, local, and other collaborative efforts to manage hazardous fuels, suppress and mitigate wildfires, and strengthen community resilience and preparedness. We are already hearing reports about the impacts of President Trump’s funding pause on our ability to prepare for catastrophic wildfire—especially now as our federal firefighters attempt to staff up for the upcoming fire season. One official warned that, “the inability to have workforce onboarded and ready to respond is going to have a negative impact on suppression efforts across the West... It’s having immediate impacts.”

The potential consequences of the President’s efforts to withhold these critical investments to the communities and lands that need them in a timely manner and as directed by Congress are grave. Without urgent corrective action from this administration, we will be less safe, less prepared, and more vulnerable to extreme wildfire threats.

Therefore, by February 15, 2025, please provide the following:

1. An inventory of all the federal funding and assistance programs across the Departments of Agriculture, Interior, and Homeland Security that the Administration has currently paused that are related to:
 - a. Hazardous fuels management or other wildfire mitigation activities;

- b. State, local, tribal, and community collaboration on wildfire mitigation;
 - c. Community resilience and preparedness activities, including home hardening and defensible space;
 - d. Firefighter training, enhanced benefits, or casualty assistance programs;
 - e. Wildfire research and science associated with managing wildland fire, fuels, and fire impacts to ecosystems and communities;
 - f. Any other programs related to wildfire;
2. A list of projects related to the programs listed in question #1 whose implementation or operation was altered in any way after the release of OMB's now-rescinded January 27, 2025 memo; physical addresses or geographic coordinates for each project; an explanation of how implementation of those projects was changed after January 27, 2025; the number of people that resigned, refused job offers, or were laid off from the projects after January 27, 2025; the total number of acres that were not treated or for which treatment was delayed after January 27, 2025; a list of programs that resumed implementation after the memo was rescinded; and a list of the programs that continue to be paused;
 3. An explanation of how your agency, in collaboration with other impacted Federal agencies described in question #1, is monitoring how the President's Executive Orders are impacting wildfire readiness, community preparedness, or hazardous fuels management goals; and
 4. A timeline for your plans to resume implementation and disbursement of agency processing and funding for programs described in question #1.

The urgent and timely need for action on wildfire preparedness and mitigation cannot be overstated. Any delay in funding and implementation of critical programs threatens the safety and resilience of our communities, ecosystems, and firefighters. We look forward to your prompt response and remain ready to work together to address this escalating crisis with the necessary resources and commitment.

USIP Firings

Dear Secretary Rubio:

We are writing to express our deep concerns and objections regarding the Trump Administration's Friday night firing of employees at the United States Institute of Peace (USIP) and its broader efforts to dismantle this essential organization. As an institution devoted to advancing peacebuilding, conflict resolution, and international diplomacy, USIP has played a critical role in fostering global stability and promoting the values of democracy, human rights, and justice. Elon Musk's recent moves to undermine this vital organization are deeply troubling and have the potential to jeopardize the progress that USIP has made in these areas.

Created by Congress in 1984, USIP is a private, nonprofit think tank whose mission supports research, policy analysis, education, and training on international peace and conflict resolution. USIP's work is indispensable to addressing the most pressing challenges of our time, including violent conflict, fragile states, and humanitarian crises. The loss of experienced and dedicated professionals within the organization weakens our nation's ability to respond effectively to global peacebuilding efforts. Furthermore, dismantling such a vital organization sends the troubling message that we are no longer committed to peace and diplomacy.

This is another attempt by the Department of Government Efficiency (DOGE) to further implement inefficiency, and streamline unauthorized executive power, which will only weaken our global standing. As a private, nonprofit, Musk and President Trump do not have the authority to shut down USIP, an organization created and funded partially by Congress. USIP has nearly an \$80 million endowment from private donors, has its own building on land authorized for use by Congress, and its workers are not federal employees.

We urge you to combat these efforts to dismantle USIP and prevent irreversible damage from occurring. The Administration cannot unilaterally modify USIP's mandate, structure, or budget without Congress. Congress must be involved in decisions about the organization's future. Peacebuilding and diplomacy should remain at the forefront of U.S. foreign policy, and USIP must be allowed to continue its vital work without political interference.

Sincerely,

USAGM

Dear President Trump,

We write with dismay at the shuttering of the Congressionally authorized U.S. Agency for Global Media (USAGM) and cancellation of grants to USAGM networks and grantees which serve a historic, long-standing, and pivotal role in providing honest, comprehensive news coverage to countries that lack a free or open media environment. We urge you to immediately reverse your Executive Order regarding USAGM and restore and implement Congressionally appropriated funds for USAGM and its entities.

Since the beginning of the Cold War, Voice of America and the entire U.S. civilian broadcasting enterprise has been a hallmark of U.S. soft power combating the spread of false narratives from authoritarian regimes around the world. Today, USAGM and its constituent networks and grantees have two unique but impactful goals. First, USAGM works to expand freedom of information and expression. Second, USAGM works to share America's democratic experience. With a minimal annual budget, USAGM has grown its audience more than 21% over the last four years which now totals 427 million unduplicated users across its networks. Audiences of USAGM entities consider this information to be reputable and the legislatively mandated "firewall" across all of USAGM's networks ensures editorial independence of its reporting.

Each of USAGM's entities and grantees will be disastrously impacted by this Executive Order. Voice of America, founded in the early 1940's, has served as a beacon of open and factual reporting for an audience of more than 350 million people in more than 49 languages. Despite a firewall in the People's Republic of China, VOA's Mandarin-language website saw a 72% increase in viewership in Fiscal Year 24 beating out leading competitors. In Iran, VOA Persian's meaningful impact has led Iranian leadership to say that VOA threatens Iranian national security. In Russia, despite efforts by the Russian government to deny access to VOA, VOA Russian article views increased by 20% in Fiscal Year 24. Responses from authoritarian governments in China, Iran, and Russia demonstrate the effectiveness of VOA's work to counter harmful narratives from these governments and provide free and honest reporting to those seeking it.

Founded in 1950, Radio Free Europe/Radio Liberty (RFE/RL) provides accurate and uncensored news in 27 languages to 23 countries across Europe and Eurasia where the media environment is threatened. Since 2021, monthly viewership across RFE/RL's Russian-language news content increased by more than 50 million. At the same time, numerous RFE/RL journalists have been targeted by regimes across the former Soviet Union, regimes which are threatened by RFE/RL's honest, fact-based reporting. Shuttering RFE/RL will enable governments in Russia, Belarus, Iran, and Central Asia to spread their own messages of regime propaganda without the fear of being held accountable by RFE/RL's award-winning reporting.

The Office of Cuba Broadcasting, which oversees Radio and Television Martí, provides the Cuban people with seven day a week coverage in one of the most restrictive media environments

in the world. For decades, the Cuban people have lived under a regime which has taken their liberty, suppressed access to objective, fact-based information, and isolated the island from the outside world. Radio and Television Martí contribute to breaking this isolation, and terminating grants to Martí will only benefit the Cuban regime and hurt the Cuban people.

The Middle East Broadcasting Network (MBN) makes use of a small annual budget to provide relevant news and information in Arabic across the region. In closed and restrictive media environments across the Middle East and North Africa, MBN is uniquely placed to provide access to information about the United States to citizens of the region who seek to better understand America. As your administration seeks to bring peace to the Middle East, it remains vitally important that viewers of MBN receive honest and fact-based reporting of the goals of U.S. foreign policy in the region rather than regime-led propaganda.

Launched in 1996, Radio Free Asia delivers uncensored news and information to audiences in China, Vietnam, North Korea, Laos, Cambodia, and Myanmar. From informing the world about the genocide in Xinjiang to reporting on the ongoing crisis in Myanmar, RFA's work holds regional governments to account. Eliminating RFA will only cede leverage to the People's Republic of China and other regimes in the region whose views on the world run counter to those of the United States and our closest allies.

Finally, the Open Technology Fund (OTF), founded in 2019, works to advance internet freedom in closed environments to enable citizens around the world to exercise their fundamental human rights online. As access to news and information evolves, OTF serves as a linchpin of changing media ecosystems and today, more than 2 billion people use OTF-supported technology daily. From combating internet shutdowns to seizing on periods of opportunities in transitioning countries, OTF is key to protecting the safety and security of journalists and global citizens who seek access to credible and objective information regardless of their location. Moreso, the recently launched Frontline Media Fund would identify opportunities for advancing new approaches to content distribution and provide surge capacity during crises abroad.

The shuttering of USAGM and the damaging impact on its broadcasting entities and grantees will only work to help our adversaries in Russia, China, Iran, and North Korea and hurt U.S. credibility and global standing around the world. More directly, it will leave millions of people in closed and restrictive environments, from Havana to Caracas to Minsk to Tehran, less able to access information about the world around them. We strongly urge you to reconsider this Executive Order and ensure the critical work of USAGM and its broadcasting networks continues.

Citizenship and Assimilation Grant Program Freeze

Dear Acting Director Scott,

We write to express our deep concern regarding the recent freeze of funding to grantees under the Citizenship and Assimilation (C&A) Grant Program, and to request further information about your actions. Since 2009, this program has been instrumental in supporting eligible lawful permanent residents on their path to U.S. citizenship. By funding organizations that provide assistance with the U.S. citizenship application process, English language instruction, and civics education, the program has significantly increased community capacity to help aspiring citizens gain the knowledge and resources necessary to navigate the naturalization process successfully.

On February 4, 2025, USCIS began notifying grant recipients that their funding would be frozen, citing a January 28, 2025, memorandum from Department of Homeland Security (DHS) Secretary Kristi Noem. The notification further stated that payments were unavailable, with no timeline from USCIS for when the freeze would be lifted. This abrupt action, along with uncertainty about when it will be resolved, has caused widespread instability for organizations that rely on these grants to continue to provide their services. There has been no indication, evidence or even outright allegation that grantees have failed to meet their commitments or contractual obligations in good faith — raising serious concerns over the justification for disrupting their ability to provide crucial services. Without immediate action, this freeze will cause irrevocable harm on organizations whose work significantly enhances the economic and civic life of the many communities they serve.

Additionally, the services funded by this program help applicants submit correctly completed forms, reducing errors and delays, and preventing unnecessary burdens on USCIS staff. By equipping eligible applicants with the tools to navigate the naturalization process more effectively, the C&A Grant Program improves efficiency within the system, saving USCIS valuable time and resources otherwise spent resolving errors, issuing requests for evidence, or reprocessing applications. Cutting funding for this program will only increase administrative inefficiencies and add to existing case backlogs.

Given the serious implications of this decision, we request an immediate response from USCIS to the following questions:

1. What authority does USCIS claim to suspend congressionally appropriated funds that have already been legally disbursed under contractual agreements?
2. What is the specific rationale behind the grant freeze, and what factors influenced this decision?
3. What is the anticipated timeline for reinstating funding to affected grantees?
4. What steps is DHS taking to mitigate the impact on organizations with a reliance interest in timely payment of grants, and on affected communities?

5. What steps is DHS taking to prevent similar disruptions to already disbursed funds in the future?

In the absence of authority or constructive purpose for this action, USCIS must swiftly reinstate funding for this critical program and provide transparency regarding the decision-making process. We look forward to your prompt response.

National Fire Academy

Dear Secretary Noem and Acting Administrator Hamilton:

We write to express our serious concern with the Administration's immediate cancellation of all in-person first responder training courses at the U.S. Fire Administration's (USFA) National Fire Academy (NFA) in Emmitsburg, Maryland. According to the Federal Emergency Management Agency's (FEMA) March 7th announcement, classes were canceled to review NFA "programs and spending to ensure alignment with Administration priorities." This action grossly undermines first responder public safety and equally threatens public safety.

Described as "the American fire service war college," the NFA provides lifesaving, critical and federally funded training and education programs. Tens of thousands of career and volunteer firefighters from departments across the country benefit from these courses each year. The NFA gathers leading experts and first responders to train with stress-tested technology, share best practices, develop innovative emergency response methods, and enhance public safety. Programs at the NFA cover topics including emergency medical services, fire prevention, arson and explosion investigation, leadership development, wildfire response, and firefighter health and safety.

Congress created the NFA through the Federal Fire Prevention and Control Act of 1974 to "advance the professional development of fire service personnel." In 2017, an overwhelming majority of Academy students reported that their coursework helped improve their individual skills and enhanced their local fire department's readiness. In Fiscal Year 2023, more than 40,000 first responders participated in NFA courses. After participating in these courses, 90 percent of supervisors shared that their firefighters were better prepared to respond to emergencies as a result of their training at the Academy.

Without the Academy's services, local departments will lose access to key tools and knowledge necessary to effectively respond to emergencies of all kinds and efficiently manage their agencies. The NFA's course offerings are unique, supplementing, rather than duplicating, state-led certification and professional development programs. Local fire departments often lack the resources to provide specialized education for their first responders. Through the NFA, local fire departments can send firefighters to Emmitsburg for accessible, affordable courses. Additionally, the Academy hosts courses across the country at state fire training academies to reach first responders who cannot make the trip. By offering training that States cannot or do not offer to their firefighters, the Academy stands alone as the national hub of innovative, lifesaving firefighting methods.

At a time when wildfires have ravaged—and continue to threaten—communities from California to the Carolinas, the collaboration and education managed by the NFA has never been more important. Recently, the Academy held a course on wildfire investigation, led by experienced professionals alongside experts from the U.S. Forest Service and CAL FIRE. Canceling critical

courses like this one, even if the suspension is temporary, will mean that our communities will be left with fewer defenses against devastating wildfires.

Given the importance of the National Fire Academy and the drastic impacts to local fire departments across the country, we demand immediate and comprehensive responses to the following questions:

1. What criteria was used to determine that the NFA's classes would be canceled?
2. The rationale that FEMA used to justify the cancellation was to review programs to ensure that they aligned with "Administration priorities." How long will FEMA's review process take?
 - a. Further, what criteria will be used to conduct the review?
3. The cancellation notice was sent on the afternoon of Friday, March 7th, after travel arrangements and hotel reservations for future classes had been made. Are local agencies going to be reimbursed for lost expenses associated with the canceled classes?
4. We have heard reports that firefighters who were enrolled in courses scheduled to continue into and beyond the week of March 10th were told to leave campus immediately upon the cancellation order. Will these students and their local fire departments be reimbursed for all expenses related to courses that were wrongfully and prematurely terminated?
5. Will you reinstate all canceled classes immediately to comply with Judge McConnell's March 6th order?

Firefighters and other first responders lay their lives on the line every day for our communities. The abrupt cancellation of courses has affected dozens of firefighters, educators, and local departments that rely on the National Fire Academy's resources, classes, and expertise to promote safe and effective fire prevention, enhance firefighter safety, and reduce the loss of life and property to fire. We call on the Administration to reverse course and reinstate these critical classes for first responder

We expect your prompt and detailed response to the questions outlined above no later than March 26th, 2025.

Support Abortion Access for Veterans

The Honorable Doug Collins
Secretary U.S. Department of Veterans Affairs
810 Vermont Ave. NW Washington, DC 20420

Dear Mr. Secretary:

We write today to voice our strong opposition to any effort to rescind or replace the final rule entitled “Reproductive Health Services,” which ensures veterans, and their eligible family members and caregivers, can access abortion care and counseling through the U.S. Department of Veterans Affairs (VA). It is our government’s solemn promise to care for our veterans’ health and well-being and protect their fundamental freedoms, as they have fought to protect ours. That promise includes ensuring veterans and their loved ones have access to the full spectrum of reproductive healthcare, including abortion care.

Prior to the implementation of this rule, which was issued as an Interim Final Rule in September 2022, and finalized in March 2024, VA’s medical benefits package did not permit abortion care or counseling in any circumstance. As a result of this ban, veterans who needed abortion care, including those whose lives were at risk, were denied access to this needed healthcare service. In issuing the Reproductive Health Services rule, VA rightly found that providing access to reproductive healthcare for veterans was necessary to uphold its statutory obligation to “promote, preserve, or restore” the health of veterans.

Veterans have long faced significant barriers to accessing reproductive healthcare, but the public health crisis created by the June 2022 reversal of *Roe v. Wade* has created an unprecedented level of confusion, chaos, and fear. The draconian abortion bans and restrictions that states have implemented in the aftermath of the decision have undermined the rights and bodily autonomy of pregnant veterans across this country. Your department, in issuing the Reproductive Health Services rule, recognized the urgency required to protect veterans’ health and well-being by providing abortion counseling, as well as abortion care in cases of rape, incest, or life or health endangerment of the pregnant person. Without this rule, pregnant veterans in states that ban abortion would have been denied access to needed care at VA and forced to travel long distances to access urgently needed healthcare, including life-saving care.

Ensuring this rule stays in place in its current form is crucial to safeguarding the health and wellbeing of our veterans and their families and caregivers, especially given the unique challenges veterans face, including experiencing post-traumatic stress disorder (PTSD), a higher risk of suicide,³ and military sexual trauma. However, we are gravely concerned about language in Project 2025 that urges VA to “rescind all departmental clinical policy directives that are contrary to the principles of conservative governance starting with abortion services.” Despite President Donald Trump’s insistence that he is in no way associated with Project 2025, it appears that your department is poised to follow this plan and roll back access to reproductive healthcare

for our veterans and their loved ones. As of the date of this letter, according to the Office of Management and Budget's Office of Information and Regulatory Affairs, an Interim Final Rule with the same title as the 2022 rule is pending regulatory review. An Interim Final Rule that restricts access to abortion for veterans would pose an immediate and grave danger for veterans and deprive them, without proper notice, of the benefits they have earned and the healthcare they need.

The Reproductive Health Services rule, as finalized in March 2024, crucially recognized that veterans deserve the freedom to make their own decisions about their health, bodies, and futures—free from interference from politicians or judges. To ensure our veterans continue to have access to the reproductive healthcare they need, we demand your agency withdraw any pending rule and refrain from issuing future rules that would rescind or restrict access to abortion care and counseling at VA. On behalf of the veterans we represent, we thank you for your immediate response to this letter.

Removal of Diverse Men and Women from Military Archives

Dear President Trump:

We write to formally refute the removal and erasure of our diverse brave men and women who honorably served our country, and their historic accomplishments. The recent actions by your Administration are unjustified and are nothing less than disparaging and offensive to anyone who has worn our country's uniform and protected our freedoms. Therefore, we demand that you reinstate Sergeant Alfredo "Freddy" Gonzalez's webpage honoring his service on the Naval History and Heritage Command Website immediately as well as anyone who was removed under the guise of eliminating "Diversity, Equity, and Inclusion (DEI)" content as directed by your Executive Order 14151: "Ending Radical and Wasteful Government DEI Programs and Preferencing."

As you know, there are over two million people serving in the United States military today, either in Active Duty or Reserves. Over 30 percent of these individuals identify as belonging to a minority group, with 18 percent identifying as Latino or Hispanic and 20 percent women. These heroes face the possibility of having their courageous efforts erased from history by these overtly discriminatory initiatives.

Those targeted by these attacks include South Texas hero, Marine Corps Sergeant Alfredo "Freddy" Gonzalez, who has been removed from the Naval History Website. Sergeant Gonzalez was tragically killed in action on February 4, 1968, and was posthumously awarded the Congressional Medal of Honor for his brave and enduring service in the Vietnam War. History is clear, Sergeant Gonzalez was in charge of Third Platoon, Company A, near Hue City, Vietnam, when his company was ambushed for days. He maneuvered his men and returned fire, personally carrying wounded warriors to safety. Doing so, he bravely gave his life for his country. Unlike your Administration, he did not ask what ethnicity these men were, what religion they practiced, or what country they were from. The fact is they were all Americans, fighting one of, if not the most, atrocious and unpopular war in our country's history.

The erasure also targets Private First Class Harold Gonsalves, who was posthumously presented the Medal of Honor for Valor during World War II; Major General Jeannie M. Leavitt, the country's first female fighter pilot; and PFC Christina Fuentes Montenegro, one of the first three women to graduate from Marine Corps' Infantry Training Battalion. Your Administration has previously targeted other notable heroes in our nation's military: from our Tuskegee Airmen who bravely fought against Nazi Germany during World War II, to our Navajo Code Talkers who helped us defeat Japan, to General Colin Powell who was the first Black American to hold the office of Secretary of State, these American patriots represent the best of our country.

These appalling efforts to erase history under the guise of eliminating (DEI) content knows no bounds. Removing Hispanic and Latinos, women, and other minorities from our nation's archives, due to nothing more than the color of their skin, last name or gender is un-American.

These brave men and women fought and oftentimes laid down their lives for a country that is erasing their achievements for heinous reasons. Honoring these brave individuals is not about diversity or equity. Honoring them is about remembering their great sacrifice and dutiful service to our nation. We stand firm in our commitment to defending the integrity of our military and the truth of its history, and demand that you halt any continued effort to erase our veterans and servicemembers from the record under the guise of purging DEI content.

We also ask that you reinstate Sgt. Gonzalez's webpage honoring his service on the Naval History and Heritage Command Website as well as anyone that was removed under the guise of eliminating DEI content. Additionally, as Commander in Chief of our Armed Forces, we urge you to reaffirm your commitment to the selfless men and women who gave their lives to our nation, those who currently serve, and our veterans regardless of race, ethnicity, gender, or background.

Letter to OMB Regarding Public Access to Federal Datasets and Tools

Dear Director Vought:

We write to urge you to immediately restore public access to federal datasets and data-driven tools, which are essential to government accountability, public and private sector research, and the work of businesses and non-profits. Those datasets have been created pursuant to Congressional direction and funded by American taxpayers. We therefore expect that data to remain publicly available, both out of duty to American taxpayers and out of economic common sense. Analyses have found that publicly-available federal health data alone adds more than \$300 billion to the U.S. economy every year. Accurate, detailed and relevant data can help save lives, create jobs, and lower public and private sector costs.

We are deeply concerned that those expectations are not being met. Among others, the following datasets and data-driven tools are currently unavailable to the public, or have been made unavailable to the public for a prolonged period in recent weeks:

Health data, including the Centers for Disease Control and Prevention's (CDC) Behavioral Risk Factor Surveillance System (BRFSS) survey data, which is "sometimes the only source of state or territory-specific risk behavior data," and the Health Resources and Services Administration's (HRSA) Area Health Resource Files, which include more than 80 years of data to track healthcare staffing, hospital spending, and healthcare gaps in states and localities across the country.^{4,5}

Energy data, including the Department of Energy's (DOE) Energy Affordability Resource Map, which allowed American homeowners and renters to find federal programs to reduce their energy bills, based on geographic location and eligibility.

Census data, including File Transfer Protocol (FTP) access to the American Community Survey (ACS) Public Use Microdata Sample (PUMS), which allows the American public to create custom tables to analyze Census Bureau data rather than relying only on premade Census Bureau products.

More than 1,000 other datasets, as the number of open datasets available to the public via Data.Gov has fallen from 307,851 on January 19, 2025,⁹ to 306,796 as of February 3, 2025.¹⁰

Urgently restoring access to these and other datasets and data-driven tools is critical to government accountability and to our nation's economic well-being. We therefore seek clarity on the Administration's plans to do so. Please provide answers to the following questions:

What datasets and data-driven tools has the Administration removed from public-facing websites?

Which, if any, does the Administration plan to restore public access to? Please provide a specific plan and timeline for restoring that access.

Of those restored or planned to be restored, please identify which have had research parameters changed or data modified to comply with recent executive orders.

Of those restored or planned to be restored, has any metadata or functionality that researchers depend on to use the data been modified or eliminated?

Which, if any, does the Administration not plan to restore public access to?

If any, please provide written explanations, specific to each dataset and datadriven tool, for why American taxpayers will be denied access going forward.

Additionally, please attach copies of all datasets to which American taxpayers will be denied access going forward.

Given the urgency of restoring access to these critical datasets, we request a response to these questions by February 19, 2025. We thank you for your attention to this matter and look forward to receiving those responses.

NIH Indirect Cost Cut

Matthew J. Memoli, M.D., M.S.
Acting Director
National Institutes of Health (NIH)
9000 Rockville Pike
Bethesda, Maryland 20892

Dear Acting Director Memoli:

The United States is a global leader in biomedical research and innovation due to National Institutes of Health (NIH) funding. That is why we are alarmed by NIH's illegal decision to slash the reimbursement rate for indirect research costs to 15 percent across the board.

Because of the NIH, grantee institutions, and a vibrant life sciences sector, the United States has made significant strides in medicine, improving and saving lives with each breakthrough. From 1991 to 2022, the cancer mortality rate in the United States decreased by 34 percent. Annual HIV infections fell by two-thirds from the height of the HIV epidemic, and 65 percent of individuals diagnosed with HIV in 2022 achieved viral suppression. The life expectancy of someone born with cystic fibrosis today is multiple decades longer than it was 30 years ago. Each of these achievements was driven by research conducted at or funded by NIH.

The dramatically lower indirect cost rate cap will have far-reaching consequences for institutions and researchers nationwide, reducing their capacity to conduct cutting-edge research. Slashing this funding means cutting financial support for the construction and maintenance of laboratories and high-tech facilities; energy and utility expenses; and the essential safety, security, and other support services researchers need to perform their work. Indirect costs make research possible. Without fair reimbursement for indirect costs, research institutions may be forced to close laboratories, lay off staff, stop clinical trials, and pause research programs. This will force Americans to go without lifesaving and life-extending treatments.

The supplemental guidance for this misguided and detrimental announcement states that the "United States should have the best medical research in the world." Cutting vital funding for indirect costs accomplishes the exact opposite. Instead of supporting efforts to cure disease, this policy will severely compromise the United States' ability to conduct lifesaving research. A recent Washington Post article described how a researcher who studies how cells communicate faced a setback when the lab's "cold room" broke down. This cold room is essential for conducting experiments critical to advancing our understanding of colon cancer and developing potential cures. The expenses associated with maintaining cold rooms represent the kind of funding that would be slashed under NIH's policy, compromising the infrastructure that allows researchers to carry out their vital work.

Research universities generate significant economic activity in communities throughout the country. In 2024, the NIH supported work at over 2,500 institutions in all 50 states. In Fiscal Year 2023, each dollar of NIH funding generated \$2.46 in economic activity. The economic pain caused by slashing NIH research funding will not be contained to university campuses. It will reverberate into communities throughout the country, hurting hardworking families already struggling to keep up with rising costs.

The Further Consolidated Appropriations Act, 2024 was passed by Congress on a bipartisan basis and contains a provision to prevent NIH from unilaterally making changes to how the agency pays for indirect costs. We are encouraged that a federal judge has issued a temporary order halting this controversial decision. However, the uncertainty and disruption caused by these irrational decisions highlight the need for the NIH to immediately rescind this guidance on indirect costs and refrain from taking unilateral action on payment for indirect costs in the future. With this in mind, we request answers to the following questions:

1. What measures has the NIH taken to thoroughly assess the impact of capping indirect cost payments?
2. Were alternative solutions considered that would allow for budgetary savings without compromising research institutions' ability to conduct research?
3. How does the NIH plan to address concerns from research institutions about potential layoffs and halted studies caused by the new indirect cost rate?
4. How will significantly reducing funds available to maintain critical laboratory infrastructure impact the overall quality and progress of biomedical research and innovation in the United States?

Thank you for your prompt attention to this important matter. We ask that you provide responses to these questions no later than February XX, 2025.

Tribal Self-Determination Executive Order Recission

Dear President Trump:

We write to request your reconsideration of your recent decision¹ to rescind Executive Order 14112, “Reforming Federal Funding and Support for Tribal Nations to Better Embrace Our Trust Responsibilities and Promote the Next Era of Tribal Self-Determination” (Tribal Self-Determination EO).² The Tribal Self-determination EO was designed to improve the efficiency and coordination of federal funding and demonstrate the Federal Government’s commitment to upholding its treaty and trust obligations to Tribal Nations. Because the Tribal Self-Determination EO is intended to improve efficiency, coordination, and respect for Native American Tribes, we believe it is a policy position that your administration and all subsequent administrations would favor.

Tribal Nations have a legal, government-to-government relationship with the United States. The inherent sovereignty of Tribal Nations is recognized in the U.S. Constitution, in treaties, and across many federal laws and policies. It is important that your administration not include Tribes in any efforts to target diversity, equity, and inclusion programs. Tribal Nations have legal status as a political, not racial class and the United States has a trust responsibility to them.

Section five of the Tribal Self-Determination EO directed agencies to increase the accessibility, flexibility, and utility of Federal funding and programs for Tribal Nations, while increasing the transparency and efficiency of Federal funding processes.³ This aligns closely with the administration’s stated goals to maximize governmental efficiency and productivity. Too often, federal funding processes impose unnecessary barriers for Tribal Nations, including restrictive limitations and burdensome reporting requirements that hinder Tribal Nations from meeting their communities’ needs. Without the coordination and efficiency processes established under the Tribal Self-Determination EO, these challenges will only grow, creating uncertainty and instability that directly undermines tribal self-determination.

We request an explanation of why the Tribal Self-Determination EO was rescinded, and whether any Tribal Nations were consulted prior to its rescission. We urge you to restore Executive Order 14112 and work directly with Tribal Nations, Congress, and your federal agencies to ensure Tribal Nations are able to exercise their sovereignty and more efficiently access federal support.

Ending Federal Collective Bargaining Executive Order

Dear President Trump:

We are writing to call on you to rescind the Executive Order (EO) Exclusions from Federal Labor-Management Relations Programs issued on March 27, 2025. This order, which will strip away collective bargaining rights for 75 percent of the federal workforce, is an unprecedented assault on the fundamental rights of 1.5 million American federal workers as well as the broader labor movement. Additionally, the EO violates the narrow authorities granted to the President by Congress and is therefore unlawful.

Collective bargaining is the strongest tool that workers have available to create a fair workplace. This action strips away those hard-earned rights – which have been upheld by presidents from both parties for decades – from federal workers who keep our country running, including nurses who care for veterans, inspectors who keep our food safe to eat, teachers who educate our children, and so many more. Additionally, the EO's exclusion of entire departments and agencies from collective bargaining opens the door to potential abuse, retaliation, and political interference. Without union representation, federal employees – including whistleblowers and veterans – will lose vital protections that ensure their ability to serve the American people without fear of unjust reprisal.

Furthermore, this EO not only undermines the principles of fair labor practices but also threatens the efficiency and effectiveness of the federal government, jeopardizing the delivery of critical services to the American people. As a direct result of this assault on federal workers, we anticipate delays in Americans receiving their tax refunds and veterans' benefits. This will cause unnecessary hardship for millions of Americans who depend on these services.

The freedom to join a union and collectively bargain is central to achieving the American dream for millions of American workers. This action is the single most anti-worker and anti-union presidential action since Ronald Reagan fired striking air traffic controllers in 1981, and it must be reversed immediately.

Finally, this EO is in clear violation of the President's narrow and rarely used authorities under the Federal Service Labor-Management Relations Statute. While Congress granted the President narrow authority to exclude some agencies from collective bargaining, those exclusions can only be made if that agency has a primary function in intelligence, counterintelligence, investigative, or national security work, and only if the statute cannot be applied "in a manner consistent with national security requirements and considerations." However, this Administration has made clear that the EO's exclusions are not based on national security concerns, but instead as retaliation for labor unions defending their members' rights and making it easier to fire federal employees. This EO is clearly inconsistent with the President's authorities and is illegal.

We urge you to immediately rescind this harmful, unlawful EO and to reaffirm the rights of federal workers to unionize and collectively bargain. The American people deserve a federal workforce that is protected, respected, and empowered to carry out its duties effectively.

Office of Minority Health Closure

The Honorable Robert F. Kennedy. Jr., Secretary
Department of Health and Human Services
200 Independence Avenue, S.W.
Washington, DC 20201

Dear Secretary Kennedy,

We write to express our deep concern following your decision to eliminate the Office of Minority Health at the Department of Health and Human Services (“HHS OMH”) and the Office of Minority Health at the Centers for Medicare and Medicaid Services (“CMS OMH”). It is particularly unsettling that the Administration is willing to so carelessly put lives at risk by dismantling the federal offices working to reduce health disparities and improve access to care.

These cuts may achieve short-term savings but will undoubtedly increase inefficiencies and waste for years to come. HHS OMH and CMS OMH are victims of the Administration’s ideological campaign against diversity, equity, and inclusion (DEI) initiatives. Websites for several minority health offices that operate under HHS, including the Food and Drug (FDA) Administration’s Office of Minority Health, and the Health Resources and Services Administration’s Office of Health Equity have been taken down in response to the President signing an executive order calling for federal agencies to end Diversity, Equity, and Inclusion initiatives.² Let us be clear: closing down these offices will kill our country’s most vulnerable. As we hope you are aware, the mission of HHS OMH is to improve the health of racial and ethnic minority populations and underserved communities, including rural communities, through the development of health policies and programs to eliminate health disparities. There are many common diseases and chronic health conditions that disproportionately impact minority populations, including:

- African American and Hispanic adults have the highest prevalence of obesity in the United States. Obesity increases the risk of developing deadly health conditions such as heart disease, stroke, diabetes, and certain types of cancers.
- Heart disease is the leading cause of death in the United States. Black Americans are 30% more likely to die from heart disease than White Americans.
 - o Heart disease is the number one killer of women; one in three women will die of heart disease, which is more than from all forms of cancer combined.
- Black and African American people have higher death rates than all other racial/ethnic groups for most cancers.
 - o Black and African American women are more likely than White women to die of breast cancer.
 - o Black and African American men are more likely than white men likely to die of prostate cancer.

- Despite Asian Americans having a 40% lower overall cancer death rate than the White population, liver cancer mortality is nearly 40% higher, and stomach cancer mortality is twice as high.
 - o Certain ethnic populations such as persons of Korean, Japanese, Chinese, and Vietnamese descent, stomach cancer rates can be up to 5 times higher.
 - o Breast cancer diagnoses for Asian American and Pacific Islander women under 50 have increased by 50% since 2000.
- Asian Americans comprise about 7% of the U.S. population but suffer 58% of chronic hepatitis B cases.
- Black adults are nearly twice as likely as White adults to develop type 2 diabetes.¹⁴
 - o Black and Hispanic diabetics are four times more likely to get an amputation than other groups.
 - o Hispanic and Latinos are 50% more likely to die from diabetes or liver disease.¹⁶
- Native Hawaiian and Pacific Islander (NHPI) adults are more than two times as likely to die from diabetes than White adults.
- Black women are three times more likely to die from a pregnancy-related cause than White women.
 - o Black infants are more than twice as likely to die in their first year compared to White infants.
- NHPI women are four times more likely than White women to begin receiving prenatal care in the third trimester or receive no prenatal care at all.
- Hispanic and Latina mothers were 80% less likely to receive late or no prenatal care.
- Incidence of colorectal, lung, and cervical cancers are higher for people who live in rural Appalachia than in individuals who live in urban areas in the same region.

Amidst these threats to public health, we are requesting information and answers to the following questions within 7 days of receipt of this letter:

1. What is your justification for eliminating the OMH within HHS? Within CMS?
2. How does the Department plan to address the health needs of minority populations and underserved communities across the country?
3. How will the elimination of these offices improve health outcomes and reduce health disparities?
4. Please list the ongoing research projects impacted by the closures of these offices. Terminating offices and programs that promote addressing minority health matters endangers millions of Americans.

As Members of Congress, we have a duty to review and oversee how agencies are spending their funds for the betterment of the American people. We urge you to reverse this dangerous decision.

Dismantling of the Office of English Language Acquisition

Dear Secretary McMahon,

We write to express our serious concern regarding the U.S. Department of Education's (the Department) recent reduction in force (RIF) and dismantling of the Office of English Language Acquisition (OELA). These actions are an outright attack on the Department's ability to fulfill its statutory obligations to the more than five million English Learners (ELs) across the country—students who rely on targeted language instruction and dedicated programmatic support to fully access the curriculum and meet academic standards.

On March 11, the Department reportedly terminated nearly all OELA staff and, in a March 14 communication to State Education Chiefs, indicated its intention to merge OELA with the Office of Elementary and Secondary Education (OESE). This brazen move is unacceptable, and we demand the immediate reversal of these harmful decisions.

OELA plays a vital role in administering the \$890 million English Language Acquisition (ELA) program under Title III of the Elementary and Secondary Education Act (ESEA), along with overseeing critical programs such as:

1. **Native American and Alaska Native Children in Schools (NAM) grants**, supporting language and academic development;
2. **National Professional Development (NPD) grants**, addressing the severe shortage of bilingual educators; and
3. **The National Clearinghouse for English Language Acquisition (NCELA)**, which serves as a hub of resources for states, educators, and stakeholders.

Terminating OELA's experienced staff—experts with deep institutional knowledge of EL programs—severely compromises the Department's ability to manage these grants, provide necessary technical assistance to states, and enforce Title III requirements.

Stripping away OELA's independence and burying it within OESE – an office already stretched thin with competing priorities—signals a blatant disregard for the needs of English Learners and will have catastrophic consequences. You will leave the most vulnerable children in America behind.

Not only is this decision an educational and moral failure, but it is also legally dubious. OELA was established by statute as a standalone office reporting directly to the Secretary. Any attempt to diminish its authority or reassign its responsibilities runs counter to the *Department of Education Organization Act* and undermines decades of bipartisan support for English Learners. We demand full transparency on the legal basis for this reorganization.

We request that the Department answer the following:

4. Who will now be directly responsible for administering the \$890 million Title III English Language Acquisition grant program following the RIF at OELA?
5. What specific steps will the Department take to prevent disruptions in the fiscal year 2026 grant cycle, including the review, approval, and monitoring of state Title III plans?
6. Has the Department conducted an equity impact analysis of the RIF and reorganization on the delivery of services to English Learners? If so, please share the findings.
7. Has the Department conducted a legal review to assess whether this reorganization violates the *Department of Education Organization Act* or Title III of ESEA? If so, please provide that analysis.
8. How will the Department ensure that the needs of English Learners—including dual language learners, newcomers, and students with limited or interrupted formal education—remain a top priority under OESE’s broader portfolio?

English Learners—who make up one in ten students in our K-12 system—are primarily U.S. citizens striving for equal educational opportunity. Dismantling OELA denies these students access to the language instruction, resources, and support they need to succeed. The Department’s actions are inexcusable and will harm over five million EL’s by denying them of their right to a quality education.

We demand the Department reverse its actions to abolish OELA including the RIF targeting OELA staff, restore OELA as a standalone office, and reaffirm the Department’s commitment to English Learners in compliance with statutory law.

Thank you for your attention to this critical matter. We request a response from the Department of Education no later than April 30, 2025.

Sincerely,

Rescindment of Language Access Executive Order

April 23, 2025

Scott Turner
Secretary
U.S. Department of Housing and Urban Development
451 7th Street, SW
Washington, DC 20410
Dear Secretary Turner:

As Members of the Congressional Asian Pacific American Caucus (CAPAC), we write to inquire how your agency plans to uphold its obligations under federal law, including Title VI of the Civil Rights Act of 1964, Section 1557 of the Affordable Care Act, and Section 616 of the Stafford Act, and existing agency regulations, to provide meaningful access to services and programs for individuals with limited English proficiency.

President Trump’s signed Executive Order (EO) 14224 “Designating English as the Official Language of the United States” which rescinds Executive Order 13166, Improving Access for Services for Persons with Limited English Proficiency (LEP). Importantly, EO 14224 gives agencies “flexibility to decide how and when to offer services in languages other than English to best serve the American people” and “specifically allows agencies to keep current policies and provide documents and services in other languages.”¹ President Trump’s executive order does not require federal agencies to stop production of products or services in languages other than English.

The U.S. Census Bureau estimates that more than 25 million Americans—eight percent of the U.S. population—have LEP.² According to the Economic Policy Institute, approximately 32 percent of Asian Americans, 12 percent of Native Hawaiians and Pacific Islanders, and 29 percent of the Latino community have LEP.³ Language assistance services for individuals with LEP have been essential in protecting every Americans’ right to access federal services. In order to best serve our constituents and the American people, we request answers to the following questions within 60 days of receipt of this letter:

- 1) What changes, if any, will your agency be taking to limit, decrease, or remove current policies and programs intended to assist individuals with LEP?
- 2) Will your agency continue to follow the most updated Language Access Plan published by your agency?
- 3) What communication are you providing to recipients of federal funds administered through your agency, as to their responsibility to provide meaningful language access under previously promulgated agency guidance?

4) Have recent staffing reductions included individuals whose primary responsibility was ensuring the agency and federal funding recipients comply with civil rights requirements or are responsible for providing information in other languages? If so, how many staff with these responsibilities have been terminated or reassigned to other duties?

5) Will your agency continue to receive, review, and address civil rights complaints regarding access to information in other languages in a timely manner? Thank you for your timely response to ensure the American people are best served by your agency.

Sincerely,

Office on Violence Against Women(OVW)

April 24, 2025

The Honorable Pamela Jo Bondi
Attorney General
United States Department of Justice
950 Pennsylvania Avenue N.W.
Washington, D.C. 20530

Dear Attorney General Bondi,

We write to express our deep concern about reports that the Office on Violence Against Women (OVW) has withdrawn its Notice of 2025 Funding Opportunities.¹ OVW administers critical grant programs that provide lifesaving support to survivors of domestic violence, sexual assault, dating violence, and stalking. The sudden withdrawal of these funding opportunities threatens to disrupt essential services, jeopardize the stability of victim assistance programs, and undermine the bipartisan commitment to combating these forms of violence. We respectfully urge the Department of Justice to clarify the status of these grants as soon as possible and take swift action to ensure funding remains available to support survivors and the organizations that serve them.

For decades, OVW's grant programs have provided vital resources to law enforcement agencies, legal service providers, crisis centers, and community organizations that work to support survivors and prevent violence and abuse. These programs have played a key role in carrying out the Violence Against Women Act (VAWA), which Congress once again reauthorized in 2022 on a bipartisan basis, creating several new programs to combat

cybercrime and new grant programs to assist with victim services that address domestic violence, dating violence, sexual assault, and stalking.²

A delay or reduction in OVW funding will have devastating consequences for the countless individuals who rely on these resources for safety, legal protection, and recovery. This abrupt

- 2 U.S. Dep't of Just., **Open Notices of Funding Opportunities**, Off. on Violence Against Women, <https://www.justice.gov/ovw/open-notices-of-funding-opportunities> (last visited Apr. 23, 2025).
- 2 Cong. Rsch. Serv., **R47570, The 2022 Violence Against Women Act (VAWA) Reauthorization** (2023), <https://www.congress.gov/crs-product/R47570>.

withdrawal of funding has created severe uncertainty that threatens the well-being of survivors who cannot afford these delays. We ask that the Department clarify its plans to rectify this situation and ensure that OVW grant funding is fully restored without further delay to continue providing care to survivors of domestic violence.

Sincerely,

International family planning and reproductive health programs

April 24, 2025

The Honorable Marco Rubio Secretary
US Department of State 2201 C St NW
Washington, DC 20541

Dear Secretary Rubio:

We write to express alarm at the reckless reported cancellation of international family planning and reproductive health programs, which in Fiscal Year 2024 alone were estimated to save the lives of 34,000 women and girls, prevent 5.2 million unsafe abortions, and serve 47.6 million women and couples around the world with modern contraceptive care.¹

For more than six decades, the United States has led the world in supporting voluntary international family planning and reproductive health programs. These programs provide critical services: counseling on and access to a full range of voluntary modern contraceptives, reproductive health education, training for healthcare workers, screening for sexually transmitted diseases, research and development for new contraceptive methods to better meet women's needs, and health care to treat female genital mutilation (FGM) and obstetric fistula—the latter a devastating childbirth injury.²

These efforts are proven to reduce unintended pregnancies, prevent maternal and child deaths, promote women's empowerment and the ability to safely and freely grow their families, and lift families out of poverty. They also advance U.S. national interests and make our nation safer, stronger, and more prosperous by contributing to global health, stability, and economic growth.

Congress first authorized international family planning programs in Section 104 of the Foreign Assistance Act of 1961 (P.L. 87-195, as amended). In FY 2024, Congress appropriated \$607.5 million for bilateral and multilateral family planning programs through the Further Consolidated Appropriations Act of 2024 (P.L. 118-47). Any attempt to cancel or redirect these funds without proper consultation with and notification to Congress is illegal and unconstitutional.

The consequences of halting these programs are not hypothetical. This Administration's executive order, "Reevaluating and Realigning United States Foreign Aid," halted international

¹ Stephanie Nolen, "Millions of Women Will Lose Access to Contraception as a Result of Trump Cuts," *New York Times*, April 1, 2025. <https://www.nytimes.com/2025/04/01/health/usaaid-contraception-cuts.html>; Samira Damavandi et al., "Just the Numbers: The Impact of US International Family Planning Assistance, 2024,"

Guttmacher Institute, February 2025, <https://www.guttmacher.org/2025/02/just-numbers-impact-us-international-family-planning-assistance-2024>.

² Consistent with federal law, these programs do not fund abortion.

family planning and reproductive health programs, causing maternal death and injury, the closure of clinics in locations with high incidents of maternal death and sexual violence, the denial of contraceptive care, and stranded \$27 million worth of family planning commodities procured with U.S. dollars.³ A full cancellation would significantly escalate these harms and cost lives.

Given these serious concerns, we respectfully request written responses to the following questions by May 16, 2025:

1. Who made the determination to explicitly exclude family planning and reproductive health from the foreign assistance waiver process and ultimately terminate international family planning and reproductive health awards? Please provide a list of all terminated awards and the specific reasoning for each termination.
2. What is the Administration's assessment of how many women and girls will be impacted by the cancellation of family planning and reproductive health programs?
3. What is the status of U.S.-procured family planning commodities currently being held in ports and warehouses, and what does the U.S. government plan to do with those commodities?

Thank you for your attention to this critical matter.

Sincerely,

Terminating grants and employees at the NEH, NEA and the IMLS

April 18, 2025

The Honorable Donald J. Trump President
United States of America
1600 Pennsylvania Ave
NW Washington, DC 20500

Dear President Trump,

We write to express our concern regarding your administration's actions against the arts and humanities community. Specifically, we are concerned regarding executive actions that have led to the termination of federal employees, as well as rescission and cancellation of grants and programs that were sponsored by the National Endowment for the Humanities (NEH), National Endowment for the Arts (NEA), and the Institute of Museum and Library Services (IMLS). Many of these programs and grants go towards museums, historic sites, places of higher education, libraries and nonprofits to educate Americans on the vast culture of our great country. Organizations across the country have reported that grants they rely on to fund their programs have been immediately terminated, often without reason. Finally, we are concerned that funding originally meant for NEH and NEA grant recipients are now going towards your "Garden of Heroes" project, estimated to cost approximately \$34 million.

In March, you ordered NEH Chair Shelly Lowe, the first Native American to hold the position, to step down, effectively crippling the organization. You have not nominated or endorsed a replacement for this position, besides designating an acting chair to serve in the interim, bringing into question your administration's long-term goals with the NEH and its critical mission. Similar events have occurred at both the NEA and the IMLS, where their future too has been called into question.

On Tuesday, April 1, almost all the employees at the NEH received an email stating that they were on paid administrative leave effective immediately. On Thursday, April 10, approximately 65% of NEH staff received termination notices, effectively crippling the agency. Additionally, NEH grants that were allotted during the Biden administration that had not yet gone into effect were immediately cancelled. Recently, federal grants held by museums, libraries and research centers provided by the IMLS that go towards funding staff trainings, building of museums and research grants were terminated. Some of the grants and programs affected include:

- \$160 million distributed from IMLS to State Library Administrative Agencies (SLAAs) through the "Grants to States" program across all 50 states and territories, which help to fund local libraries and learning programs.
- A World War One (WWI) museum and war memorial in Kansas City, Missouri, digitization project of its nearly 2,000 documents from the era.
- A \$485,000 NEH grant to help produce a film titled *The People's Will*, which would shed light on the 1849 Astor Place Riot in New York.

- A \$500,000 NEH grant to help revitalize and restore Henry Ford's Model T plant in Detroit, Michigan.

As you can see, the NEH, NEA, and the IMLS are all critical institutions for the development of our communities and for American culture across the entire nation. These are independent agencies of the federal government that serve as a main source of funding for a variety of cultural institutions such as libraries, museums, theaters, and galleries; as well as for projects like humanities education and research. These institutions enrich learning experiences for our children, provide resources to bridge gaps in communities, and provide Americans with access to our nation's vast history and culture. They are important in informing generations of Americans about our past so we can have the proper wisdom and context to decide our future.

All Americans benefit from the services provided by these institutions, but your administration's actions will undoubtedly have harmful effects to the cultural and educational retention of our nation. We urge you to reconsider the actions taken by your administration towards the arts and humanities community, including the termination of federal employees and the cancellation of vital grants and programs, and urge that appropriated funds that were authorized by Congress continue to flow to their appropriate agency. We look forward to your response.

Sincerely,

Opposing Deep Sea Mining

April 25, 2025

President Donald Trump
1600 Pennsylvania Avenue NW
Washington, DC 20500

Dear President Trump,

We are writing to express our strong opposition to your decision to expedite the approval of deep-sea mining operations in both U.S. and international waters. The potential environmental consequences of this decision are severe and irreversible and thus warrant far more careful consideration.

Our oceans, particularly the deep-sea ecosystems, are among the last unexplored frontiers of our planet. What little we do know highlights their immense ecological importance. These deep-sea ecosystems are not only incredibly diverse but also essential to the health of the entire planet. They support carbon sequestration processes that help mitigate climate change, provide habitats for countless marine species, and contribute to vital biogeochemical processes. Some of the species inhabiting these deep environments have already played key roles in advancing human knowledge and technology. For example, enzymes from microbes found in hydrothermal vents were critical in developing accurate COVID-19 tests.

Despite these invaluable contributions, the ecosystems of the deep ocean are under direct threat from large-scale commercial seabed mining. The methods used in seabed mining, such as shearmining, can be highly destructive, resembling the harmful practices of terrestrial strip mining.

The destruction of seamounts and the disruption of the ocean floor could result in the loss of species, the creation of toxic sediment plumes and the contamination of marine food chains. Moreover, these operations could interfere with critical processes that contribute to carbon storage in the ocean, potentially accelerating climate change rather than mitigating it.

One of the primary arguments for seabed mining is the need for minerals required for renewable energy technologies. However, this is a false promise. While these minerals are crucial, they can also be sourced from more sustainable means, such as recycling materials from old electronics and batteries.

The risks associated with deep-sea mining remain largely unknown, and the scientific understanding of its long-term impacts is still in its infancy. Deep-sea ecosystems are incredibly slow to recover, and once disturbed, they may never return to their natural state. Thus, the economic benefits of mining the ocean floor may not outweigh the long-term environmental costs, as the destruction of these ecosystems could lead to irreversible damage that far exceeds any short-term gain.

It is also crucial to acknowledge the broader social and cultural implications of seabed mining. Coastal and Indigenous communities that rely on the ocean for sustenance, cultural practices and livelihoods will face devastating impacts as the health of these ecosystems deteriorates. Many of these communities are already grappling with the effects of climate change, and adding deep-sea mining into the equation could further undermine their resilience and ability to thrive.

We must approach the future of our oceans with extreme caution, prioritizing the protection of these vital ecosystems. Fast-tracking seabed mining is an unwise gamble with our planet's future, and it is imperative that we fully understand the implications of such actions before moving forward.

We urge your administration to reconsider its position on fast-tracking deep-sea mining. We have an obligation to protect our oceans for future generations, ensuring that the long-term health of our planet takes precedence over short-term interests.

Sincerely,

Requesting the House Speaker fill the Office of Congressional Conduct vacancy

The Honorable Mike Johnson
Speaker of the United States House of Representatives
H-232; The Capitol

Dear Speaker Johnson,

We write to express my deep concern about the continued delay in appointing the full bipartisan board of the Office of Congressional Conduct (OCC), formerly known as the Office of Congressional Ethics (OCE). This delay, which is now entering its fourth month of the 119th Congress, not only undermines the integrity of this body but threatens to erode the trust that the American people place in our capacity to hold ourselves accountable.

As you know, OCC was established in 2008 as an independent, nonpartisan office designed to review allegations of misconduct against Members of the House, officers, and staff. It was created in direct response to a series of high-profile ethics scandals that had severely damaged public trust in Congress. Its mission is clear: to serve as an impartial watchdog, ensuring transparency, ethical compliance, and public accountability. While the OCC does not have the power to sanction Members, it conducts preliminary reviews and refers credible complaints to the House Ethics Committee. In doing so the OCC acts as a critical mechanism to restore confidence in the integrity of this institution.

For OCC to operate, its board must be reconstructed each Congress with up to six members, three appointed by each party. Despite Democrats having submitted their appointees, OCC remains stalled due to the absence of Republican nominees and your final appointment. Notably, two former GOP members of the board, former Representative Lynn Westmoreland and former House Clerk Karen Haas, have reportedly agreed to return. Yet, as of today, you have not taken the necessary steps to read appointees' names into the record, which would allow the board to be formally seated and OCC to resume its full operations.

The failure to do so has left the office paralyzed. Without a seated board, it cannot initiate or advance new investigations, regardless of their merit. While it may continue limited work on previously approved matters, OCC is effectively sidelined from its core mission of ethical oversight. This inaction only fuels the perception that Congress is unwilling to police its own.

This pattern of obstruction is not new. Since OCC's inception, it has faced repeated attempts to weaken or dismantle it. For instance, the most recent rules package adopted at the start of the 119th Congress has made it even harder for the OCC to function by requiring the board to be fully seated before staff could be reappointed. These changes, layered atop the current delay, have made the situation exponentially more difficult.

To rectify this oversight, we urge you to move swiftly to appoint the Republican members of the OCC board when Congress returns for this work period. This simple step does not require a vote of the full House; it requires only the formal announcement of names during a pro forma session. If the Republican Party shares a commitment to good governance, transparency, and restoring public faith in Congress, then ensuring OCC can operate effectively should not be a partisan issue.

Thank you for your consideration. We stand ready to work with you to ensure OCC is restored and allowed to carry out its mission without delay.

UDSA ARS Restriction on Terminology

Dear Madam Secretary:

We write to you today deeply alarmed about an internal directive within the United States Department of Agriculture (USDA) that appears to impose a politically motivated filter on discussions related to key scientific and policy matters within the Agricultural Research Service (ARS). According to a recently leaked memo issued by leadership at USDA-ARS, agency staff were informed that they may no longer use certain terms in evaluating agreements and awarding contracts presumably related to ARS's core functions, particularly to applicants who may have included banned words in their application.^[1] The document outlines a sweeping and categorical prohibition against references to terms ranging from "affordable housing" to foundational elements of environmental protection such as "safe drinking water," "runoff," "PFAS," and "soil pollution."

In response to further reporting on this issue, a USDA spokesperson confirmed that "the leaked list of terms currently circulating was created by career employees tasked with reviewing active awards to ensure compliance with the President's priorities and relevant Executive Orders."^[1] While the USDA spokesperson stated that leaders at USDA "were not involved in drafting this list of terms," it nevertheless remains your responsibility to ensure that all of USDA is implementing policies to support American agriculture and farmers, improve food security and safety, and conserve natural resources crucial to these missions.

This directive raises serious concerns about the integrity of your agency's decision-making processes, and we fear how this censorship will impact food security, environmental health, and the resilience of American agriculture. At a time when wildfires, drought, and other climate-fueled disasters are becoming increasingly dangerous and common, it is difficult to understand how official orders to suppress these topics are anything other than reckless and unhelpful.

Climate change is a scientifically established threat to agricultural productivity, food security, and our rural economies. Ignoring it does not make the problem disappear; rather, it substantially weakens our ability to address these issues, resulting in a wasteful focus on the symptoms instead of efficiently and effectively addressing the root of the problem. The exclusion of these terms from consideration for funding opportunities demonstrates an intentional effort to hinder, distort, and improperly steer federal scientific work in the name of political expediency, and the American people deserve far better than that.

The American people deserve transparency and integrity from federal research agencies, not political interference and outright censorship. The farmers and ranchers who rely on

sound science to navigate environmental and economic challenges should not have their livelihoods undercut by unscientific, bureaucratic gatekeeping. Critical research proposals to reduce pollution, increase irrigation efficiency, or address emerging pest and disease threats should not be denied solely because they used a phrase that Donald Trump does not like. When the agencies responsible for the safety and security of our food system refuse to acknowledge the realities of climate change, pollution, and equitable access to federal resources, they undermine their very missions and fail to meaningfully serve the American people.

We strongly oppose the continued use of key word lists in evaluating and reviewing USDA's agreements, contracts, grants, loans, and other programs. We expect you to provide immediate clarification regarding this directive and its implications. Please respond to the following questions, in writing, no later than April 18, 2025.

1. Has the USDA conducted any review to determine whether this policy violates federal transparency laws, scientific integrity policies, or anti-discrimination statutes? If so, please share the documentation. If not, please explain why a review has not been done.
2. The USDA has confirmed the existence of the ARS memo that has been publicly reported. Please provide any other lists of key words that the USDA is using to evaluate federal agreements, contracts, grants, loans, and other programs.
3. For each list provided under question 2, please explain the purpose of each list, including any relevant laws, regulations, Executive Orders, or memoranda that the USDA is seeking to comply with.
4. What safeguards have you put in place to ensure that these restrictions do not lead to biased or politically motivated decision-making at the expense of merit, scientific integrity, and public welfare?
5. Have these restrictions resulted in the rejection of agreements that would have directly benefited farmers, food supply security, or rural economies? If so, what processes does the USDA have in place to allow for the appeal of decisions and evaluations made based off key word lists for federal agreements, contracts, grants, loans, or other programs? Provide an itemized list of all agreements under all impacted programs that were rejected because they included one or more of these banned terms, as outlined in the directive, as well as a full justification for each rejection.
6. In the case of the ARS banned word list, if an ongoing research agreement is focused on biofuels, for example, the ARS website lists 29 research projects

containing the word biofuel.^[2] Will funding for these projects be revoked? Will ongoing research be halted? Will USDA require projects to rephrase their contracts? If a project cannot be rephrased without using a banned word, will the contract be terminated?

7. What are the consequences for researchers or other agency employees who identify serious risks related to any of these banned terms, such as, for example, the expanded range of certain pests and diseases due to changing climate conditions, or nitrate contamination in the drinking water supply from fertilizer runoff?

- a. Will research proposals and agreements to address these critical issues – and others that include banned terms – be considered under this policy?

- b. If so, through what process are they getting around the banned terms list, and how is that decided? If not, how do you justify such negligence?

- c. Are career scientists, policy experts, and agency staff being pressured to remove or avoid these terms in their work? If not, explain how USDA plans to enforce these restrictions. If so, how does that not constitute political coercion?

6. Does the USDA deny that climate change, pollution, and the accessibility of federal funding impact the safety and security of the American food supply? If so, provide your justification. If not, then why are these issues being censored?

7. Will you release all internal communications regarding the creation, justification, and enforcement of this policy to ensure full transparency? If so, when? If not, why?

We look forward to your prompt response and an explanation of how your agency intends to ensure that science and factual analysis -- not politics -- remain at the core of its decision-making processes.

Opposing Hiring Freezes at Military Depots

Dear Secretary Hegseth,

As Members of the House Military Depot and Industrial Facilities Caucus, we write to encourage you to exempt all depots, shipyards, arsenals, and maintenance facilities across the DoD from any department-wide civilian hiring freezes, pauses, restrictions, or limitations. Based on engagement with these facilities in our districts, we believe current policies are hurting their ability to manage attrition and to recruit for increased workload from the military services.

We are highly concerned that a sustained reduction in workforce stemming from these hiring limitations will lead to worse depot, shipyard, and arsenal execution, increase DoD reliance on private contractors for depot-level maintenance workloads, and reduce readiness against our peer adversaries.

We wanted to recall a Memorandum from the Undersecretary of Defense for Personnel Readiness on March 18, 2025 titled “Guidance on Hiring Freeze Exemptions for the Civilian Workforce,” which outlined that “positions at depots, shipyards, arsenals, and maintenance facilities” would be exempted from the Department-wide civilian hiring freeze for positions related to building readiness and providing essential services. While we are grateful for these instructions, our facilities are still dealing with de-facto restrictions and harmful red tape. Software onboarding systems such as [USASTaffing.gov](https://usa staffing.gov) remain off limits to military services and DoD agencies, preventing those who have received hiring exemptions from bringing on new hires. Military services are also not allowed to openly recruit for civilian roles vacated by employees who have taken the first two Deferred Resignation Programs, leaving mission-critical maintenance roles vacant. Moreso, new White House guidance requiring agencies to only hire one new employee for every four employees who leave the government poses unique challenges for our facilities, given that they are funded through the Working Capital Fund (“WCF”) – a revenue stream that our depots, arsenals, and shipyards generate from the military services based on billable hours and contracted workload – as opposed to Congressional appropriations.

WCF operations generate revenue only from the work accomplished by their labor force. If WCF facilities are unable to recruit to replace departed workers, their operations will lose the revenue the former workers could generate through their billable hours. The downstream effects of this approach will cause WCF hourly rates to rise and render our depots, arsenals, and shipyards unable to maintain their assumed productivity and yield rate (the work they generate and the hours they bill the customer). Output would be reduced, and reliance on private industry for depot-level repair work would increase, at higher rates than our depots charge. Put quite simply, we have reason to believe that these limitations on recruitment will increase rather than reduce costs to the U.S. taxpayer over time.

At a time when the federal government’s workforce is already rapidly aging, the DoD needs as many young skilled technicians as possible to maintain, equip, and support next-generation weapon

systems. Our depots, shipyards, arsenals, and maintenance facilities already struggle to keep up with increasingly competitive hiring environments in the private sector. Hamstringing the DoD here risks the viability of our legacy systems as an effective deterrent against our peer adversaries and competitors. It also will prevent our industrial facilities from completing their necessary workload on time and will undoubtedly funnel more work into the hands of private contractors who don't ultimately answer to American national security interests and readiness timelines.

The DoD needs to unlock every tool at its disposal to generate new talent, particularly from the retired military community who already possess many of these technical skills and active security clearances. Our deterrence capabilities against adversaries like the Chinese Communist Party depend on it.

Thank you for your time and attention to this critical matter.

Terminating grants at the National Endowment for the Arts

Dear President Trump,

We write to express our deep concern about recent grant cancellations at the National Endowment for the Arts (NEA). These cancellations will have a resounding impact on communities in every part of the country, costing jobs and harming local economies. We urge you to direct their immediate reversal and restore full funding of the NEA as authorized by statute and approved by Congress.

The NEA is a small but efficient agency, using its modest resources to ensure that the benefit of federal funds reaches every Congressional district. The cancellation of hundreds of grants threatens a wide range of initiatives, from apprenticeship programs to youth engagement to economic development planning. Many grantees are anchors in their communities, whether as employers and educators, prominent Main Street destinations, and tourist attractions. Lost grants will hurt budgets, contract programming, and may lead to layoffs – right as the crucial summer season kicks off for many organizations and small businesses.

Our relatively minimal federal investment reaches Americans who would not otherwise benefit from the arts. In 678 counties across the country – primarily in rural areas – the Endowment does more to fund the arts than the top 1,000 foundations. And the benefit is not just local. It underpins the \$1.2 trillion economic powerhouse that is the cultural sector, representing 5.4 million jobs and a \$36.8 billion trade surplus. In short, the bang for our buck delivered by the NEA is too significant to ignore.

The NEA fulfills an essential role in our nation's economic and cultural life, particularly as we look toward America250 celebrations next year. The Endowment's support for local arts organizations remains a cornerstone of its statutory purpose and of its value to local communities across the country. We urge you to restore the full potential of that value by reversing grant cancellations to local arts organizations.

Sincerely,

NSF Funding Awards

Dear President Trump,

We write to express our deep concern regarding recent actions taken by your Administration that irreparably harm the National Science Foundation (NSF) and, by extension, the broader American scientific enterprise. As Members of Congress committed to maintaining the United States' leadership in science and technology, we are troubled by reports of halted funding and shifts away from the NSF's longstanding merit-based review process.

According to a recent article in *Nature*, NSF staff were instructed on April 30 to "stop awarding all funding actions until further notice." This directive not only halts new research grants but also suspends the disbursement of funds for existing projects, including those with previously approved annual installments. This means that money appropriated by Congress and already invested in ongoing research projects, which are now halted, has been wasted. Furthermore, the NSF has introduced a policy requiring staff to screen grant proposals for alignment with unspecified "agency priorities," with non-conforming proposals to be returned to applicants. The NSF has, for decades, been a cornerstone of American innovation, funding groundbreaking research that has led to advancements in medical imaging, artificial intelligence, geographic information systems, and numerous other fields. Central to the NSF's success has been its commitment to a merit-based, peer-reviewed grant process, ensuring that funding decisions are made based on scientific excellence and potential impact, free from political or ideological influence.

Changes to this commitment have far-reaching implications. They not only disrupt ongoing research but also erode the confidence of the scientific community in the federal funding apparatus. Moreover, in an era of intense global competition, particularly with nations like China investing heavily in science and technology, these actions risk ceding our leadership position and compromising our ability to address critical challenges. Political meddling by your Administration has already resulted in the termination of over 1,000 grants, totaling approximately \$739 million, and has prompted the resignation of widely respected NSF Director Sethuraman Panchanathan, leaving the NSF without leadership at a critical time.

Given these concerns, we request answers to the following questions:

1. What specific criteria define the "agency priorities" now guiding NSF funding decisions?
2. How does the Administration plan to ensure that the NSF's merit-based review process remains intact and free from political interference?
3. What measures are being taken to mitigate the impact of the funding freeze on current research projects and the scientific workforce?

4. How does the Administration intend to maintain the United States' competitive edge in science and technology in light of these policy shifts?

The Administration must reaffirm its commitment to the principles of scientific integrity and merit-based evaluation that have long underpinned the NSF's success. Ensuring transparency and objectivity in research funding is essential not only for the advancement of knowledge but also for maintaining public trust and our nation's global standing.

Thank you for your attention to this critical matter. We look forward to your prompt response.

Wireless Emergency Alerts

The Honorable Brendan Carr
Chair
Federal Communications Commission
45 L Street NE
Washington, D.C. 20554

Chair Carr:

We write to express our deep concern regarding the Commission's ongoing failure to publish its January 8, 2025, Report and Order in the Federal Register to implement multilingual Wireless Emergency Alerts (WEAs). This delay is not only indefensible but dangerous—it directly jeopardizes the ability of our communities to receive life-saving emergency information in the language they understand best.

On October 19, 2023, the Commission unanimously approved rules to modernize the WEA system by enabling alerts to be delivered in more than a dozen languages, including English and American Sign Language. This was an important step forward to ensure that the WEA system serves all Americans. As a reminder, you voted in favor of this rule, recognizing the need to make sure emergency alerts can reach as many people as possible.

As directed by that Order, the Public Safety and Homeland Security Bureau developed templates for the 18 most time-sensitive alerts in the 13 most commonly spoken languages in the United States, plus English and American Sign Language. The Commission released a Report and Order on January 8, 2025, that would require commercial mobile service (CMS) providers to install these templates on consumer devices within 30 months of publication in the Federal Register.

However, more than four months later, that publication still has not occurred. As you know, the 30-month compliance clock cannot begin until the Report and Order appears in the Federal Register. As we saw during the devastating Los Angeles wildfires this year and recent hurricanes in North Carolina and Florida, non-English speakers rely on accurate and timely communications to stay informed and safe during an emergency. Your failure to complete this ministerial step—despite having supported the rule itself—has left this life-saving policy in limbo and significantly delayed access to multilingual alerts for millions of Americans.

As members of the Congressional Hispanic Caucus, Congressional Asian Pacific American Caucus, and the Congressional Black Caucus, we represent communities who are often the first to suffer the consequences when public safety systems fail to reach everyone effectively. Failing to implement this rule means denying millions of Americans access to potentially life-saving emergency alerts—whether for wildfires, earthquakes, hurricanes, active shooters, or other disasters—in a language that they understand. That is unacceptable.

We urge you to immediately take all necessary steps to publish the January 8, 2025, Report and Order in the Federal Register and allow this critical, bipartisan rule to move forward without further delay.

Sincerely,

Restore all appropriated Title X funding

June 5, 2025

The Honorable Robert F. Kennedy Jr.
Secretary of Health and Human Services
200 Independence Avenue, S.W.
Washington, D.C. 20201

Dear Secretary Kennedy,

On the 60th anniversary of the U.S. Supreme Court's landmark ruling in *Griswold v. Connecticut*, we write to express our unwavering support for the Title X Family Planning Program (Title X), the only domestic federally-funded program dedicated to family planning. For 60 years, the constitutional right to contraception has been protected by *Griswold v. Connecticut*, empowering millions with the ability to make their own reproductive health care decisions. However, due to the actions of this Administration, reproductive freedom is under threat. The Administration's decision to withhold millions in funding for Title X means low-income individuals have lost access to contraceptive services and supplies. On this landmark anniversary of *Griswold*, it is extremely important to protect Title X and reiterate why it has and should continue to serve as the cornerstone of safety-net care for millions of people.

Title X provides access to contraception to help people avoid pregnancies they do not want, and to plan and space pregnancies they do want, decreasing the risk of complications.¹ This is even more critical for patients who face financial barriers to health care. Title X plays an instrumental role in ensuring patients get the care they need and want without cost being a barrier. In 2023, 83% of clients served by Title X-funded clinics had family incomes at or below 250% of the federal poverty level, with 60% qualifying for free services because they had incomes at or below 100% of the federal poverty level (\$30,000 for a family of four). Among all Title X clients, 27% were uninsured, while 67% of users with some form of health insurance had public insurance coverage.² It is no wonder that 60% of women who receive reproductive health care services from Title X providers say it is the only form of health care they receive in a year. The Title X program supports a network of approximately 4,000 clinics across the country.³ Without Title X funding, many of these clinics could shutter, ripping access to contraception away from millions.

As we reflect on the significance of *Griswold*, we must not turn a blind eye to the broader mounting threats to our reproductive freedoms. Both contraception and abortion are essential health care services and part of a full range of sexual and reproductive health care that allow every American the freedom to make decisions about our own bodies and their own futures. The overturning of *Roe v. Wade* dealt a direct blow to people's privacy rights, access to health care, including imperiling access to contraception. In a world where access to abortion is severely limited or not accessible at all, it is even more important for people who want to prevent

pregnancy to be able to affordably and easily access it from trusted family planning providers of their choice. That is why Title X is so important. Title X has historically received broad bipartisan support and has been funded by Congress every year since 1970 because we recognize what Griswold holds true: that all individuals should have the freedom to make decisions about their own bodies and lives.

On March 31, 2025, your Department notified 16 Title X grantees — representing networks of health care providers in 23 states — that their funding was being withheld until an investigation over ‘possible violations’ of grant terms and conditions, specifically federal civil rights laws and executive orders, could be undertaken.⁴ More than two months later, these grantees remain without funding and have received no communication from the Administration regarding the status of the investigations, the expected timeline, or the future of their funding. In that time, several of these entities have been forced to furlough or layoff staff, limit available services or charge for services that were previously available to low-income individuals at low or no cost, and shutter health centers. Congress has already appropriated these funds, and the Administration has a responsibility to distribute them without undue delay or obstruction, ensuring that critical care is not disrupted for millions of people who rely on Title X services.

We urge you to restore all appropriated funds for Title X providers and work with Congress to ensure that all people have access to the comprehensive contraception services they seek.

Sincerely,

[[SIGNATURES]]

Letter Condemning the Forceful Restraining of Senator Alex Padilla

June 16, 2025

The Honorable John Thune
Senate Majority Leader
United States Senate
Washington, D.C. 20510

The Honorable Mike Johnson
Speaker of the House
U.S. House of Representatives
Washington, D.C. 20515

Dear Leader Thune and Speaker Johnson,

We write to express our profound concern regarding the shocking and deeply troubling mistreatment of United States Senator Alex Padilla on Thursday, June 12, at the Wilshire Federal Building in Los Angeles. While visiting the building for a scheduled briefing with military officials, Senator Padilla attempted to ask a question during a press conference being held by Department of Homeland Security Secretary Kristi Noem in the same building.

As has been widely reported and documented, Senator Padilla was thrown to the ground, handcuffed, and forcibly restrained by agents of the U.S. Secret Service and the Federal Bureau of Investigation while attempting to lawfully exercise his constitutional and congressional authority to question a senior official of the current administration.

Senator Padilla clearly identified himself and was acting within his rights as a Member of Congress. The use of force against a sitting senator—in a federal building, during official business—is a grave breach of protocol. It is also a potential violation of separation of powers and raises alarming questions about the conduct of federal law enforcement agencies, the coordination of protective services, and the administration's posture toward congressional oversight.

This unprecedented incident is not simply an affront to security protocol—it is a constitutional issue—as these actions may constitute an assault on a sitting senator. If members of the United States Senate can be physically restrained for seeking answers from executive officials, it sets a dangerous precedent for the independence of the legislative branch.

We look forward to your swift and decisive action to uphold the dignity and authority of Congress.

Sincerely

Job Corps Support

The Honorable Lori Chavez-DeRemer
Secretary
Department of Labor
200 Constitution Avenue, N.W.
Washington, D.C. 20210

Dear Secretary Chavez-DeRemer:

We are writing to express our support for the continuation of the Job Corps program. We recently received notice of the phased pause in operations at contract-operated Job Centers nationwide taking effect by June 30, 2025. As you know, Congress appropriated nearly \$1.8 billion to all Job Corps programs in Fiscal Year (FY) 2024 and remains funded through the FY 2025 Continuing Resolution that passed in March.

Nearly 20,000 young people utilize Job Corps to learn skills for in-demand vocational and technical job training. Job Corps is one of the few national programs that specifically targets the 16-24-year-old population that is neither working, nor in school, and provides them with a direct pathway into employment openings in industries such as manufacturing and shipbuilding. The program also connects these young Americans with apprenticeships, higher education opportunities, or the military. By filling job openings, Job Corps ensures that young people become productive members of the American workforce. No other program takes homeless youth and turns them into the welders, electricians, shipbuilders, carpenters, nurses, mechanics, and vocational workers of the future.

As companies continue to onshore and invest in the men and women of our country, a steady stream of skilled laborers will be required to meet the growing workforce demand. The Job Corps program is uniquely positioned to fill that role and provide these hardworking young Americans with the vocational and technical job training that will set them and our country up for success.

There is no one more capable than the American worker when given a chance at success. We urge you to support our request so that local Job Corps Centers can continue connecting young Americans with careers and opportunities available to them. We are confident that, in collaboration with the Administration and Job Corps Centers in our communities, we can strengthen this program, continuing to develop a highly skilled and competitive labor force.

Thank you for your kind attention.

Sincerely,

Language Access Services Support (14 Agencies)

As Members of the Congressional Asian Pacific American Caucus (CAPAC), we write to inquire how your agency plans to uphold its obligations under federal law, including Title VI of the Civil Rights Act of 1964, Section 1557 of the Affordable Care Act, and Section 616 of the Stafford Act, and existing agency regulations, to provide meaningful access to services and programs for individuals with limited English proficiency.

President Trump’s signed Executive Order (EO) 14224 “Designating English as the Official Language of the United States” rescinds Executive Order 13166, Improving Access for Services for Persons with Limited English Proficiency (LEP). Importantly, EO 14224 gives agencies “flexibility to decide how and when to offer services in languages other than English to best serve the American people” and “specifically allows agencies to keep current policies and provide documents and services in other languages.”¹ President Trump’s executive order does not require federal agencies to stop production of products or services in languages other than English.

The U.S. Census Bureau estimates that more than 25 million Americans—eight percent of the U.S. population—have LEP. According to the Economic Policy Institute, approximately 32 percent of Asian Americans, 12 percent of Native Hawaiians and Pacific Islanders, and 29 percent of the Latino community have LEP.² Language assistance services for individuals with LEP have been essential in protecting every Americans’ right to access federal services.

In order to best serve our constituents and the American people, we request answers to the following questions within 60 days of receipt of this letter:

- What changes, if any, will your agency be taking to limit, decrease, or remove current policies and programs intended to assist individuals with LEP?
- Will your agency continue to follow the most updated Language Access Plan published by your agency?
- What communication are you providing to recipients of federal funds administered through your agency, as to their responsibility to provide meaningful language access under previously promulgated agency guidance?

- Have recent staffing reductions included individuals whose primary responsibility was ensuring the agency and federal funding recipients comply with civil rights requirements or are responsible for providing information in other languages? If so, how many staff with these responsibilities have been terminated or reassigned to other duties?
- Will your agency continue to receive, review, and address civil rights complaints regarding access to information in other languages in a timely manner?

Thank you for your timely response to ensure the American people are best served by your agency.

Reinstate the Building Resilient Infrastructure and Communities Program

Dear Secretary Noem and Acting Administrator Richardson,

We are writing to urge the Administration to reinstate the Building Resilient Infrastructure and Communities Grant (BRIC) program within the Federal Emergency Management Agency (FEMA). BRIC funds are spurring communities across the country to strengthen their resilience to extreme weather, and forgoing these critical investments will only make it harder and more expensive for communities to recover from the next storm. We acknowledge that the BRIC program, like all grant funding programs, has room for improvement, and we urge you to couple the reinstatement of the program with an opportunity for Congress and FEMA to improve the application review and funding distribution process to more effectively reduce the costs disasters pose to our communities, economies, and livelihoods.

The BRIC program was established by Congress in the 2018 Disaster Recovery Reform Act and signed into law by President Trump with bipartisan support. In the years since, this program has catalyzed community investments in resilient infrastructure, saving federal funds by investing in community preparedness before a disaster strikes.

According to research, one dollar invested in disaster mitigation can save up to \$18 in response and recovery expenditures. BRIC funds are making communities safer in the next storm through projects like upgrading and protecting wastewater and drinking water plants after the facilities suffered repeated flooding, or bridge upgrades and road drainage improvements to improve driver safety. Because of its benefits, the demand for BRIC grants continues to increase, and our states and communities benefit from the reliability of the funding cycles.

The BRIC program also plays an essential role in helping Tribal Nations and rural communities strengthen their defenses against natural disasters and safeguard critical infrastructure. Through BRIC, Tribes and rural communities can access dedicated funding to strengthen community resilience by investing in hazard mitigation projects—such as flood protection, fire prevention, Administration decision to review funding for Emergency Food and Shelter Program Unused supplies from foreign assistance programs and infrastructure hardening—that are otherwise difficult to finance in rural or remote settings. Importantly, FEMA supports Tribal sovereignty by allowing Tribes to apply directly for funding, reserving a dedicated Tribal set-aside, and providing direct technical assistance—ensuring Tribes can lead their own planning and mitigation efforts. These investments not only strengthen community resilience but also

honor the federal trust responsibility to support the safety, self-determination, and well-being of Tribal Nations.

At the same time, we acknowledge that the BRIC program should be evaluated for opportunities to increase efficiency and reduce the complexities for recipients to access the critical resources.³ The benefits of the program should not be concentrated in or limited to jurisdictions with dedicated offices and the staff necessary to navigate the grant application requirements. Additionally, the program should be updated with a strategic approach that empowers states and local governments to address degraded and vulnerable infrastructure based on their localized priorities and understanding of risk.

We urge the Administration to take swift action to reinstate the BRIC program, and to work with Congress to identify and implement reforms to strengthen our nation's resilience for decades to come.

Administration decision to review funding for Emergency Food and Shelter Program

Dear Mr. Hamilton and Secretary Noem:

We write to express our deep concern over the decision to “review” previously-obligated funding for the Federal Emergency Management Agency’s (FEMA) Emergency Food and Shelter Program (EFSP). Not only does this “review” apply to current Fiscal Year 2025 funds, but it also applies to money promised to food pantries and homeless shelters over the past several years. FEMA must make good on these financial commitments at once.

EFSP plays a critical role in combatting hunger and homelessness in our country, working to lift children and families out of desperate circumstances. We demand that you take immediate action to ensure that full funding for EFSP, as appropriated by Congress, resumes without further disruption.

EFSP provides funding to local governments and nonprofit organizations that supply food, shelter, rental and utility assistance, and other essential resources to individuals and families who are “experiencing, or at risk of experiencing, hunger and/or homelessness.” Since its founding in 1983, EFSP has supported over 14,000 local organizations in over 2,500 counties and cities across the country. The EFSP National Board, which oversees the disbursement of funds in line with the intent of Congress, ensures that priority is given to communities and organizations most in need of support.

Although EFSP receives comparatively little federal funding – \$117 million in FY20244 – the program provides critical support to local organizations, filling gaps to respond to urgent needs or where other sources of funding fall short. If the review of EFSP funding continues long-term, over 8,000 local organizations across the country that provide life-saving services to the most vulnerable could be forced to make difficult cuts, turn people away, or close entirely.

During a time when our country is experiencing a cost-of-living crisis and record high homelessness, the administration's freeze of EFSP funds will have devastating impacts on

millions of people across rural, urban, and suburban communities. Children and families – who experienced the largest increase in homelessness between 2023 and 2024 – would likely be the most impacted.

To ensure that EFSP can continue to provide life-saving support to individuals, children, families, and communities nationwide, EFSP must resume disbursement of funds immediately. In addition, we request answers to the following questions:

- 1) Under what authority are FY20-FY24 EFSP funds being reviewed? When will that review be completed?
- 2) Under what authority can FEMA withhold previously appropriated and obligated funds?
- 3) We understand you are reviewing this program, which feeds and houses the most vulnerable, for “waste, fraud, and abuse”. We are also to understand that you are yet to provide any congressional inquirers a substantive example of such “waste, fraud, and abuse”. Are you able to provide any examples at this time?
- 4) If EFSP has been terminated, which official signed the termination order and how does the administration plan to support homeless and food insecure individuals and families?

Thank you for your attention to this urgent matter. We look forward to your prompt response.

Unused supplies from foreign assistance programs

Dear Secretary Rubio:

We write to express alarm regarding reports that unused supplies and commodities from cancelled foreign assistance programs will go to waste.

President Trump’s foreign aid freeze has devastated foreign assistance programs around the world. At least 83% of all foreign assistance contracts run by the U.S. Agency for International Development (USAID) have been terminated, and the remaining programs have struggled to receive the funding they are owed for work completed before the funding freeze. Very few of the remaining foreign assistance organizations have received new contracts to continue their work and many continue to receive contract terminations. Additionally, your administration has shuttered USAID, fired thousands of USAID employees and continued to cancel essential USAID programs – all of which has had a devastating impact around the world, undermined our national security and hurt American jobs. Now, the President’s so-called “skinny budget” for Fiscal Year 2026 would gut the State Department and international program budget by \$49.1 billion, a nearly 84% decrease from Fiscal Year 2025.

Amid all the chaos caused by cancelling foreign assistance funding and programs, the question remains of what will happen to the supplies and commodities that were purchased for foreign aid programs prior to this administration’s termination. At the beginning of the foreign assistance funding freeze in early February, there were reports of nearly \$500 million worth of food aid rotting at our ports and hundreds of thousands of dollars’ worth of medical supplies stuck in warehouses.

Now, months into the foreign assistance funding freeze and the termination of most foreign assistance programs, we are alarmed about the status of the supplies purchased for those now-terminated programs. Medicine, food, educational supplies, and other foreign assistance commodities were purchased using taxpayer funds. Without the contracts to implement these programs, these supplies are at risk of expiring or being destroyed, which is a complete waste of taxpayer funds.

With this in mind, we request answers to the following questions:

1. What is the process to review the status of supplies and commodities purchased for now-terminated foreign assistance programs? How has this process changed from the previous administration?
2. What is your plan to ensure the supplies and commodities purchased for now-terminated foreign assistance programs are not diverted, destroyed, or otherwise allowed to expire without use?
3. Is there a plan to repurpose the supplies and commodities purchased for now-terminated foreign assistance programs for other U.S. foreign assistance programs?
4. Is there a plan to share supplies and commodities that can no longer be used by the United States with partner organizations or allied countries implementing similar programs?
5. What guidance has the State Department or USAID provided to staff at embassies and missions in the field responsible for managing these supplies and commodities?
6. Will you commit to prioritizing providing these supplies and commodities originally purchased for now-terminated foreign assistance programs to other U.S. foreign assistance programs or, if none are available, provide these supplies to allies or organizations providing similar programs?

We ask that you respond to these questions no later than July 15, 2025.

Roadless Rule Repeal

Dear Secretary Rollins,

We write to express profound concern with your recent decision to fully rescind the 2001 Roadless Area Conservation Rule. This critical environmental safeguard ensures the protection of 58.5 million acres of our nation's most pristine wild forestlands and provides durable climate benefits; protects watersheds that provide drinking water to millions of Americans; preserves critical habitats for threatened species; and supports recreation opportunities for American communities.

In your announcement, you claimed that this rule is overly restrictive and limits our ability to protect forests from devastating fires. However, the Roadless Rule already includes commonsense provisions to allow road construction to protect public health and safety and timber harvests when needed to maintain healthy ecosystems and reduce wildfire risks. Moreover, evidence shows that roads actually increase the risk of fire. According to the U.S. Forest Service (USFS):

“Building roads into inventoried roadless areas would likely increase the chance of human-caused fires due to the increased presence of people. Fire occurrence data indicates that prohibiting road construction and reconstruction in inventoried roadless areas would not cause an increase in the number of acres burned by wildland fires or in the number of large fires.”[\[1\]](#)

Additionally, recent analysis of wildfire data shows that fires are nearly four times as likely within 50 meters of roads as in roadless areas.[\[2\]](#) Further, USFS has stated that “the agency rarely builds new roads to suppress fires.”[\[3\]](#) It is simply untrue to assert that repealing the Roadless Rule will necessarily result in fewer or less damaging fires or that the USFS lacks the flexibility to respond effectively to these disasters.

This also represents a significant potential burden on USFS resources at a time when your Administration has pursued staff reductions and proposed spending cuts that threaten the agency's ability to effectively carry out its mission. This Administration has already put more Americans at risk from wildfire as a result of dismantling the Forest Service. Rescinding the Roadless Rule will only exacerbate the wildfire crisis facing our western communities. Now is not the time to ask this critical agency to do more with less.

USFS already has an enormous backlog of maintenance needs for the existing 368,102-mile road system, which will cost \$5,980,000,000 to eliminate.[\[4\]](#) One of the many reasons the Roadless Rule was adopted 25 years ago was to stop the excessive and fiscally irresponsible road construction that was happening across our national forests at American taxpayer expense. Forcing the rescission of this policy to allow more roads to be built is an irresponsible distraction and massive waste of taxpayer funding.

Beyond these realities, repeal is deeply unpopular[\[5\]](#). More than 1.6 million comments were submitted in favor of the Roadless Rule – more than any other rulemaking in our nation's history

at the time it was adopted— and the rule has survived decades of attacks. This is precisely because millions of Americans are clear-eyed about the value of these protected ecosystems. These include anglers and hunters[6], hikers[7], tribal communities[8], and so many more Americans who use and cherish our country’s incredible natural resources. That includes the outdoor recreation and tourism industry. A 2019 analysis of the economic values of roadless area conservation found that the recreational and passive uses of inventoried roadless areas yielded a total of nearly \$9 billion in economic benefits each year[9] – benefits our country and forest-adjacent communities cannot afford to lose.

The Roadless Rule keeps these wild ecosystems intact, sustaining critical habitats for threatened species such as native salmon populations that provide immense economic value in the Pacific Northwest and represent significant tribal cultural resources. In Alaska, the Tongass National Forest is the largest national forest, with 9 million acres of roadless areas and mature and old-growth rainforest, storing more than 1.5 billion metric tons of CO2-equivalent and sequestering 10 million metric tons a year. These forests protect clean drinking water for American communities, particularly rural communities which cannot afford to pay for drinking water infrastructure. They also serve as carbon sinks, making them an important tool in our work to address climate change, which agricultural producers depend on to sustain their businesses.

For over two decades, the Roadless Rule has served as dependable protection for some of our nation’s most valued public lands. We urge you to reverse course and retain full roadless protections for these 58.5 million acres.

[[CLOSING]]

[[SIGNATURES]]

Letter to AG Bondi Regarding Weakening of ATF

Dear Acting Director Driscoll and Attorney General Bondi,

We write with serious concerns regarding reports of restructuring at the Bureau of Alcohol, Tobacco, Firearms, and Explosives (ATF) and efforts to dismantle federal gun regulations. As communities across the U.S. continue to suffer from the scourge of gun violence, the Trump administration must immediately reverse plans to weaken the ATF and its ability to enforce our nation’s gun laws.

As you know, ATF serves as a critical law enforcement agency for the Department of Justice in enforcing gun regulations, investigating firearms trafficking, ensuring federal firearm licensee (FFL) compliance, and coordinating with state and local law enforcement to conduct investigations. Since its founding in 1972, ATF’s responsibilities and jurisdiction have evolved, taking an increasingly central role in crime prevention. The agency has become critical in developing criminal cases for prosecution, cracking down on ghost gun production, and holding

nefarious gun dealers accountable for breaking the law. As the gun violence epidemic in the U.S. has worsened, ATF agents and staff have proven essential to criminal investigations, providing over 221,000 investigative leads in Fiscal Year 2023 using ATF Crime Gun Intelligence Center tracing systems.[\[1\]](#) With the passage of the Bipartisan Safer Communities Act, ATF was empowered to expand anti-straw purchasing campaigns, conduct increased oversight of those engaged in dealing firearms, and help law enforcement track down stolen weapons.[\[2\]](#)

According to recent reports, the Trump administration's embattled Department of Government Efficiency (DOGE) has taken aim at ATF in efforts to curb enforcement of gun regulations, inhibiting the agency's ability to conduct firearms-related investigations.[\[3\]](#) This includes changing a reported 50 regulations, such as loosening background check requirements, ending policies designed to conduct oversight on problematic FFLs, and promoting policies that encourage the reinstatement of revoked FFL licenses.[\[4\]](#) We are deeply concerned by reports that the Trump administration is working to shorten forms that most gun purchasers are required to fill out, and is considering eliminating important questions about mental fitness for ownership.[\[5\]](#) The ATF should operate in a manner that respects lawful, responsible ownership while simultaneously improving, not reversing, regulations that prevent dangerous individuals from possessing a firearm. DOGE's efforts to strip ATF of its oversight role, under the false pretense of "partnership with the firearms industry" and promoting efficiency, strains already limited federal resources, encourages unlawful gun ownership, emboldens bad actors, and risks public safety in a nation fraught with gun violence.[\[6\]](#)

These dangerous actions by DOGE are compounded by the administration's proposals to slash ATF's budget by \$468 million, reduce its ability to regulate the firearms industry by 40 percent, cut more than 500 gun store inspectors, and consolidate the agency within an already overburdened Drug Enforcement Administration.[\[7\]](#) As the only federal agency with the authority to trace crime guns, ATF has historically faced delays in gun tracing requests due to federal prohibitions that block ATF from modernizing its databases. This only stands to worsen with a smaller budget, fewer staff, and an undermined mission that will lead to the increased flow of illegal firearms, reversing gains made by the Biden administration and the Bipartisan Safer Communities Act.

On average, 46,000 people are killed by guns each year in the U.S.[\[8\]](#) At a time when the scourge of gun violence shows no signs of slowing down, we urge this administration to reverse course on efforts to loosen, weaken, and undermine the primary federal agency responsible for keeping Americans safe from gun violence.

Social Security Staffing Cuts Impact on Congressional Casework

The Honorable Frank Bisignano
Commissioner
Social Security Administration
250 E Street, SW, Suite 8030
Washington, DC 20254

Dear Commissioner Bisignano,

We write as Members of Congress who are concerned about the negative impacts that reductions in force (RIFs) will have on constituent casework processing.

As you know, a crucial service provided by Members of Congress to their constituents is assistance with federal agencies. From ensuring constituents receive their tax refunds to Social Security payments, from supporting with passport renewals to U.S. Postal Service delivery – to name just a few – congressional offices are here to help. Each year, congressional offices return millions of dollars to constituents through the casework process.

Unfortunately, the Department of Government Efficiency's plans to slash the federal workforce will likely lead to fewer personnel available to support constituents, many of whom need time-sensitive assistance. Already, caseworkers in Congress have received bounce-back emails and no-replies from legislative liaison offices that were previously responsive to congressional inquiries.

On February 26, 2025, the Office of Management and Budget (OMB) and Office of Personnel Management (OPM) issued a memo titled "Guidance on Agency RIF and Reorganization Plans Requested by Implementing The President's 'Department of Government Efficiency' Workforce Optimization Initiative." This memo required each agency to submit to OMB and OPM a two-phase Agency RIF and Reorganization Plan (ARRP) by April 14, 2025. Notably, the ARRPs must include the following:

"For agencies that provide direct services to citizens (such as Social Security, Medicare, and veterans' health care), the agency's certification that implementation of the ARRPs will have a positive effect on the delivery of such services."

However, reporting states that at least some services are experiencing negative impacts. For example, the backlog in retirement benefit claims received by the Social Security Administration increased to almost 575,000 applications as of May 17, 2025. Additionally, the Internal Revenue Service National Taxpayer Advocate's Fiscal Year 2026 report states that as of the beginning of June 2025, the IRS has decreased its staffing by almost 26 percent – which may impact casework services. And amidst this series of rapid layoff announcements, Congress has yet to receive access to real-time, authoritative data sources tracking separations from the federal workforce and their impacts.

With this in mind, we request responses to the following by no later than July 31, 2025:

1. Please provide a complete copy of the agency's ARRP (both Phase 1 and Phase 2), including the Phase 2 certification that implementation of the ARRP will have a positive effect on the delivery of citizen services. Please explain how the agency will measure any alleged positive effect.
2. Please provide the total number of federal workers at the agency who worked with congressional offices to respond to constituent casework inquiries prior to the announcement of planned RIFs.
3. Please provide the total number of federal workers at the agency who worked with congressional offices to respond to constituent casework inquiries who have been separated from the federal workforce since the announcement of planned RIFs.
4. Please provide the current total number of federal workers at the agency who work with congressional offices to respond to constituent casework inquiries.
5. Please provide a responsive casework point of contact at the agency, including the name of casework liaison, their email address, and phone number.

Thank you for your consideration of this matter. A similar letter is being sent to the Internal Revenue Service

Opposing Incineration of International Food Aid

Dear Secretary Rubio:

We write to express our profound alarm and strong opposition to the reported decision under your leadership to withhold nearly 500 metric tons of emergency food aid and instead incinerate those supplies once they were left to expire. As you know, these rations were designed to nourish vulnerable children in conflict-affected regions such as Afghanistan and Pakistan. This action is not only morally indefensible, but also wasteful, strategically shortsighted, and completely counter to the entirety of your work while in the Senate.

The emergency high-energy biscuits in question, which served as nutritional lifelines and were purchased at a taxpayer cost of \$800,000, have reportedly now expired after sitting in warehouses for months. We understand that instead of delivering this emergency assistance to malnourished children as originally intended, the State Department will destroy the biscuits at an additional cost to the taxpayer of \$130,000. According to reporting in the Atlantic, USAID employees and inventory data say this food could have fed 1.5 million children for a week. Given the alarming rates of food insecurity and famine in regions like Gaza and Sudan, the decision to burn lifesaving aid produced by American farmers and paid for by American tax dollars amounts to a tragic abdication of our global humanitarian responsibilities and hurts our own global interests.

In May, Reuters reported that more than 60,000 metric tons of food aid, including ready-to-use therapeutic food, was sitting idle in warehouses across the globe. In your May testimony before the House Appropriations Committee, you committed to ensuring that food aid would reach its intended recipients before spoiling. In another hearing before the House Foreign Affairs Committee, you also testified that “We’re going to continue to do food aid... We’re going to do more food aid than any other country on the planet, times 10”. Yet, reports now show that the directive to destroy this food had already been issued by the time of your public assurances. We find this inconsistency troubling, and it raises serious concerns about transparency and accountability within the Department of State’s management of humanitarian aid.

We are also alarmed by reports indicating that internal USAID memos requesting urgent approval to move the biscuits went unanswered for months. If accurate, this speaks to a systemic breakdown in communication and leadership that has paralyzed America’s food aid delivery systems.

Supporting global food security enhances our national security and creates conditions in recipient countries that support our geopolitical and economic interests. Food insecurity threatens to exacerbate poverty, strain societal tensions, and increase dissatisfaction with governments, thereby increasing the risk of social, economic, and political instability—key drivers of mass migration and terrorism. Reducing foreign aid weakens our ability to address these threats.

Moreover, our withdrawal from congressionally mandated foreign assistance undermines our role as a global leader in humanitarian aid. For example, following the Trump Administration’s decision to downsize and subsequently eliminate USAID, China moved quickly to fill the void—

donating \$2 million in rice to Uganda in March and expanding aid to Nepal to address shortages we left behind.

Therefore, we respectfully request answers to the following questions:

1. Who specifically authorized this destruction order, when was that order authorized, and on what grounds was it deemed preferable to distribution or repurpose?
2. Did you intentionally mislead the House Appropriations Committee and House Foreign Affairs Committee in your testimony by committing to disperse food aid to its intended recipients before expiring? If not, what communications or actions did you take to ensure that State Department staff would proceed with delivering food aid?
3. Why was this food aid not redirected to other areas in urgent need, such as Sudan or Gaza, before expiration?
4. What would have been the expected cost to distribute or repurpose the emergency food aid?
5. What steps has your office taken to ensure that other existing emergency food aid does not meet a similar fate?
6. Please provide an accounting of all U.S. government-purchased emergency food commodities and supplies currently in storage, including their expiration timelines and intended destinations.

The United States has long led the world in humanitarian assistance, not only as a matter of compassion but also as a cornerstone of global stability and diplomacy. Destroying aid that could save lives undermines that legacy and damages our standing in the international community.

We urge you to immediately prioritize the distribution of all remaining and viable food assistance stockpiles. American leadership demands nothing less.

Opposing the EPA Repeal of the Endangerment Finding

Dear Administrator Zeldin,

We write to urge the U.S. Environmental Protection Agency (EPA) to immediately reverse course and withdraw the present proposal to eliminate federal standards limiting greenhouse gas pollution from light-, medium-, and heavy-duty vehicles. This is a clear abdication of EPA's core mission to protect human health and the environment and a flagrant rejection of Congressional intent. We find it particularly concerning that EPA's primary justification for eliminating the vehicle pollution standards is to rescind the 2009 Greenhouse Gas Endangerment Finding and deny the near-universal scientific consensus on climate change. The evidence for climate change is overwhelming, and contrary to EPA's secondary claims, the transportation sector—the largest source of U.S. greenhouse gas pollution—is a significant driver of climate change. Strong federal pollution standards for cars and trucks are integral and necessary to stopping climate change, and EPA is bound by its mission and statutory duties to regulate and reduce this pollution. This is a shocking new low point for the agency and will result in significant and myriad negative impacts to the health and wellbeing of Americans from across the country.

The scientific evidence for human-caused climate change is overwhelming. Surveys of climate scientists have repeatedly shown more than 97% of scientists agree that climate change is happening and that it is caused by greenhouse gas pollution from vehicles, power plants, industry, and other human activities. The evidence was overwhelming in 2009 when EPA first finalized the Endangerment Finding, and it has only grown stronger in the sixteen years since. Climate models have proven to be largely accurate in forecasting global warming, and the contemporary effects of climate change have become increasingly undeniable. Severe floods, wildfires, and storms are already devastating communities across the country, disrupting supply chains, and draining billions of dollars from the American economy. Climate change is an immediate and grave threat to public health, and it is EPA's statutory duty to address both the root causes and the impacts of this crisis.

Pollution from passenger cars and trucks is a leading cause of climate change and must be addressed to stop the most severe impacts to public health. The transportation sector is the leading source of greenhouse gas pollution in the United States, accounting for 28% of total emissions, and of these, 80% of transportation emissions come from light, medium, and heavy-duty vehicles. Federal vehicle pollution standards are therefore a necessary and effective solution to reduce greenhouse gas pollution and protect human health. Eliminating these standards would tie our hands, ensuring the global climate will continue to deteriorate and exacerbating the climate-fueled natural disasters and extreme weather events that Americans are already experiencing. In 2024 alone, 27 climate-fueled disasters each contributed to over one billion dollars in damages. At the same time, climate change has driven record temperatures across the nation, doubling the number of heat deaths among Americans since 1999. EPA must fulfil its mission to protect communities and regulate the greenhouse gas pollution that causes these deaths.

The transportation sector is also a leading source of local air pollution, including NOx, particulate matter or soot, and ozone-forming VOCs. Over 100,000 Americans die prematurely each year from air pollution, and studies show that the combination of high temperatures from global warming and poor air quality is particularly deadly. Greenhouse gas pollution standards for vehicles reduce local air pollution as well as greenhouse gases, and the deployment of zero-emissions vehicles will significantly improve local air quality. Elimination of these pollution standards will make the public health crisis worse.

Eliminating vehicle pollution standards would also cause profound damage to the U.S. economy and American workers. The world is racing towards a zero-emission future, and ignoring this reality threatens the future of the American auto industry. Over 410,000 Americans are employed in manufacturing the next generation of clean vehicles. In 2024, 69% of the vehicles exported by the U.S. were sold in countries with electric vehicle sales requirements. Jobs in the clean vehicles sector grew faster than the gas- and diesel-powered vehicle industry, adding about 60% more jobs between 2021 and 2024. Repealing the vehicle pollution standards

would hamstring this growing industry, killing thousands of good-paying American jobs and ceding the future of global automotive leadership to China.

At the same time, repealing the vehicle pollution standards would rob American consumers of trillions in savings, in the midst of a worsening cost-of-living crisis. If we turn our backs on clean vehicle technologies, the next generation of American vehicles will be significantly more expensive to fuel, maintain, and repair. EPA's own analysis suggests the proposal to eliminate vehicle pollution standards would result in \$1.3 trillion in lost fuel and maintenance savings.

Rolling back the vehicle pollution standards would also threaten American energy independence by deepening our reliance on foreign oil. Only 60% of the oil refined by U.S. fuel refineries is extracted in the United States. The remaining 40% is imported, making our gas-guzzling transportation system extremely dependent on other countries. Continuing dependence on global oil markets further links the costs Americans pay at the pump to the whims of countries like Russia, whose invasion of Ukraine resulted in a price shock for consumers of 50 cents per gallon in just seven days.

Once again, we urge you not to gut these life-saving vehicle pollution standards. We urge you to uphold your oath to faithfully discharge the duties of your office and fulfil EPA's mission to protect human health and the environment. The greenhouse gas pollution standards for cars and trucks have already saved lives and they will be critical to preventing the worst public health impacts of climate change. These standards have improved the health and financial security of the American people and strengthened the competitiveness of the American auto industry for over a decade. Every American deserves to breathe clean air. Every American deserves the opportunity of a prosperous future free from climate change. And every American should be able to drive an affordable next-generation clean vehicle made here in America.

RIFs Disrupting IRS Casework Services

The Honorable Billy Long
Commissioner Internal Revenue Service
1111 Constitution Avenue, NW
Washington, DC 20224

Dear Colleague:

We write as Members of Congress who are concerned about the negative impacts that reductions in force (RIFs) will have on constituent casework processing.

As you know, a crucial service provided by Members of Congress to their constituents is assistance with federal agencies. From ensuring constituents receive their tax refunds to Social Security payments, from supporting with passport renewals to U.S. Postal Service delivery – to name just a few – congressional offices are here to help. Each year, congressional offices return millions of dollars to constituents through the casework process.

Unfortunately, the Department of Government Efficiency's plans to slash the federal workforce will likely lead to fewer personnel available to support constituents, many of whom need time-sensitive assistance. Already, caseworkers in Congress have received bounce-back emails and no-replies from legislative liaison offices that were previously responsive to congressional inquiries.

On February 26, 2025, the Office of Management and Budget (OMB) and Office of Personnel Management (OPM) issued a memo titled "Guidance on Agency RIF and Reorganization Plans Requested by Implementing The President's 'Department of Government Efficiency' Workforce Optimization Initiative." This memo required each agency to submit to OMB and OPM a two-phase Agency RIF and Reorganization Plan (ARRP) by April 14, 2025. Notably, the ARRPs must include the following:

"For agencies that provide direct services to citizens (such as Social Security, Medicare, and veterans' health care), the agency's certification that implementation of the ARRPs will have a positive effect on the delivery of such services."

However, reporting states that at least some services are experiencing negative impacts. For example, the backlog in retirement benefit claims received by the Social Security Administration increased to almost 575,000 applications as of May 17, 2025. Additionally, the Internal Revenue Service National Taxpayer Advocate's Fiscal Year 2026 report states that as of the beginning of June 2025, the IRS has decreased its staffing by almost 26 percent – which may impact casework services. And amidst this series of rapid layoff announcements, Congress has yet to receive access to real-time, authoritative data sources tracking separations from the federal workforce and their impacts.

With this in mind, we request responses to the following by no later than July 31, 2025:

1. Please provide a complete copy of the agency's ARRP (both Phase 1 and Phase 2), including the Phase 2 certification that implementation of the ARRP will have a positive effect on the delivery of citizen services. Please explain how the agency will measure any alleged positive effect.
2. Please provide the total number of federal workers at the agency who worked with congressional offices to respond to constituent casework inquiries prior to the announcement of planned RIFs.
3. Please provide the total number of federal workers at the agency who worked with congressional offices to respond to constituent casework inquiries who have been separated from the federal workforce since the announcement of planned RIFs.
4. Please provide the current total number of federal workers at the agency who work with congressional offices to respond to constituent casework inquiries.
5. Please provide a responsive casework point of contact at the agency, including the name of casework liaison, their email address, and phone number.

Thank you for your consideration of this matter. A similar letter is being sent to the Social Security Administration.

Sincerely,

[[SIGNATURES]]

Oppose visa integrity fee and the visa bond pilot program

September 8, 2025

The Honorable Kristi Noem
Secretary
U.S. Department of Homeland Security
Washington, DC 20528
The Honorable Marco Rubio
Secretary
U.S. Department of State
Washington, DC 20520

Dear Secretary Noem and Secretary Rubio:

We write to express serious concern regarding the newly enacted \$250 visa integrity fee and the visa bond program for international visitors from certain countries. With the United States hosting the World Cup next year and Summer Olympics soon after, now is not the time to add additional fees and requirements that will further discourage international travel to the United States. According to the most recent data from the *National Travel and Tourism Office*, international visitation in July was down 3.1% compared to last year.¹

Travel and tourism are a vital part of the U.S. economy, supporting 15 million jobs, \$89 billion in state and local tax revenue, and 2.5% of our nation's gross domestic product.² These new fees and the confusion associated with them jeopardize our ability to take advantage of the upcoming decade of mega-events. An analysis by *Tourism Economics* indicates that this new \$250 per person fee will deter 5.4% of international visitors from coming to the United States, representing nearly a million fewer travelers per year. This alone will cost the U.S. economy \$9.4 billion in lost visitor spending and \$1.3 billion in lost tax revenue over the next three years, far outweighing any perceived budgetary benefit that may come with the fee.³

The \$250 per person visa integrity fee will add to the already high \$209 non-immigrant visa and Form I-94 fees that travelers to the United States face, resulting in one of the highest-cost tourist visas in the world. Additionally, there has been no guidance from the Administration about whether they will make this fee refundable and how they would do so. The Congressional Budget Office estimates that the State Department will issue 120 million nonimmigrant visas between 2025 and 2034. Given that most visas remain valid for up to a decade and refunds would only be processed after expiration, this integrity fee will function as a permanent cost increase and deterrent for international visitors, not a refundable deposit.⁴

The visa bond pilot program, which will require visitors from certain countries to post bonds of

\$5,000, \$10,000, or \$15,000, was previously abandoned “in light of the worldwide reduction in global travel as a result of the COVID-19 pandemic.”⁵ As the United States is the only country in the world which is seeing a decline in tourism, according to the *World Travel and Tourism*

<image007.png>

¹ “I-94 Monthly Summary and Analysis Reports”, *National Travel and Tourism Office*.

² “Economic Impact of the U.S. Travel Industry- 2024 National Data”, *US Travel Association*.

³ “New \$250 Visa Integrity Fee Will Cost US \$11 Billion, Say Tourism Officials”, *Forbes*.

⁴ “At a Glance- Reconciliation Recommendations of the House Committee on the Judiciary”, *Congressional Budget Office*.

⁵ “Visas: Visa Bond Pilot Program, Department of State,” *Federal Register*, August 5, 2025.

Council,⁶ we urge the Administration to abandon this effort once again. Currently, the State Department has identified Malawi and Zambia as countries whose citizens are subject to the visa bond pilot program ostensibly because of their high overstay rates.

Adding an unclear visa fee and travel bond program at this time when inbound travel is already down and our nation is preparing for global sporting events that should welcome millions makes no sense. These new policies will only add to the negative impacts of slashing Brand USA funding, the unwieldy imposition of tariffs, persistent beratement and insults of our allies, and widespread reports of arbitrary detention of visitors. We urge the Administration to, at a minimum, both delay implementation of the visa integrity fee for one year so you can learn from the travel bond pilot program and not interfere with the World Cup, and cease further expansion of the travel bond pilot program. Additionally, we ask you to answer the following questions by October 15, 2025:

- 1) Has the Administration conducted an analysis of how the visa integrity fee and travel bond pilot will impact international travel to the United States?
- 2) Is the Administration concerned with the downturn in international travel to the United States?
- 3) Will the visa integrity fee be refundable, and if so, how will this be administered considering that many non-immigrant visas are valid for ten years?
- 4) What exchange rate will the Administration use to reimburse international travelers--the rate when the fee was paid or the rate when the fee is reimbursed?

- 5) Will the State Department or Department of Homeland Security be implementing this fee and does either agency have experience in this type of reimbursable program?
- 6) What metrics are being used to justify the designation of countries subjected to the visa bond pilot program?
- 7) Does the administration plan to expand the visa bond pilot program beyond Malawi and Zambia?

We look forward to your timely response to these questions.

Sincerely,

[[SIGNATURES]]

PSLF placed into forbearance

October 7, 2024

The Honorable Miguel Cardona Secretary
U.S. Department of Education
400 Maryland Avenue SW
Washington, D.C. 20002

Dear Secretary Cardona:

In light of the disruptions many borrowers face due to ongoing litigation over the Saving on a Valuable Education (SAVE) Plan, we write to urge you to provide clarity and support to minimize the harm posed to affected borrowers.

As you know, the eight million SAVE Plan participants are facing uncertainty after the 8th Circuit Court of Appeals halted implementation of the SAVE Plan. While we recognize the Department of Education's efforts to avoid penalizing borrowers by putting their accounts into forbearance, we remain concerned about the numerous challenges borrowers continue to face.

In particular, for those borrowers in the process of pursuing Public Service Loan Forgiveness (PSLF), the current period of forbearance and accompanying disruptions in loan servicing create uncertainty for the status of their loan forgiveness eligibility and financial future. We acknowledge the Department's efforts to provide guidance for borrowers in this situation to apply for different repayment plans or to consider future buybacks for nonrepayment during forbearance. We are also encouraged to see the Department reinstate the online application so that borrowers can apply for repayment options. Unfortunately, our constituents report hearing conflicting information from servicers about whether any income-driven repayment plan applications are being accepted and processed. As a result, these borrowers are locked out of making progress toward the qualifying 120 monthly payments for PSLF eligibility even as they continue to serve our communities.

For these and other borrowers currently enrolled in the SAVE plan, we remain concerned about the importance of ensuring that all borrowers have adequate support and information to successfully navigate student loan repayment as litigation continues. The Department must also ensure that it has sufficient plans in place to facilitate a successful and immediate transition for affected borrowers should the final judicial ruling ultimately prevent implementation of the SAVE plan. The Department's plans should include preparing the necessary guidance for borrowers, adjusting contracts and issuing new regulations as needed. Given the instability created by the court's ruling and the resulting widespread impact on borrowers, it is clearly in the public's interest for the Department to move quickly as possible to be prepared for any potential judicial outcome.

Given the Department's duty to protect student loan borrowers, we respectfully request that:

1. The Department ensures that the current period of forbearance counts for PSLF borrowers, given that these circumstances are out of their control;
2. The Department restore access to other income-based repayment plans during the duration of these court proceedings and conduct robust outreach to borrowers to increase awareness of borrowers' ability to submit online applications with their servicers for available repayment options; and
3. The Department plan to immediately ensure access to alternative, pre-existing repayment plans if SAVE is struck down by the courts.

We thank you for your immediate attention to these matters, and we urge you to work as quickly as possible to prevent any further harm to borrowers.

Sincerely,

[[SIGNATURES]]

Oppose Abortion Ban for Veterans

Steven L. Lieberman, MD
Acting Under Secretary for Health
Department of Veterans Affairs
810 Vermont Avenue NW
Washington, DC 20420

Dear Dr. Lieberman,

We write today to comment on the Department of Veterans Affairs' (VA) proposed rule, RIN: 2900-AS31, published in the Federal Register on August 4, 2025, to reinstate a full exclusion on abortions and abortion counseling from VA's medical benefits package. This incredibly dangerous and reckless rule change will take away essential health care for veterans and beneficiaries of the Civilian Health and Medical Program of the Department of Veterans Affairs (CHAMPVA). For the past three years, these patients have been able to obtain abortion counseling and care in cases of rape, incest, or life or health endangerment. This proposed rule seriously calls into question whether the Department is putting political allegiances and culture wars ahead of its sacred obligation to deliver quality, life-saving health care to veterans, including the more than 462,000 women veterans of reproductive age enrolled in VA health care.

We reject this rule's premise that only providing a carveout for abortions in cases of life endangerment is adequate for providing "needed" health care for veterans. Evidence has shown that extreme abortion bans, like the ban this rule would create, cause chaos and confusion for providers, who often end up turning away ailing patients because of ambiguous laws and the threat of criminal penalties. Worse, such a ban would also be extremely dangerous to the health and wellbeing of veterans. As we have seen in states with extreme abortion bans, even those with "life exceptions" in place, patients have faced severe health complications and even death in cases when providers did not know if the patient's life was endangered *enough* to be covered under this exception.

Additionally, though this proposed rule claims "[n]o State law prohibits treatment for ectopic pregnancies or miscarriages to save the life of a mother," there are numerous cases of providers nationwide declining to provide care for women with ectopic pregnancies or experiencing miscarriages, for fear of facing criminal penalties. As such, this rule will now require VA providers to make the impossible determination of if and when a veteran is close enough to death to be covered under the "threat to life" exception before providing an abortion. VA's proposed rule presupposes that a blanket prohibition and a narrow, undefined exception will be sufficient to ensure VA can provide "needed" care to veterans and that "the lives of pregnant women will continue to be protected..." instead of trusting veterans and their providers to decide on a path forward that actually meets patients' needs and protects their lives. This is no way to treat our veterans, or VA providers.

Beyond the ban on abortion care, the prohibition on abortion counseling in this proposed rule also endangers VA's ability to provide appropriate care to veterans. Regardless of the reason a veteran chooses or needs to seek abortion care, they must be allowed to discuss all their health care options openly and honestly with their provider. In removing VA providers' ability to provide abortion counseling in this proposed rule, the Department is unnecessarily and detrimentally allowing the government to interfere with health care decisions that should be between a veteran and their provider. In putting forth this proposed rule, VA has decided that its political judgement and legal analysis should supplant medical care decisions that are best made by providers and the patients in their care, even in life and death situations.

Further, despite VA's argument that previous eligibility requirements for abortion care and counseling at the Department – as put in place under the Biden Administration's September 9, 2022, interim final rule – was contradictory to “decades of Federal policy against forced taxpayer funding for abortion,” the Biden-era rule brought VA *more* in line with abortion coverage in other federal programs. Most federally funded health programs – including those covered under the Hyde Amendment – have carveouts for abortions in cases of rape, incest, or life endangerment. VA's rule will lead to an inequity for veterans and CHAMPVA beneficiaries when compared to their civilian counterparts, making their access to abortion care more limited than those who use almost any other federally funded health care program.

This proposed rule also claims the Biden-era rule was an act of overreach, “creating a purported Federal entitlement to abortion for veterans where none had existed before and without regard to State law.” In reality, the Department has previously issued a regulation (38 CFR 17.419) confirming the ability of VA health care professionals to practice their health care profession consistent with the scope and requirements of their VA employment, notwithstanding any State license, registration, certification, or other requirements that unduly interfere with their practice. Additionally, the Justice Department issued an opinion after the release of the Biden-era rule, citing the Supremacy Clause of the U.S. Constitution and its applicability to the Biden rule: “[s]tates may not impose criminal or civil liability on VA employees...who provide or facilitate abortions or related services in a manner authorized by federal law, including VA's rule.” Given the applicability of VA's own regulations and the Supremacy Clause of the U.S. Constitution, we fail to see how the Department can reject the Biden-era rule on the premise of “overreach.”

Finally, we find the Department's claim that “abortion is not a ‘needed’ service for veterans” to be insulting and ignorant. Veterans of reproductive age have high rates of chronic medical and mental health conditions, many of which are service connected, that may increase the risks associated with pregnancy. Such conditions include chronic post-traumatic stress disorder (PTSD), severe hypertension, and chronic renal disease. When a health care professional determines these conditions (potentially in combination with other factors) render an abortion necessary to preserve the health of a veteran, access to abortion is essential health care. In addition, veterans who are forced to carry pregnancies resulting from rape or incest are at risk of long-lasting psychological conditions and traumatic stress, making abortion access for these

veterans needed for protecting their health. It is also vital given the high incidence of military sexual trauma in the Armed Forces, and the number of veterans who already suffer from PTSD or other mental health conditions.

The concerns we raise about this cruel proposal to roll back essential health care for veterans are not ours alone – they are shared by veterans and their families nationwide. A survey conducted by Iraq and Afghanistan Veterans of America after the U.S. Supreme Court's *Dobbs v. Jackson Women's Health Organization* decision found more than two-thirds of their members surveyed *supported* both VA and the Department of Defense stepping in to ensure veterans, servicemembers, and their families have access to the reproductive care they need. Since the *Dobbs* decision, more than half of women veterans and CHAMPVA beneficiaries of reproductive age live in states that have enacted abortion bans or restrictions. Should their health be in jeopardy due to a pregnancy, or if they are raped, this rule will leave them with nowhere to turn. To finalize this rule will be a failure for our women veterans, and we urge the Department to reconsider.

Thank you for your consideration of this comment.

Oppose DOJ Guidance for Implementation of Executive Order 14224

The Honorable Donald J. Trump
President of the United States of America
The White House
1600 Pennsylvania Avenue NW
Washington, D.C. 20500

The Honorable Pamela J. Bondi
Attorney General
U.S. Department of Justice
950 Pennsylvania Avenue NW
Washington, D.C. 20530

Dear President Trump and Attorney General Bondi:

We write to express our deep concern regarding the President Trump's and U.S. Department of Justice's (DOJ) continued attack on language access with your July 14, 2025, release of Guidance to implement President Trump's Executive Order (EO) 14224.

President Trump does not have the authority to declare English as the national language. The issue of a national language has been debated in Congress, and the legislative branch has not made such an establishment. In bypassing Congress with his declaration, the President continues to flout the constitution's checks and balances. Similarly, in this guidance, the Attorney General falsely claims that *Lau v. Nichols* has been overturned, directly contradicting previous rulings by federal judges and the Supreme Court, which have determined discrimination against people with limited English proficiency (LEP) amounts to discrimination on the basis of national origin.

The memorandum in itself raises significant legal, operational, and civil rights concerns by treating language access as discretionary, which undermines guarantees under Title VI of the Civil Rights Act of 1964. The memo attempts to roll back decades of progress and weakens the legal framework to combat national origin discrimination by treating language access as an unnecessary privilege rather than a civil right. The new DOJ guidance will create uncertainty and confusion across federal agencies and will lead to millions of people with LEP being denied access to critical, life-sustaining services.

Over 25.7 million individuals in the United States – more than 8% of the U.S. population – are LEP and rely on translation and interpretation services to access vital public services and institutions, including health care, the legal system, education, housing, and employment. In August 2000, President Clinton signed EO 13166, which required federal agencies meet the needs of LEP individuals and develop guidance that clarifies language accessibility obligations for recipients of federal assistance. EO 13166 also built upon Title VI of the Civil Rights Act of 1964, which prohibits discrimination based on national origin. Federal courts and agencies have recognized that failing to provide language access constitutes national origin discrimination.

While the DOJ can provide guidance to federal agencies around their language obligations, it cannot absolve recipients of federal funding of their obligations under Title VI of the Civil Rights Act of 1964, Section 1557 of the Affordable Care Act, and other civil rights legislation

and statutes that require recipients of federal funding to ensure meaningful access to their programs for people with limited English proficiency.

Translation and interpretation services can be the difference between life and death. In 2021, a Spanish-speaking family in Mayfield, Kentucky survived a deadly tornado only because they received a Spanish-language alert moments before their home was destroyed. In 2020, a woman with coronavirus symptoms died in New York after emergency room staffers could not communicate with her in Hungarian. In 2023, a Navajo man died in a New Mexico hospital because he was denied an interpreter. And just this month, a deaf Mongolian asylum-seeker in California, who has faced discrimination and physical attacks in his own country due to his disability, was finally released from immigration custody after being unable to communicate for six months in court because he was denied access to a Mongolian Sign Language interpreter.⁸

Additionally, we are concerned that this guidance is already having negative impacts. The Internal Revenue Service (IRS), in an effort to comply with EO 14224, is considering eliminating non-English language tax services such as translated documents and phone and inperson interpretation. When taxpayers cannot understand IRS forms, they are more likely to make mistakes or avoid filing altogether. Cutting multilingual resources will not save money; they will instead cost the U.S. significant revenue loss in unpaid taxes. We are also concerned about DOJ's removal of many language access resources, including LEP.gov which has provided data and best practices to agencies and funded entities for many years.¹⁰

Therefore, we request answers to the following inquiries to ensure that your administration is upholding its obligations under Title VI and protecting language accessibility for Americans with LEP. We further request answers to the questions in the attached April 11, 2025 letter, which has not yet received a response.

1. How does DOJ define “necessary,” “unnecessary,” and “non-essential” in regard to multilingual services, and what standards or criteria will the DOJ use to determine which non-English services are “unnecessary” and/or “non-essential”?

- a. What standards or criteria will agencies use to determine whether a program “serves the public at large better if operated exclusively in English”?
- b. Once the internal inventory is completed, please provide a comprehensive inventory of all “unnecessary” or “non-essential” multilingual services the DOJ intends to phase out, and the rationale for each.

2. The memo states that the DOJ's implementation of Executive Order 14224 will be “cost effective[,] reducing administrative burdens and costs, enhancing operational efficiency across agencies.”

- a. Please provide this cost analysis, including the current annual LEP translation spending, and the projected cost to implement EO 14224.
- b. Please detail any contracts for the provision of language services that have been cancelled since January 20, 2025.

3. The memo encourages all agencies to “use technology to save costs” and to specifically utilize “technological advances in translation services” including “artificial intelligence and machine translation” to communicate with LEP individuals.
 - a. What procedures are in place to ensure that AI and machine translation tools used by federal agencies meet acceptable standards of accuracy and cultural competence?
4. The memo states that LEP and translation services resources funds will be “redirecting... toward research and programs that improve English proficiency and assimilation”.
 - a. What specific parameters and oversight mechanisms will govern the redirection of federal funds toward English-language acquisition and assimilation programs?
 - b. What metrics will DOJ use to measure the effectiveness of these programs?
 - c. Which DOJ components have the expertise in English language teaching or assimilation programming to lead or fund such programs?
 - d. Please detail any programs that provide English language skills training and education that have been cut, had funding withheld, or seen staff reductions since January 20, 2025.
5. The memo states that “English is the official language and authoritative version of all federal information”.
 - a. What authority does the President and Department of Justice have to declare that English is the official language?
 - b. In cases where translation errors cause confusion or miscommunication, what protocols are in place to resolve disputes when the English version is deemed the “authoritative” version?
 - c. What remedies will exist for LEP individuals if discrepancies arise between translations and the English version?
6. Federal offices of civil rights are responsible for ensuring that recipients of federal funding comply with their obligations under the law. When someone submits a complaint to a federal office for civil rights alleging they were denied meaningful access to a federally funded program in their primary language, how will that complaint be addressed under this new guidance?
7. The memorandum acknowledges that Title II of the Americans with Disability Act and the Rehabilitation Act of 1973 require effective communication for individuals with disabilities. How will DOJ ensure any reduction in LEP services does not conflict with obligations under these statutes?

EO 14224 and the guidance outlined in Attorney General Bondi’s memo threaten to cause significant harm to millions of LEP Americans by limiting their access to essential federal services and undermining longstanding civil rights protections. These changes risk creating confusion, denying critical information, and exacerbates disparities in health, safety, and justice.

We demand clear answers on how DOJ will prevent these harmful outcomes and ensure that language access remains a right—not a privilege—for all Americans. We look forward to your timely response to this important matter.

Firing of Administration for Community Living Regional Administrators

The Honorable Robert F. Kennedy, Jr.
Secretary
U.S. Department of Health and Human Services
Hubert H. Humphrey Building
200 Independence Avenue SW
Washington, DC 20201

Dear Secretary Kennedy,

We write to you with concern about the abrupt firings of Administration for Community Living (ACL) Regional Administrators. As you are well aware, ACL was formed thirteen years ago to support the needs of aging Americans and those with disabilities. In the U.S., there are over 11,000 people who turn 65 each day, and one in four adults live with a disability. The population of aging Americans is rapidly growing and will continue increasing for decades. Now is not the time to dismantle this critical program that serves millions of Americans.

The work of ACL helps aging Americans remain healthier longer, reducing the strain on our healthcare system. By connecting older adults and those with disabilities to support systems, inclusive transportation, abuse prevention, resources for caregivers, and providing mental health tools, more people are able to live independently. Additionally, ACL oversees and carries out the Older Americans Act (OAA), which was reauthorized by Congress in 2024. Through this law, nearly one million nutritious meals are served to seniors in need and their caregivers across the country every day. The value and success of these programs is undeniable. It is unacceptable that this Administration is willing to play with the lives of the American people.

In the wake of the One Big Beautiful Bill Act (OBBBA), which makes the largest cut to Medicaid in history, the services and resources provided by ACL are more important now than ever. Over 15 million people with disabilities rely on Medicaid for their healthcare coverage. These massive cuts strain our hospital systems and healthcare workers, hurting millions of aging Americans and individuals with disabilities. OBBBA also makes drastic cuts to the Supplemental Nutrition Assistance Program (SNAP), which supports more than 11 million adults over the age of 50.⁴ Without ACL, the resources needed to fill the gaps created by this detrimental law will be further limited, pulling the safety net out from millions of Americans.

We understand that the Administration plans to completely dismantle ACL and divide its remaining programs across multiple agencies in the name of efficiency. Despite this news,

HHS has continued to release OAA formula grant funding, which we applaud, yet we do not understand how these actions align with recent firings of Regional Administrators and employees who implement these critical programs. We urge you to keep ACL intact, reinstate the Regional Administrators, and answer the following questions no later than September 2, 2025:

1. How many of the ten Regional Administrators have been fired?
2. If the Administration plans to reassign ACL programs to various other agencies, why weren't the Administrators reassigned to agencies to continue overseeing these important programs?
3. Which agency will ensure OAA formula grants continue without interruption if ACL is dismantled?
4. In the wake of cutting healthcare and nutrition assistance for millions of Americans, what is the Administration's plan to continue providing nutritious meals and support for our nation's aging Americans and people with disabilities?
5. How is HHS planning to ensure efficiency in program and grant award delivery with reduced staff capacity?

On May 5, 2025, you said, "We stand with our elders and individuals with disabilities — we don't abandon them," and ACL's funding opportunities "directly invests in dignity, protects independence, and affirms every American's right to age with respect and community." Your recent actions do not reflect your empty promises.

We must work to ensure the American people are set up for success. Removing the supports and structures that help our most vulnerable populations thrive in their communities is unacceptable. We respectfully request that you allow ACL to continue existing, rehire the Regional Administrators and other employees who have been let go without reason, and prioritize the health and wellbeing of Americans with disabilities and seniors.

Letter AG Bondi and ATF Director Regarding Weakening of ATF

Dear Acting Director Driscoll and Attorney General Bondi,

We write with serious concerns regarding reports of restructuring at the Bureau of Alcohol, Tobacco, Firearms, and Explosives (ATF) and efforts to dismantle federal gun regulations. As communities across the U.S. continue to suffer from the scourge of gun violence, the Trump administration must immediately reverse plans to weaken the ATF and its ability to enforce our nation's gun laws.

As you know, ATF serves as a critical law enforcement agency for the Department of Justice in enforcing gun regulations, investigating firearms trafficking, ensuring federal firearm licensee (FFL) compliance, and coordinating with state and local law enforcement to conduct investigations. Since its founding in 1972, ATF's responsibilities and jurisdiction have evolved, taking an increasingly central role in crime prevention. The agency has become critical in developing criminal cases for prosecution, cracking down on ghost gun production, and holding nefarious gun dealers accountable for breaking the law. As the gun violence epidemic in the U.S. has worsened, ATF agents and staff have proven essential to criminal investigations, providing over 221,000 investigative leads in Fiscal Year 2023 using ATF Crime Gun Intelligence Center tracing systems.[\[1\]](#) With the passage of the Bipartisan Safer Communities Act, ATF was empowered to expand anti-straw purchasing campaigns, conduct increased oversight of those engaged in dealing firearms, and help law enforcement track down stolen weapons.[\[2\]](#)

According to recent reports, the Trump administration's embattled Department of Government Efficiency (DOGE) has taken aim at ATF in efforts to curb enforcement of gun regulations, inhibiting the agency's ability to conduct firearms-related investigations.[\[3\]](#) This includes changing a reported 50 regulations, such as loosening background check requirements, ending policies designed to conduct oversight on problematic FFLs, and promoting policies that encourage the reinstatement of revoked FFL licenses.[\[4\]](#) We are deeply concerned by reports that the Trump administration is working to shorten forms that most gun purchasers are required to fill out, and is considering eliminating important questions about mental fitness for ownership.[\[5\]](#) The ATF should operate in a manner that respects lawful, responsible ownership while simultaneously improving, not reversing, regulations that prevent dangerous individuals from possessing a firearm. DOGE's efforts to strip ATF of its oversight role, under the false pretense of "partnership with the firearms industry" and promoting efficiency, strains already limited federal resources, encourages unlawful gun ownership, emboldens bad actors, and risks public safety in a nation fraught with gun violence.[\[6\]](#)

These dangerous actions by DOGE are compounded by the administration's proposals to slash ATF's budget by \$468 million, reduce its ability to regulate the firearms industry by 40 percent, cut more than 500 gun store inspectors, and consolidate the agency within an already overburdened Drug Enforcement Administration.[\[7\]](#) As the only federal agency with the

authority to trace crime guns, ATF has historically faced delays in gun tracing requests due to federal prohibitions that block ATF from modernizing its databases. This only stands to worsen with a smaller budget, fewer staff, and an undermined mission that will lead to the increased flow of illegal firearms, reversing gains made by the Biden administration and the Bipartisan Safer Communities Act.

On average, 46,000 people are killed by guns each year in the U.S.[\[8\]](#) At a time when the scourge of gun violence shows no signs of slowing down, we urge this administration to reverse course on efforts to loosen, weaken, and undermine the primary federal agency responsible for keeping Americans safe from gun violence.

Opposing Potential Censorship of Historic National Park Service Sites

Dear Acting Director Bowron:

We write to request an update on the impact of your June 9 memo on educational and historical markers, monuments, and memorials that are part of the National Park System. We are greatly concerned that your memo aims to undermine cultural resources at those sites while neglecting meaningful upgrades and improvements.

Your June 9, 2025 memo to all NPS units required NPS units to solicit public reports about existing signage that is subjectively negative about either past or living Americans, or that fail to emphasize the “beauty, grandeur, and abundance” of landscapes and other natural features. Additionally, that memo set a July 18, 2025 deadline for units to review all public signage and language for any such content.

We are deeply concerned that your memo will create changes that damage valuable historical resources, disrupt NPS operations, and unnecessarily hurt our national parks and the communities that use and enjoy them.

The history of our great nation is told through the National Park System. Historical markers, monuments, and memorials play an important role in educating Americans about that history. The National Park System currently includes:

- 54 National Historical Parks, which tell stories of American history at sites as diverse and irreplaceable as Independence Hall, Appomattox Court House, Martin Luther King, Jr.’s childhood home, and the inland Northwest home of the nimípuu (Nez Perce) people.
- 75 National Historic Sites and 1 International Historic Site, which protect additional, unique sites from Washington and Montana, to Maine, to Florida, Puerto Rico, and the Virgin Islands.
- 25 National Battlefields, Battlefield Parks, Battlefield Sites, and Military Parks, including sites from important battles in the Revolutionary War, Civil War, and other conflict that shaped American history.
- 31 National Memorials that mark important figures, places, and events in our nation’s history, including iconic memorials on the National Mall, Mount Rushmore, Arlington House, and solemn memorials to Flight 93 and the attack on Pearl Harbor.

Those dedicated historical sites join hundreds more NPS units across all 50 states, which collectively welcome more than 330 million visitors every year to witness their natural beauty and learn from longstanding educational resources, including signs and others interpretative materials. None of those sites can, or should, be separated from the history that makes them part of our nation’s fabric.

Instead, your memo will further divert resources away from deferred maintenance, an infamous issue within the Park Service. The NPS maintenance backlog affects all aspects of parks,

including not only historical markers, monuments, and memorials, but also basic signage essential for visitor safety. Addressing that backlog should be NPS' utmost priority in updating or changing cultural resources, rather than neglecting safety and the visitor experience in pursuit of censorship and erasure.

The outcomes of your review are potentially significant for the people and communities that use and enjoy our National Park System. Please therefore provide answers to the following questions:

1. What properties, if any, in the National Park System were flagged for violations as part of the review initiated by your June 9 memo?
 - a. Please provide a full list of NPS units that were found to contain signs or other property flagged for violations.
 - b. Please provide a full list of signs and other property flagged for violations, disaggregated by NPS unit.
2. What properties, if any, in the National Park System have been altered or removed as a result of that review?
 - a. Please provide a full list of NPS units that were found to contain signs or other property that were altered or removed.
 - b. Please provide a full list of signs and other property that were altered or removed, disaggregated by NPS unit.

Given the importance of the National Park System to our nation's history, economy, and natural landscapes, we request a response to these questions by September 30, 2025. We look forward to receiving those responses.

Urging Health and Human Services Secretary to Cancel 340B Pilot Program

Dear Secretary Kennedy,

We, the undersigned members of Congress, write to express our concerns regarding the recently announced 340B Rebate Model Pilot Program. As the Department of Health and Human Services (HHS) notes, this change would “fundamentally shift how the 340B Program has operated for over 30 years.” Congress intended the 340B Program to enable the nation’s safety-net providers to stretch scarce federal resources as far as possible, reaching more eligible patients and providing more comprehensive services. An unchecked rebate model would severely undermine that purpose. We urge you to abandon the Rebate Model Pilot Program, or if the program must move forward, to proceed with the utmost caution and impose stronger guardrails to ensure the 340B program is not entirely dismantled.

As HHS is aware, last year, several multinational drug manufacturers—Bristol Myers Squibb (BMS), Eli Lilly, Johnson & Johnson (J&J), Novartis, and Sanofi—attempted to unilaterally impose rebate models on certain covered entities and drugs, despite a clear lack of statutory authority. We are grateful to the Health Resources & Services Administration (HRSA) for its swift and consistent enforcement efforts blocking manufacturers’ unlawful attempts to restructure the program without Secretarial approval. HRSA’s interpretation and enforcement against the rebate models were upheld by the U.S. District Court in the District of Columbia.

We are concerned that HHS’s pilot program will severely damage community health centers, safety net hospitals, and other providers that rely on the 340B program to provide comprehensive, quality services to their patients and communities.

The rebate model pilot program will require all covered entities to purchase drugs on the CMS Medicare Drug Price Negotiation Selected Drug List at the wholesale acquisition cost – the highest sticker price that manufacturers offer, which is rarely actually paid by purchasers in the health care system. This will require 340B providers to float significant amounts of cash to drug companies in hopes of a rebate being paid. Further, these drugs, despite their prices being reduced through price negotiation, are still some of the costliest drugs in the Medicare Part D program. If the entire 340B program moved to a rebate model, the average Disproportionate Share Hospital in the country would be forced to float an estimated \$72.2 million to manufacturers annually.

This is a cost most 340B providers, many of whom are experiencing financial instability, simply cannot afford. 340B hospitals already have substantially lower—negative on average—operating margins compared to non-340B hospitals. And in 2023, nationally, nearly half of health centers had negative operating margins; overall net margins were 1.6 percent. These changes threaten 340B providers’ ability to provide care and to keep their doors open to serve low-income communities.

In addition, we are concerned that this rebate model will be used by manufacturers as a backdoor to recoup their own profits that may have been lost as a result of lowering prices through the Medicare Drug Price Negotiation Program (MDPNP). This was never Congress's intent in establishing the MDPNP. While we appreciate HRSA's attempts to place guardrails around this pilot program, these guardrails will not be sufficient to prevent aggressive tactics by manufacturers to deny claims and siphon money away from providers and their patients.

Finally, as we have affirmed on multiple occasions, we continue to believe that the rebate approach contravenes Congressional intent in establishing the 340B program and over three decades of precedent set by HRSA that distinguishes rebates and retroactive discounts from upfront 340B discounts.

As such, we urge you to cancel the pilot program. However, if HHS chooses to continue with this pilot, we request answers to the following questions, no later than September 15, 2025:

1. HHS notes that this pilot would “fundamentally shift how the 340B Program has operated for over 30 years.” Yet the timeline for implementation of this pilot leaves little room for meaningful covered entity input, while mandating significant additional costs for those entities.
 - a. What legal authority does HHS cite to support a 30-day public comment period, after which HHS is “under no obligation to respond or act on” any comments, in making this significant change?
 - b. What is HHS's justification for imposing such significant changes on a rushed timeline, including only 30 days for public comment, one week to review public comments including input from 340B providers who have otherwise been uninvolved in the process, and four weeks to review manufacturers' proposed plans?
2. How will the Information Technology (IT) platform be selected to ensure reduced administrative and logistic burden for covered entities, while avoiding any conflicts of interest? Will manufacturers be required to consider input from covered entities?
3. With regards to the determination of claims' validity and issuance of rebates under the program:
 - a. What are HHS's plans for ongoing audits and oversight to determine whether manufacturers are appropriately approving claims and issuing rebates in a timely manner?
 - b. If manufacturers do not pay rebates within 10 days of receiving covered entities' submissions of data as required by the rebate model parameters, inappropriately deny entities' claims, or otherwise use this pilot program to abuse the 340B Program, what enforcement tools will HHS use against noncompliant manufacturers? Will there be any special expedited procedures to allow covered entities to use the administrative dispute resolution (ADR) process to contest invalid manufacturer actions?
 - c. What additional criteria do HHS envision as permissible and impermissible for manufacturers to use as grounds to deny claims? For example, will HHS permit

manufacturers to deny rebates by alleging that providers are not complying with the manufacturer's unilaterally imposed restrictions on contract pharmacy?

4. The guidance states that "no additional administrative costs of running the rebate model shall be passed onto the covered entities." How will HHS ensure this includes all administrative costs related to this rebate model pilot program, including labor costs and the costs of contesting denials? What enforcement mechanism will ensure that manufacturers pay all such costs in a timely manner?
5. The announcement notes that manufacturers can apply to participate for a "minimum of 1 year."
 - a. What is the maximum amount of time HHS will permit manufacturers to run these rebate models?
 - b. Does HHS plan to re-evaluate the rebate model after one year to assess whether it will continue to permit manufacturers to remain in these rebate arrangements?
6. HHS states that it will evaluate "data and reports received from the participating manufacturers on the effectiveness of the model and covered entity and other stakeholder feedback," after which HHS may consider expanding the rebate model to other drugs purchased under the 340B program.
 - a. Which performance measures will the agency use to measure effectiveness?
 - b. How will the ability of covered entities to provide care to underserved patients, as well as other feedback from covered entities, be weighed in the assessment of effectiveness?
 - c. Will the agency commit to make public the results of the assessments it conducts of the model's effectiveness?
 - d. On what basis would the agency decide to increase the number of drugs subject to rebates by adding drugs with negotiated prices coming into effect in 2027 under the MDPNP?
 - e. On what basis would the agency determine to include drugs that are not under the MDPNP?
7. For many years and across several administrations, HHS has requested increased resources for implementation and oversight over the 340B Program. Yet this pilot program would significantly increase administrative burden for HHS staff, whose new responsibilities will include reviewing manufacturers' applications and resolving any issues within 30 days from receipt, performing audits and ADR for any deviations from program guidelines, addressing issues raised by covered entities if there are issues with rebate delays and denials, and fielding any other administrative or logistical issues emerging through implementation of the rebate model. What is HHS's plan to implement such a pilot program while maintaining regular oversight of the 340B program?

Opposing ECA Programs Funding Cuts

Dear Director Vought,

We write to urge you to release the Fiscal Year (FY) 2025 funding for 22 Department of State Bureau of Educational and Cultural Affairs (ECA) program awards totaling more than \$100 million. Such cuts to Congressionally appropriated, bipartisan programs would undermine America's more than 75-year legacy of international education and exchange programming.

Continued funding is essential for ECA to carry out critical international education and exchange programs that advance U.S. national security, strengthen economic competitiveness, and reinforce democratic values—all vital to achieving the Administration's foreign policy goals. Without predictable and timely funding, flagship initiatives with longstanding bipartisan support, such as the Mandela Washington Fellowship for Young African Leaders, the Young Southeast Asian Leadership Initiative, and the Kennedy-Lugar Youth Exchange and Study (YES) Program, would be at risk of elimination.

The consequences of effectively ending these programs for next year would be severe. More than 55,000 students, scholars, and professionals—including 15,000 Americans traveling abroad—would lose access to programs that, according to the State Department, “strengthen the national security of the United States through improved foreign relations, support U.S. international leadership, and provide a broad range of domestic benefits by...investing in American communities and organizations.”

These programs also provide an exceptional return on investment for American taxpayers. More than 90% of ECA's funding is reinvested in American organizations, educational institutions, and communities. Funding cuts would strip American businesses, schools, and host organizations of billions of dollars in annual economic impact that they generate for the U.S. economy. Eliminating these programs is unfortunately a domestic disinvestment.

Through strong, bipartisan funding in both chambers, Congress has recognized that ECA programs not only advance America's diplomatic and security interests abroad but also deliver substantial benefits here at home. These programs were fully funded in the final FY25 appropriations legislation, and just last month, the House FY26 National Security, Department of

State, and Related Programs (NSRP) Appropriations bill funded Educational and Cultural Affairs Programs at more than \$700 million.

If these funds are not released before the end of the fiscal year, long-standing and well-respected public diplomacy programs could be forced to discontinue. We request that OMB take immediate action to release all of the FY25 Congressionally appropriated funds for these critical programs without further delay.

List of Programs:

1. Community College Administrator Program (CCAP)
2. Community College Initiative Program (CCI)
3. Community Engagement Exchange (CEE, Leahy Initiative on Civil Society)
4. Community Solutions Program (CSP)
5. Council of American Overseas Research Centers
6. English Access Scholarship Program
7. English Language Fellow Program
8. Global Undergraduate Exchange Program
9. IDEAS Program
10. Kennedy-Lugar Youth Exchange and Study (YES) and YES Abroad Program
11. Leaders Lead On-Demand
12. Mandela Washington Fellowship for Young African Leaders
13. Mike Mansfield Fellowship Program
14. National Clearinghouse for Disability and Exchange (NCDE)
15. Professional Fellows Program
16. Survey of International Educational Exchange Activity (IEEA) in the United States
17. TechWomen
18. The J. Christopher Stevens Virtual Exchange Initiative
19. U.S. Congress-Korea National Assembly Exchange Program
20. U.S.-South Pacific Scholarship Program (USSP)
21. Young Southeast Asian Leaders Initiative (YSEALI) Academic Fellowship
22. Young Southeast Asian Leaders Initiative (YSEALI) Professional Fellowship Program (PFP)

Thank you for your attention to this urgent matter.

Opposing FEMA Requiring Noem's Approval for Activities over \$100,000

Dear Secretary Noem and Mr. Richardson:

We are writing to express deep concern over Secretary Noem's policy directive requiring her personal approval for all purchases, grants, and contracts exceeding \$100,000. This policy is impractical, dangerous, and has already reportedly delayed the Federal Emergency Management Agency's (FEMA) response and recovery efforts to the catastrophic flooding that devastated Texas early last month. This also raises serious concerns about how this will impact ongoing reconstruction projects in Puerto Rico. FEMA routinely handles major contracts and grants worth hundreds of millions of dollars, and imposing top-level sign-off on routine expenditures introduces unnecessary and disruptive bottlenecks. In disaster zones, even brief delays in recovery efforts or the deployment of life-saving resources can be fatal, and this directive risks causing exactly that.

The impact of this directive is especially severe in regions like Puerto Rico, where communities are still recovering from Hurricanes Irma and Maria, and timely access to federal funding is essential for progress. It puts hundreds of projects at risk of missing FEMA-approved completion deadlines, potentially triggering the de-obligation of critical federal funds. Local officials have also raised concerns that cash flow disruptions could delay phased construction payments and drive up costs for municipal governments. These delays will harm local economies by reducing employment, contractor activity, and construction excise tax revenue, further straining local budgets and hindering their ability to deliver vital services.

Although reports of this new policy directive have circulated, we have not received any formal notification from the Department of Homeland Security or FEMA outlining the directive, its implementation guidelines, or the procedural framework. Therefore, we ask that you provide the following documents and respond to the following questions by August 19, 2025:

1. Please provide a copy of the official announcement of this policy, along with any formal agency guidance regarding its implementation.
2. What specific criteria determine which purchases, grants, and contracts require Secretary Noem's approval? Are there any exceptions or thresholds based on disaster severity or urgency?
3. What is the expected duration of this directive? Is it temporary, or does DHS intend for it to be a permanent policy?

4. What is the average amount of time it currently takes for Secretary Noem to review and approve a request under this new policy? Please provide data on processing times since its implementation.
5. What measures are DHS and/or FEMA taking to mitigate the delays caused by this additional approval requirement?
6. How will DHS and/or FEMA ensure that local governments and grantees receive timely communication and support throughout this new approval process?
7. Is there a system or platform available for grantees to track the status of requests subject to this new approval process? If so, please provide detailed instructions on how grantees can access and use it.

Opposing decision to rescind \$350 million in funding for several Minority-Serving Institutions, including Native Hawaiian-Serving Institutions and Asian American and Native American Pacific Islander-Serving Institutions

Secretary Linda McMahon
U.S. Department of Education
400 Maryland Avenue, SW
Washington, D.C. 20202

Dear Secretary McMahon,

We write to express strong concern regarding the rescission of federal resources from Minority-Serving Institutions (MSIs), including Hispanic-Serving Institutions (HSIs), Predominantly Black Institutions (PBIs), Alaska Native and Native Hawaiian-Serving Institutions (ANNHSIs), Asian American- and Native American Pacific Islander-Serving Institutions (AANAPISIs), Native American-Serving Nontribal Institutions (NASNIs), and Minority Science and Engineering Improvement (MSEIPs) and diverting them to Historically Black Colleges and Universities (HBCUs) and Tribally Controlled Colleges and universities (TCUs). While we deeply value and support the role HBCUs and TCUs play in advancing educational opportunities, shifting resources from Minority-Serving Institutions undermines the broader national commitment to serve all students.

Minority Serving-Institutions collectively educate millions of first-generation, low-income, and underrepresented students. MSIs enroll some of the nation's most economically disadvantaged students, often serving as the only affordable pathway to higher education for their communities. These schools serve large concentrations of low-income students, many who receive Title IV needs-based assistance, while consistently demonstrating higher rates of economic mobility than other institutions.

These colleges and universities play a critical role in advancing opportunities for students from all backgrounds who would otherwise be left behind. Diverting funds would not only hurt these institutions' ability to serve underrepresented students, but it would also disproportionately harm the students who rely on them for access to affordable, high-quality higher education.

Rather than forcing these institutions into competition over limited resources, federal policy should focus on increasing overall investment across the full spectrum of minority-serving institutions. Sustained, equitable funding ensures that HBCUs, TCUs, and MSIs, can all fulfill their missions of expanding opportunity, reducing inequities, and strengthening our economy.

We urge you to reject efforts that pit these institutions against one another and instead champion comprehensive solutions that recognize the unique and complementary contributions of each.

Our collective goal must be to uplift all students, no matter which institution they attend.

Sincerely,

Follow up Violence Against Women Act Letter to AG Bondi

September 8, 2025

Dear Attorney General Bondi,

We write once again to express our grave concern regarding the Department of Justice's recent actions that have effectively halted access to Violence Against Women Act (VAWA) grant funding due to the imposition of vague and burdensome certification requirements. Despite a bipartisan letter sent on April 24, 2025 — signed by more than 120 Members of Congress — the Department has yet to provide a formal response.¹

For more than three decades, VAWA has served as a cornerstone of our national effort to prevent and respond to domestic violence, sexual assault, dating violence, and stalking. The Office on Violence Against Women (OVW), charged with administering VAWA, has distributed critical funding to community organizations, law enforcement agencies, legal service providers, and victim support programs nationwide. These grants have saved lives and provided a lifeline for countless survivors. Under your leadership, however, the Department has issued two memoranda — commonly referred to as the “Bondi Memo” and the “Blanche Memo” — that fundamentally alter the grant certification process in a way that undermines both the letter and spirit of VAWA. The Bondi Memo tasks the Department's Civil Rights Division with investigating and eliminating undefined diversity criteria, yet fails to offer any clarity, definition, or legal grounding for such standard.²

Meanwhile, the Blanche Memo calls for sweeping, punitive use of the False Claims Act against grant recipients for alleged violations, including known violations of the “Bondi Memo”'s undefined criteria.³ Taken together, these memos create an environment that openly encourages private parties to file lawsuits against grantees based on undefined criteria, creating a pipeline for costly, reputation-damaging litigation that could chill participation in federal programs and divert resources away from their intended public purposes. The threat of federal investigation or civil enforcement — especially for small, under-resourced nonprofits — poses an unacceptable barrier to accessing funds that Congress has explicitly appropriated to serve survivors of gender-based violence.

As a result of the Department's actions, an assembly of seventeen state-level coalitions who work with domestic violence and sexual assault survivors filed suit, challenging these new restrictions tied to VAWA funding. In a twenty-seven-page decision, Senior District Judge William E. Smith of the U.S. District Court for the District of Rhode Island concluded that, “...on the present record, the Court can only conclude that the Office [OVW] engaged in a wholly under-reasoned and arbitrary process.”⁴

Equally troubling is the Department's recent proposal to reduce OVW's budget by nearly thirty percent and merge its functions into the Office of Justice Programs — a move directly at odds with congressional intent.⁵ In reauthorizing VAWA in 2022, Congress reaffirmed OVW's independent status and strengthened statutory protections to prevent such consolidation.⁶ As Judge Smith noted at the July 29 hearing, “...the public has an interest in the Executive respecting the Legislature's spending decisions.”⁷

During your confirmation hearing to become Attorney General, you made an unequivocal pledge to faithfully implement VAWA programs and ensure all Department-administered programs, including those at OVW, are executed effectively and in line with their congressional mandates. In your

response to written questions from Senator Hirono regarding OVW, you noted that, if confirmed as Attorney General, you would not only “...faithfully implement these programs,” but also “...ensure that all programs administered by the Department, **including those at OVW, are administered effectively and in accordance with their missions as enacted by Congress.**”⁸ The Department has a responsibility to uphold the commitments made by Congress under VAWA and to avoid placing critical support for survivors and their service providers at risk.

More recently, on June 26, 2025, during a hearing with the Senate Appropriations Committee, when asked by Senator Collins about this nearly 30 percent reduction in funding, you emphasized that “...**you have my word that we will do everything in our power to fight for victims of domestic violence throughout this country.**”⁹ It is imperative that you stand by your word.

We respectfully request that the Department immediately rescind the harmful certification requirements, reinstate all canceled grants, and work collaboratively with stakeholders — including those involved in the pending litigation — to restore funding and ensure continued access to essential services. The lives, safety, and well-being of survivors across the country depend on swift and decisive action.

We look forward to your timely response.

Sincerely,

1

<image002.png>

See Office of Congressman Josh Gottheimer, Release: 100+ Members Join Bipartisan Push to Restore Violence Against Women Act Funding (Apr. 24, 2025) <https://gottheimer.house.gov/posts/release-100-members-join-bipartisan-push-to-restore-violence-against-women-act-funding>.

2 Mem. from Att’y Gen. Pam Bondi, *Ending Illegal DEI and DEIA Discrimination Preferences* (Feb. 5, 2025), <https://perma.cc/KH9Y-A2VQ>.

3 Letter from Todd Blanche, Deputy Att’y Gen., to DOJ Offices, Divisions, and U.S. Attorneys (May 19, 2025), <https://perma.cc/3W6K-FGHA>.

4 Rhode Island Coal. Against Domestic Violence v. Bondi, No. 1:25-cv-00279, ECF No. 34 (D.R.I. Aug. 8, 2025).

5 Ryan Tarinelli, *White House Seeks to Diminish Office on Violence Against Women*, Roll Call (June 6, 2025), <https://rollcall.com/2025/06/06/white-house-seeks-to-diminish-office-on-violence-against-women/>.

6 See 34 U.S. Code § 10442

7 Alexander Castro, *Judge Temporarily Blocks DOJ Requirements for Domestic Violence Grants in PA. and other States*, Penn Capital-Star (Aug. 13, 2025), <https://penncapital-star.com/criminal-justice/r-i-federal-judge-temporarily-blocks-doj-grant-requirements-for-domestic-violence-services/>.

8 Pam Bondi, Responses to Questions for the Record at 82, Nomination Hearing to be Attorney General of the United States, Senate Judiciary Committee, 118th Cong. (Jan. 15, 2025), https://www.judiciary.senate.gov/imo/media/doc/2025-01-15_-_qfr_responses_-_bondi.pdf. (Emphasis Added) 9 U.S. Senate Comm. on Appropriations, Subcomm. on Commerce, Justice, Science, & Related Agencies, “A Review of the President’s Fiscal Year 2026 Budget Request for the Department of Justice,” hearing, June 25, 2025. <https://www.appropriations.senate.gov/hearings/a-review-of-the-presidents-fiscal-year-2026-budget-request-for-the-department-of-justice>

Opposing Recission of Funds for the Corporation for Public Broadcasting

Dear President Trump:

The Corporation for Public Broadcasting (CPB) is one of our nation's most vital community services. The CPB connects millions of Americans to emergency alerts, educational programming, trusted news, and local culture, often in places where no other outlets remain. It is for this reason, that we write with great concern following the passage of the Rescissions Act of 2025, which includes the elimination of CPB funding. This action jeopardizes the core infrastructure that allows local news stations to serve our communities and endanger the jobs of those who make that service possible.

Public broadcasting is not a luxury – it is a critical public service that delivers free, trusted, and local content to over 99% of Americans. In many rural and low-income areas, public broadcasting is not just one option among many; it is often the only reliable source for education, news, and essential community resources. The early signs are already clear: cutting CPB funding will have real and far-reaching consequences for communities across the country. Local programming will be lost, some stations will shut down, and thousands of union jobs could disappear. That kind of loss would accelerate the decline of local journalism and deepen the information gaps in communities already struggling to stay connected.

Moreover, public broadcasting serves as a critical lifeline during emergencies. Stations provide timely, reliable alerts and information that can save lives in times of natural disasters, severe weather, or other crises. These local outlets are deeply embedded in their communities and deliver reporting that is relevant and responsive to the unique needs of our constituents. Eliminating CPB funding risks weakening this vital community connection, leaving many Americans without access to trusted news sources precisely when they need them most. Taking that away doesn't just eliminate a service, it disconnects people from their communities and from each other.

Beyond its immediate harm to public broadcasting, the passage of this rescissions package sets a troubling precedent for the appropriations process. Retroactively clawing back funds that were already approved by Congress to serve partisan political purposes undermines the integrity of the regular, bipartisan budgeting process. This kind of maneuver could destabilize agencies, institutions, and workers who rely on a transparent, structured funding process.

Protecting CPB resources remains essential not only for preserving public media but also for safeguarding the principles of transparency and accountability. We respectfully call on the administration to work collaboratively to restore services offered under CPB and ensure that public broadcasting can continue fulfilling its indispensable mission for all communities across the country.

OMB on Backpay for Furloughed Federal Workers

[[DATE]]

The Honorable Russell Vought
Director
The Office of Management and Budget
725 17th Street, NW
Washington, DC 20503

Dear Director Vought:

The Office of Management and Budget's (OMB) recent update to the Frequently Asked Questions During a Lapse in Appropriations document implies that furloughed federal workers are not entitled to back pay. Additionally, a draft OMB memo stated the administration would deny back pay to furloughed federal workers for the current government shutdown.^[1] During the 2018-2019 shutdown, we worked with President Trump to enact the Government Employee Fair Treatment Act (GEFTA) of 2019, the intent of which is clear – federal employees are entitled to retroactive pay in the event of a government shutdown. We applauded President Trump for signing this bipartisan bill into law.

On January 16, 2019, the Senate unanimously passed the Government Employee Fair Treatment Act to guarantee back pay for all impacted federal workers once a government shutdown ends. This law was enacted during the longest government shutdown which lasted 35 days at the end of 2018, and into the beginning of 2019. Prior to the law's passage, Congress had to pass specific legislation after each shutdown to ensure furloughed workers received back pay.

Explicitly, the law guarantees back pay for all federal employees in the event of a government shutdown. "Each employee of the United States Government or of a District of Columbia public employer furloughed as a result of a covered lapse in appropriations shall be paid for the period of the lapse in appropriations, and each excepted employee who is required to perform work during a covered lapse in appropriations shall be paid for such work, at the employee's standard rate of pay, at the earliest date possible after the lapse in appropriations ends, regardless of scheduled pay dates, and subject to the enactment of appropriations Acts ending the lapse."^[2] The law requires that retroactive pay be required in the event of *any* government shutdown after December 22, 2018.

The law is clear: all impacted government employees, regardless of excepted or furloughed status, are entitled to back pay after a government shutdown ends, which is consistent with the guidance currently provided by federal agencies, including the Office of Personnel Management (OPM). OPM's shutdown guidance from September 2025 still states that furloughed federal

workers will be provided back pay once the government reopens.^[1] The decision by OMB to remove critical guidance on federal employee back pay is causing unnecessary stress for the federal workforce comprised of nearly 2.2 million employees.

Thus, we request you immediately clarify and update the Frequently Asked Questions During a Lapse in Appropriations Document and other relevant materials to affirm that furloughed employees will receive back pay, as is required by law.

[[CLOSING]]

[[SIGNATURES]]

^[1] Marc Caputo, Scoop: White House Memo Says Furloughed Federal Workers Aren't Entitled to Back Pay, Axios, October 7, 2025

^[2] 31 U.S. Code § 1341(c)(2)

^[3] Office of Personnel Management, Guidance for Shutdown Furloughs, September 28, 2025

Clean Energy Cancellations

The Honorable Chris Wright
Secretary
Department of Energy
1000 Independence Avenue, SW
Washington, D.C. 20585

October 7, 2025

Dear Secretary Wright:

We write to condemn the Department of Energy's (DOE) termination of 321 financial awards, supporting 223 projects supporting energy resilience across the country. We are deeply concerned about your Department's attempt to rebrand the elimination of U.S. clean energy as "\$7.56 billion in savings" to taxpayers and the potential political motivations behind the targeting of projects in Democratic-leaning states.

This decision is a reversal of properly awarded projects that will harm American jobs, drive private capital out of our country, weaken our power grid, and give China a strategic edge. This Administration's decision to play political games will result in genuine harm at a time when millions of American families are already struggling to pay their electricity bills amidst the everrising cost of living. These blatantly partisan cancellations must immediately be reversed.

The projects that the Department of Energy (DOE) has unilaterally decided to cancel were driving down costs for all our constituents—regardless of their political affiliation. Household electric bills have already increased 10% nationally since January 2025 and are poised to spike even further. This Administration's reckless energy policy and award terminations, designed to stifle the development of cheap clean energy and prop up more expensive dirty energy, will only further increase the cost burden for families to keep the lights on.

Your press statement claims these projects "did not adequately advance the nation's energy needs, were not economically viable, and would not provide a positive return on investment." That is a pretext for cancellations that track political talking points, not facts. Many of these awards had already passed rigorous review, and many of those had already been processed. Companies hired workers, signed contracts, broke ground, and put up private capital in reliance on DOE commitments. Calling that "savings" ignores stranded equipment orders, canceled subcontracts, and layoffs—real costs that ripple through American supply chains. Instead of executing Congress's direction to build U.S. energy leadership and grid reliability, DOE is moving the goalposts while terminating the very projects that would deliver results.

The consequences of these actions are significant: cancellations will shutter facilities, kill jobs, and stall critical domestic manufacturing. They also inject avoidable uncertainty into energy markets—forcing investors to consider political risks that you have created, which raises financing costs. Terminating grid and manufacturing projects locks in congestion and supply chain bottlenecks, which will lead to higher long-term electricity prices for households and businesses.

We are at a moment of unprecedented growth in electricity demand, which is expected to increase by 25% by 2030. At a time when more energy supply is needed than ever, these cuts will only exacerbate upward pressure on electricity prices by stranding low-cost supply, delaying grid expansion, and increasing reliance on higher-cost imports. In your confirmation hearing, you pledged to pursue “all sources of affordable, reliable energy” to meet these challenges. By terminating awards for cheap energy solutions and those that strengthen the grid, you are going against your word and worsening the very problem you promised to help solve.

Eliminating the Grid Deployment Office and Office of Clean Energy Deployment projects delays transmission and weakens grid resilience, a shortsighted decision that threatens even steeper increasing costs to American consumers and businesses in the future. Additionally, these so-called “savings” waste sunk federal and state dollars and betray disadvantaged communities by erasing critical work to reduce pollution and improve energy affordability.

Fifteen years ago, China generated less electricity than the United States. Today, China generates more than twice as much as we do—and the gap continues to grow.⁵ As China and other nations continue to innovate and build the energy technologies of the future, this is precisely the wrong time for the U.S. to back out and cede our technological leadership. The rest of the world will continue to innovate with or without us, and these grant terminations will only set our innovation back at a pivotal time.

It is difficult for us to believe that these project terminations were anything but a partisan targeting of states that are not politically aligned with this Administration. These terminations undermine the spirit of competitive, merit-based awards and throw into question the fairness of the award process under this Administration.

As such, we demand that DOE take the following immediate actions by Tuesday, October 14, 2025:

1. Suspend all terminations and de-obligations and reinstate the projects.
2. Provide a complete list of affected awards (office, recipient, state, award number, selection date, federal obligation, non-federal cost share, milestone status) along with the project-specific written justification for termination.
3. Identify the specific statutory and regulatory authorities relied upon for these mass postaward terminations.
4. Preserve and provide all Department of Energy records, memoranda, and communications related to the review and termination of these awards, including those resulting from the May 2025 Secretarial memorandum “Ensuring Responsibility for Financial Assistance.”
5. Describe DOE’s process for recipient appeals and dispute resolution, including timelines, decision-makers, and whether interim funding will be permitted to avoid waste while appeals are pending.

Dismantling America’s advanced-energy buildout under the banner of “savings” does not protect taxpayers—it subsidizes our competitors. It means higher bills and fewer American jobs. We will utilize every oversight and legislative tool available to ensure the DOE follows the law, honors congressional intent, and keeps the United States at the forefront of the global energy race.

Urging USDA to use SNAP Contingency Funds During Shutdown

Dear Madam Secretary,

Right now, millions of Americans are struggling to afford food due to the Administration's ill-conceived trade war. Just this year, we've seen household staples like eggs, coffee, and ground beef hit record high prices. Now more than ever, millions of families across the country depend upon the Supplemental Nutrition Assistance Program (SNAP) to make ends meet. For far too many veterans, seniors, and children, SNAP benefits are the difference between having food or not. Now, due to the government shutdown, they are facing crippling levels of uncertainty about whether they will be able to afford food next month.

A potential lapse in benefits would be felt by Americans of all ages and affect every corner and congressional district in the country. As the largest food assistance program in the United States, SNAP serves 42 million people. That includes 16 million children, 8 million seniors, 4 million people with disabilities, and 1.2 million veterans.

That is why we were deeply concerned to see your comments suggesting that SNAP will run out of funding in two weeks and that no SNAP benefits will be issued in November. USDA's shutdown plan acknowledges that "Congressional intent is evident that SNAP's operations should continue since the program has been provided with multi-year contingency funds..." USDA still has significant funding available in SNAP's contingency reserve – which Congress provides precisely for this reason – that can be used to fund the bulk of November benefits.

We urge USDA to use these funds for November SNAP benefits and issue clear guidance to states on how to navigate benefit issuance. Additionally, while the contingency reserve will not cover November benefits in full, we urge USDA to use its statutory transfer authority or any other legal authority at its disposal to supplement these dollars and fully fund November benefits.

There are clear steps the administration can and must take immediately to ensure that millions of families across the country can put food on their table in November. Choosing not to ensure SNAP benefits reach those in need this November would be a gross dereliction of your responsibilities to the American people. We appreciate your consideration of these requests.

Opposing the President's withholding of SNAP contingency funds during shutdown

The President
The White House
1600 Pennsylvania Avenue, NW
Washington, DC 20500

Dear Mr. President:

You are the first president in American history to withhold Supplemental Nutrition Assistance Program (SNAP) benefits from the American people. Across this country, millions of children, seniors, veterans, Americans with disabilities, and working families are going without food thanks to your administration's lawlessness and cruelty. Your refusal to issue November SNAP benefits in a timely manner – and now, your announcement that you are willfully ignoring a court order directing you to issue benefits – is immoral and illegal.

As we pointed out in a letter^[1] to the Secretary of Agriculture on October 24, 2025, your administration acknowledged in writing that “Congressional intent is evident that SNAP’s operations should continue since the program has been provided with multi-year contingency funds...”^[2] That guidance mysteriously disappeared from the United States Department of Agriculture’s (USDA) website and soon thereafter your administration announced you would not be issuing November benefits, prompting two lawsuits filed in federal court.^[3]^[4] In both instances, the court sided with the plaintiffs and ordered USDA to spend the contingency fund and to issue November SNAP benefits. Inexplicably and in defiance of the court order, you then announced via Truth Social that November benefits would not be going out, causing mass confusion among states and panic among working families.

Mr. President, what you are doing is unacceptable. You quickly came up with \$40 billion to bail out Argentina at the expense of American farmers, but when it comes to meeting the most basic needs of the American people – food – you refuse to lift a finger. You are purposely and shamefully taking food away from 42 million people who rely on SNAP benefits to survive by not sending out full November benefits, and you are now willfully and illegally ignoring a court order.

You have created tremendous chaos for regular, working people just trying to get by. Given the confusion your administration has created over the past several weeks as it relates to the issuance of November SNAP benefits, please respond to this letter by Monday, November 10, 2025 to 1) confirm you will follow the court orders issued on November 3, 2025 and issue November SNAP benefits; 2) explain why your administration will not issue full SNAP benefits; 3) provide a detailed timeline for when November SNAP benefits will be issued.

Opposing the reduction in force at the U.S. Department of Education during the shutdown

Secretary McMahon and Director Vought:

We write to you to share our deep opposition to your decision to lay off federal employees dedicated to the education and support of students with disabilities and their families. We demand that you immediately reverse course and rescind the termination notices that were sent to these workers.

On Friday, October 10th, 2025, remaining staff in the Department of Education's Office of Special Education and Rehabilitative Services (OSERS) appear to have been illegally fired. This includes employees in the Office of Special Education Programs (OSEP) and the Rehabilitative Services Administration (RSA), as well as the Office of Civil Rights (OCR) and the Office of Elementary and Secondary Education (OESE)¹. These firings, along with other decisions you have made that directly undermine special education, will have a devastating impact on the more than 7.5 million students with disabilities across the country and their families just one month before the 50th anniversary of the passage of the Individuals with Disabilities Education Act (IDEA).

Decimating these offices threatens accountability for special education and vocational rehabilitation funds, as well as the civil rights Congress has enshrined in federal law, at a time when schools nationwide are already struggling to meet the needs of students and when people with disabilities continue to face barriers to employment. Federal employees at OSERS play a key role in ensuring that federal dollars are spent appropriately and effectively to support students with disabilities. Without them, there will be no oversight to ensure that physically disabled students, blind/deaf children and teenagers, as well as students with dyslexia, autism, and other disabilities are receiving the free and appropriate public education they are guaranteed under the IDEA. Staff answer calls directly from families around the country seeking help in understanding their rights under federal disability law and support when those rights may have been violated. Because of your decision, those calls and questions will now go unanswered.

These reckless terminations are just another in a line of actions by your administration that threaten the rights that individuals with disabilities have fought long and hard for. We urge you to immediately rescind your plans to wrongly fire employees at the agencies listed above so that they can continue working to ensure that every family, no matter where they live or their income, has access to an education that will set them up for a successful future regardless of their child's disability.

We look forward to your response.

**Opposition to the Administration's decision to terminate the entire staff of the Treasury
Department's Community Development Financial Institutions (CDFI) Fund**

October 20, 2025

The Honorable Donald J. Trump
President of the United States
The White House
1600 Pennsylvania Avenue NW
Washington, D.C. 20500

Dear Mr. President:

We write to express deep concern over your Administration's decision to terminate the entire staff of the Treasury Department's Community Development Financial Institutions (CDFI) Fund—a move that jeopardizes the vital work of Native CDFIs and the Native communities they serve. Eliminating the office that administers capital to 69 Native-certified lenders threatens decades of progress in Native community and economic development.

For more than 30 years, the bipartisan-supported CDFI Fund has delivered capital to underserved communities through community banks, credit unions, loan funds, and venture capital funds. Established by Congress in 1994, the Fund supports financial institutions that provide credit and services to low-income and historically marginalized communities often overlooked by traditional banks. These 1,432 certified CDFIs operate nationwide—including in all 50 states, D.C., Guam, and Puerto Rico—offering critical financial access to consumers and small businesses in rural, urban, and Native communities.

Together, CDFIs manage over 19 million loans totaling more than \$300 billion. While individual institutions are relatively small—banks and credit unions typically hold around \$577 million and \$567 million in assets respectively, with loan funds averaging \$67.8 million—they consistently generate outsized impact. Every federal dollar invested leverages about \$8 in private and philanthropic capital, making this one of the highest-return federal economic development programs.

Native CDFIs are especially vital. Providing culturally informed lending, financial services, and technical assistance, they support Native-owned businesses, homeownership, infrastructure, and community facilities in Native communities and rural areas where traditional banking systems fall short. Since the Native American CDFI Assistance (NACA) Program began in 2001, over

\$221 million has been invested in Native CDFIs—unlocking more than \$1.6 billion in capital for Native communities. Though often small in size, their impact is transformative.

During the COVID-19 pandemic, CDFIs proved essential in delivering relief to underserved communities. After initial Paycheck Protection Program (PPP) loans favored large bank clients, Congress, working with the Trump Administration, allocated \$60 billion specifically to CDFIs and community lenders to ensure equitable distribution. Subsequently, \$12 billion in capital investments and grants for CDFIs and Minority Depository Institutions (MDIs) was authorized to boost lending by an estimated \$130 billion over the next decade. Additionally, the State Small Business Credit Initiative (SSBCI) provided \$10 billion to support small business financing through institutions including CDFIs.

We recognize and support your Administration’s goals to empower entrepreneurs, revitalize rural America, and attract private capital to historically underserved areas. These facts make clear that the CDFI Fund is a proven, cost-effective engine for economic empowerment. Yet, the Reduction-In-Force at the CDFI Fund—combined with the proposed elimination of NACA in the FY 2026 budget and the withholding of 86 percent of FY 2025 NACA funds—undermines those objectives. Without a staffed CDFI Fund, Native-serving institutions cannot be certified, manage awards, or plan for growth, jeopardizing the program’s success and undermining generations of progress in strengthening Native and rural economies.

Therefore, we respectfully urge your Administration to:

1. Reverse the reduction-in-force and reinstate full staffing at the CDFI Fund so it can resume its critical functions; and
2. Obligate all NACA funds already appropriated by Congress, including the \$28 million currently being withheld by OMB, to ensure existing and future projects are not stalled or abandoned.

Native communities are seeking access to the same financial tools and opportunities that support growth and prosperity in other parts of the country. We remain hopeful your Administration will continue to support the institutions that make this possible. We stand ready to work with you to restore and strengthen the CDFI Fund’s ability to serve Native and rural communities, ensuring these proven, high-impact programs continue delivering results where they are needed most.

Sincerely,

[[SIGNATURES]]

**Rescind widescale Reduction in Force (RIF) termination notices sent to the Impact Aid Program
(IAP) Office staff**

[[DATE]]

The Honorable Linda McMahon
Secretary of Education
United States Department of Education
400 Maryland Avenue, SW
Washington, DC 20002
The Honorable Russell Vought
Director
Office of Management and Budget
1650 17th Street, NW
Washington, DC 20006

Dear Secretary McMahon and Director Vought:

We demand that you rescind the widescale reduction in force (RIF) termination notices sent to federal employees dedicated to supporting the Impact Aid Program (IAP) Office at the Department of Education (ED).

The Impact Aid program was signed into law by President Harry Truman in 1950 and has enjoyed the broad, bipartisan support of local school districts, Congressional leaders, and military leaders in the decades since. It is based on the principle that the children of military service members should have equal access to high quality public education in the communities and school districts that their parents serve. This obligation to provide education to the children of service members dates back in one form or other to General George Washington's service in the Revolutionary War. It is one of the only major federal education programs that is not forward funded, meaning that funds are used in real time to pay staff and keep schools operating. Impact Aid is disbursed to over 1,000 school districts across the country, and it reaches nearly 8 million students.¹

As you know, public schools are funded through state and local property taxes. However, in school districts where there is a significant amount of federal land, schools lose funding because federal lands are exempt from paying state and local property taxes. School districts that have military installations, Indian Trust and Treaty lands, federal low-rent housing facilities, Veterans Affairs facilities, national parks, and other U.S. government-owned properties located within their bounds miss out on thousands of taxpayer revenue every year, and Impact Aid helps to fill these gaps.

We are seeking clarification on how ED plans to support school districts reliant on Impact Aid following the recent mass Reduction in Force (RIF) at the U.S. Department of Education, issued by Director Vought on October 10, 2025.² Major staffing changes and potential disruptions in program funding will adversely impact the educational outcomes of all students. Impact Aid dollars are especially necessary for our nation's military families. Additionally, while supplemental Department of Defense Education Activity (DoDEA) Impact Aid is distributed

1 <https://www.nafisdc.org/wp-content/uploads/2025/03/Impact-Aid-Overview-Infographic-FY25.pdf>

2 <https://x.com/russvought/status/1976686105199268177>

separately, DoDEA relies on data provided by the Federal Impact Aid Program at the Department of Education.³

We demand a reversal of the RIF notices that would affect the Impact Aid Program Office's ability to disburse funds to Local Education Agencies across the country.

Additionally, we request answers to the following questions:

1.

How many total staff are currently employed at the Impact Aid Program Office?

a.

How many staff were furloughed on or after October 1, 2025

b.

How many Impact Aid staff received RIF notices after October 1, 2025?

c.

Who is overseeing the Office/Program in their absence?

2.

FY 2027 grant applications have a deadline of January 31, 2026.

a.

Where should school districts direct requests for technical assistance given the RIFs and current government shutdown?

b.

Does the Department of Education plan on extending the application deadline to account for current closures?

3.

How does the Department of Education plan to ensure the Impact Aid Program can continue to perform its full duties once the 60-day transition period for noticed employees passes?

4.

How does the Department of Education plan to comply with the temporary restraining order issued by San Francisco U.S. District Court Judge Susan Yvonne Illston?⁴

We look forward to your prompt response and explanation of how Impact Aid will continue to serve its important mission for students across the country.

[[CLOSING]]

[[SIGNATURES]]

3 <https://www.dodea.edu/education/partnership-and-resources/dod-impact-aid>

4 https://storage.courtlistener.com/recap/gov.uscourts.cand.457131/gov.uscourts.cand.457131.56.0_1.pdf

Letter to OMB expresses concerns surrounding agency communications regarding backpay

Director Russell Vought
Office of Management and Budget
725 17th St. NW
Washington, DC 20503

November 10, 2025

Dear Director Vought,

We are writing with deep and urgent concern about reports that certain federal agencies have sent communications to their employees implying that they may not receive back pay when the government shutdown ends. Scores of furloughed federal workers who are already struggling to pay their bills are now reaching out to our congressional offices about these notices, worried that now they will never be made whole.

We urge you to immediately clarify that all federal government employees, including those who are furloughed, will receive back pay after the shutdown in strict accordance with federal law, and provide us with additional information on why furloughed employees are receiving these deceptive communications from federal agencies across the U.S. government that seem to imply otherwise.

Congress passed the Government Employee Fair Treatment Act in 2019 by voice vote in the Senate and in a nearly unanimous vote in the House, with just seven House members voting against the legislation. President Trump signed the bill in a celebratory signing ceremony in the Oval Office on the very same day the bill passed the House. This Act leaves no room for ambiguity: “Each employee of the United States Government ... furloughed as a result of a covered lapse in appropriations shall be paid for the period of the lapse in appropriations... at the employee’s standard rate of pay, at the earliest date possible after the lapse in appropriations ends, regardless of scheduled pay dates, and subject to the enactment of appropriations Acts ending the lapse.” Back pay is guaranteed by federal law to all federal employees, including furloughed workers.

Yet furloughed federal employees continue to receive these confusing and alarming communications regarding back pay. At agencies including the National Institutes of Health, Department of Health and Human Services, Department of Defense, and Department of Commerce, federal workers received an initial furlough notice at the beginning of October which included language specifying they would receive back pay. But just a few days ago these same employees were asked to acknowledge a renewed furlough notice that extended the expected duration of the furlough yet removed all references to back pay. Other agencies provided even more confounding communications. One message sent to federal employees added a sentence to their original furlough message, saying “Once an appropriation or continuing resolution is

enacted, excepted employees are entitled to receive payment.” At the State Department, notices issued before and during the shutdown never included assurances that furloughed workers would get paid. Equally concerning is that some furloughed federal workers recently reported that their agencies placed them on “leave without pay” status without their notice or consent. This likely illegal move could threaten these workers’ back pay and affect their annual leave and benefits calculations.

According to public reporting, it seems the Administration is also opposed to following the law. On November 4, White House press secretary Karoline Leavitt said regarding back pay for furloughed workers “this is something we are very much open to discussing with Democrats as part of the discussions about the continuing resolution to keep the government open....And it’s something that Republicans are talking with Democrats about right now.” Yet back pay is in fact non- negotiable because it is guaranteed by law in a statute the President himself signed.

We urge you to immediately clarify that back pay is guaranteed by law for furloughed workers, and we demand full information surrounding what has already been communicated to the federal workforce regarding back pay. Please send written responses to the following questions by no later than November 14, 2025.

1. Was the decision to remove references to back pay in furlough renewal notices and other communications government-wide?
2. Did OMB provide guidance to agencies that directed or encouraged them to remove references to back pay in the furlough renewal notices and in other communications with furloughed employees? Did OMB provide guidance to agencies encouraging them to place furloughed workers on “leave without pay” status?
3. Please provide an action plan, including a timeline, on how you intend to clarify for furloughed workers that they are guaranteed back pay.

We strongly reject you sadistically threatening federal employees as they struggle to afford groceries and housing costs. As costs skyrocket across the country, we urge you to stop using federal workers as political props and realign your actions with federal law.

Sincerely,

[[SIGNATURES]]

**Call the House back into session to consider the Senate-passed bipartisan resolutions
terminating the emergencies declared to justify President Trump's tariffs on Brazil,
Canada and other global trading partners**

November 17, 2025

The Honorable Mike Johnson Speaker
U.S. House of Representatives
H-232, The Capitol
Washington, DC 20515

Dear Speaker Johnson,

We urge you to allow for consideration of the three bipartisan resolutions that passed the Senate during the week of October 27th, which would terminate national emergencies declared by the Trump Administration to impose tariffs on Brazil, Canada, and numerous other countries. As these tariffs, which are likely illegal, continue to make life more expensive for workers, families, farmers, and small businesses, we have heard repeated calls from our constituents to take action to mitigate the harmful impacts of President Trump's chaotic trade policies. Our constituents elected us to work on behalf of the American people, but prior to yesterday, you chose to keep the House in an unprecedented recess for nearly eight weeks straight. Now that you have finally ended this protracted recess, we implore you to allow for swift action to repeal these harmful tariffs.

As you know, the Senate passed S.J.Res.81, S.J.Res.77, and S.J.Res.88 with bipartisan support. These resolutions would undo the tariffs President Trump has placed on Brazil, Canada, and other global trading partners, consistent with Congress' constitutional authority to levy new taxes. While the Senate has reasserted its constitutional authority, under your leadership, the House has ceded control to the President and abdicated its responsibility to the American people. Although you have blocked any similar resolutions from coming to the floor under privileged consideration through March 2026, we urge you to reconsider your position as these tariffs threaten to ravage the American economy. It is essential that each member of Congress has the opportunity to show their constituents where they stand on this critical issue and that is only possible if you allow for a vote on the House floor.

As the federal government emerges from the longest shutdown in history – due to Republicans' refusal to protect health care for millions of Americans – it is time to show the American people that we are serious about lowering costs. President Trump's tariffs are causing chaos in the economy and exacerbating the affordability crisis facing our country today. We cannot afford to wait any longer to take action. You have the opportunity to take a concrete step toward ending

this manufactured crisis by allowing these bipartisan resolutions to come to the House floor. We urge you to do so expeditiously.

Thank you for your attention to this important issue.

Sincerely,

Letter to FEMA on FY 2026 Nonprofit Security Grant Program (NSGP) Awards

Dear Secretary Noem and Mr. Richardson:

We write to you out of shared concern about the status of the Fiscal Year (FY) 2025 Nonprofit Security Grant Program (NSGP) awards.

FEMA was required by law to publish the FY 2025 Notice of Funding Opportunity (NOFO) for NSGP by May 14, 2025, but chose not to comply.^[1] The administration finally released the FY 2025 NSGP NOFO on July 28, but it lacked basic information necessary to move the application process forward and to fruition, such as when FEMA planned to administer the application process, make award decisions, and release funding to nonprofit organizations. To date, FEMA still has not shared this information with States or nonprofit organizations, nor has FEMA indicated whether the period of performance for awarded projects has already begun. States have repeatedly asked FEMA for this information, and they have received no response. This has also created a chilling effect on faith-based and nonprofit organizations that are hesitant to participate in an opaque application process. We understand that FEMA plans to continue to withhold the \$275 million in FY 2025 NSGP funds and, prior to the government shutdown, awards for nonprofit organizations were scheduled to take several months. Further, FEMA continues to disregard the congressionally mandated outreach, engagement, and educational assistance to advise nonprofits on how to apply for NSGP.^[2] As of the date of this letter, FEMA has not held a single webinar to advise nonprofits on how to apply for these needed funds. Because of FEMA's delays and lack of coordination and communication with States, many States have already opened and closed the application period for nonprofit organizations, meaning that any outreach from FEMA at this point would be too late. Other States have not opened the application process and have not communicated with faith-based and nonprofit stakeholders, leaving the process and the potential applicants in limbo.

In addition, FEMA's FY 2025 NOFO introduced vague, new requirements and conditions that have created confusion among States and nonprofits, leaving applicants uncertain about whether their proposals would be qualified or disqualified for funding and what constituted compliance in order to receive payments from FEMA. For example, the NOFO includes language implying that eligibility for funding could depend on cooperation with Federal immigration enforcement efforts—a significant departure from past practice. FEMA also now requires States to collect and submit additional information about each nonprofit organization before awards can be made and each time nonprofits need to be reimbursed—steps that could significantly slow the process for both States and nonprofits and add undue administrative costs and burden. Such provisions have created concern that faith-based and community organizations might not be able to receive timely reimbursements from FEMA, if they receive any reimbursement at all, discouraging them further from applying for funds.

We are also deeply concerned by reports that DHS may be discriminating against Muslim organizations. In August 2025, DHS reportedly cancelled NSGP funding that had been awarded to over 40 Muslim organizations and banned their eligibility for future funding, citing “alleged affiliations with terrorist activities.”^[3] More recent reporting indicates that these cancellations may have been part of a broader attempt by DHS leadership to ban FEMA funding for all Muslim organizations.^[4] DHS has not presented evidence sufficient to justify disqualifying these organizations from receiving grant funding.^[5]

We are alarmed that the administration has not awarded the \$275 million that Congress made available for NSGP in FY 2025 given the escalating threats that nonprofit organizations—including synagogues, churches, and mosques—continue to experience. This delay comes at a time when our Nation continues to see nonprofits targeted by bad actors, which the NOFO itself acknowledges. In August, a Minneapolis Catholic Church was the

site of a mass shooting that left 2 children dead and injured 21 other people.^[6] In September, a man opened fire and set ablaze a Church of Jesus Christ of Latter-day Saints in Grand Blanc, Michigan, killing 4 people and wounding 8.^[7] Now is not the time for NSGP resources to be withheld from communities, nor the NOFO and grant guidance to continue to remain incomplete.

In further departure from precedent, the administration has yet to share with Congress which nonprofits received NSGP awards from the National Security Supplemental funding, despite awards having been made months ago and repeated bipartisan requests. Congress has invested historic levels in NSGP and the administration's refusal to share information with Congress hurts the ability of Congress to properly assess resource needs.

Therefore, we urge DHS and FEMA to take the following actions:

1. Immediately clarify the timeline for the FY 2025 NSGP applications, address all other open issues or incomplete grant guidance to the State Administrative Agencies and nonprofit sub-applicants, and expedite application completion and awards to nonprofits.
2. Immediately remove the vague NOFO requirements that unduly burden States and nonprofit organizations and may ultimately prevent nonprofits from accessing funds.
3. Immediately provide Congress with the full list of nonprofits that received NSGP awards this year and continue to provide this information each time awards are made in the future.
4. Immediately begin outreach, engagement, and educational assistance to nonprofits to share essential information about the NSGP application process.
5. Immediately rescind any guidance or directives that have resulted, or could result, in violations of anti-discrimination laws within NSGP.

FEMA must take immediate steps to get the FY 2025 NSGP back on track so that FY 2026 can proceed without the present delays, inconsistencies and uncertainties, and lack of uniformity and predictability that have previously been the hallmarks and guiderails for a program serving several thousand faith-based and nonprofit applicants each grant cycle. The Administration's own budget for FY 2026 endorsed continued NSGP funding, reflecting a shared commitment to keeping communities safe and ensuring funds reach those who need them most.

Letter to Secretary Rubio to continue supporting aid to Gaza and requests clarity on the plan to get aid to Palestinian civilians

Dear Mr. Secretary:

Two years after Hamas' brutal attack on Israel on October 7, we are encouraged by the ceasefire announced on October 8, 2025, and urge all parties to embrace this opportunity to create lasting peace and security in the region. While we welcome the news that humanitarian aid is entering Gaza after the October 8 ceasefire agreement, we seek clarity on your plan to ensure desperately needed humanitarian aid reaches Palestinian civilians in Gaza.

After over two years, there remains an insufficient supply of food, water, baby formula, medicine, and other essential humanitarian supplies needed to support life for Palestinian civilians in Gaza. People are dying of starvation, including over 100 children since the start of the war,¹ with an additional 320,000 children at risk of acute malnutrition.² At the end of August, the Integrated Food Security Phase Classification Famine Review Committee found that there is a famine in Gaza.³ As a condition of the ceasefire agreement from January 19 to March 2, 2025, approximately 600 trucks carrying aid entered Gaza daily.⁴ However, between March 2 and late May 2025, the Netanyahu government barred all aid from entering Gaza.⁵ Then, in late May, Prime Minister Netanyahu's government created a new system to deliver aid through the Gaza Humanitarian Foundation (GHF) with funding from the Trump administration.⁶ GHF failed to provide the same level of aid delivered during the earlier ceasefire.⁷

Since July 20, 2025, Prime Minister Netanyahu's government has allowed UN-coordinated aid to enter Gaza on a more regular basis.⁸ Over 45,000 metric tons of aid entered Gaza in the last month, allowing over 100 community kitchens to operate.⁹ But, there have been several instances of aid being diverted before they reach their destination, reducing the aid available to civilians in Gaza.¹⁰

The lives of innocent civilians, including children, are at risk each day that sufficient aid is not immediately surged into Gaza. While it is progress that additional truckloads of aid have entered Gaza in the last month, recent data suggests more work is needed. From September 1 to 28, less than 26% of the food supplies required to meet the basic humanitarian needs of civilians in Gaza was delivered.¹¹

We are encouraged that more aid is being delivered following the recent ceasefire agreement, and we urge that aid distribution to be conducted by reputable international institutions. We hope that amidst the challenges of maintaining the ceasefire, there remains a robust commitment between all parties involved to continuing the flow of aid

into Gaza. However, several questions remain about the implementation of this ceasefire and the State Department's plan to increase humanitarian aid into Gaza for civilians.

Therefore, we request that you provide answers to the following questions no later than DATE, 2025:

1. What steps is the State Department taking to ensure that sufficient levels of humanitarian aid immediately enter Gaza once the ceasefire begins?
2. How will the State Department partner with reputable international institutions to bring humanitarian aid into Gaza?
3. Will the State Department work with the UN, UN agencies, and the Red Crescent, and other nongovernmental organizations with programming in Gaza? Please explain whether the State Department plans to continue working with the GHF or any other organizations connected to the Israeli government to distribute aid and how the State Department plans to work with international agencies.
4. As originally proposed by President Trump, how will the State Department determine what qualifies as "full aid" to Gaza?¹²
5. As originally proposed by President Donald Trump, how will the State Department ensure that at least 600 truckloads of humanitarian aid a day, as required by the January 19, 2025, agreement, are entering Gaza?¹³ And, how will the State Department ensure that there is no effort to limit the aid to the minimum amount allowed?
6. How will the State Department ensure that there is not only a sufficient amount but also a proper combination of humanitarian aid, such as food, water, baby formula, medicine, and housing supplies, to meet the needs of Palestinian civilians in Gaza?
7. How will the State Department ensure that civilians in Gaza can safely access the aid provided under this agreement?
8. How will the State Department ensure that there is no diversion of the aid intended for civilians in Gaza under this agreement?

Thank you for your time and attention to this matter. The State Department must continue to demand that humanitarian aid be allowed into Gaza for Palestinian civilians and must have a plan to ensure this goal is swiftly achieved. We urge you to do all possible to ensure civilians in Gaza are protected and provided with desperately needed humanitarian aid.

Letter to BOP Director Urging Reinstatement of Recently Cancelled Union Collective Bargaining Agreement

Dear Director Marshall:

We write to express deep concern regarding the recent cancellation of the collective bargaining agreement (CBA) between the Bureau of Prisons (BOP) and its employees represented by the American Federation of Government Employees Council of Prison Locals 33. This action is an unjustified attack on the rights of dedicated public servants who work in one of the most challenging and demanding professions in federal service, and we urge you to swiftly restore these workers' collective bargaining rights.

Correctional officers and BOP employees put their safety on the line every day to protect our communities. Given the high-stress and dangerous work environments, it is highly concerning that the BOP chose to terminate this CBA because it provided protection for workers. Specifically, the CBA ensured fair treatment, due process, a safe workplace, and a voice. BOP's termination of this CBA undermines morale, weakens institutional accountability, and jeopardizes the safety and security of both staff and inmates.

Union representation at the BOP has long contributed to safer working conditions, improved staffing protocols, and better training. These protections enhance public safety, as well as help to retain experienced staff, reduce costly turnover, and minimize the need for excessive overtime. Furthermore, the union plays a proactive role in preventing workplace disputes, injuries, and potential legal liabilities—promoting efficiency and transparency within the agency.

We urge the BOP to immediately restore this union contract and reinstate vital collective bargaining rights that are essential to the safety, fairness, and stability of the federal prison system. Protecting the rights of federal workers is not just about honoring their service, it is about upholding the integrity of the institutions they serve. We look forward to your prompt attention to this matter and commitment to restoring the full collective bargaining rights of BOP employees.

Letter to CDC Director Regarding Acceptance of Advisory Committee on Immunization Practices September 2025 Vaccine Recommendations

Dear Acting Director O'Neill,

We write to express our serious concerns regarding the recent acceptance of the Advisory Committee on Immunization Practices' (ACIP) September 2025 vaccine recommendations and the broader erosion of scientific integrity and trust in the Centers for Disease Control and Prevention's (CDC) vaccine recommendation process.

Patients, parents, and health care providers deserve clear, evidence-based guidance they can trust. Instead, ACIP experts have been replaced with unvetted and unqualified vaccine skeptics whose recent actions have fueled confusion, undermined public confidence in vaccines, and threatened the health of all Americans. At the same time, the recent round of unjustified CDC staff layoffs and the subsequent rehiring of these experts has only further eroded confidence in your agency's leadership and decision-making. Now, amid the worst measles outbreak since 2000, when the disease had been considered eliminated in the U.S., the CDC's recent actions are making the vaccine-preventable crisis even worse. These actions jeopardize the well-being of the American people, especially our most vulnerable children and seniors.

When the ACIP convened on September 18th to review scientific data and vaccine recommendations, the Committee instead undermined its own process standards. It failed to provide adequate notice of agenda items, presented unfounded and biased data, displayed visible confusion from members on policies and implications of their votes, and abandoned the Grading of Recommendations, Assessment, Development, and Evaluation (GRADE) methodology. Equally troubling was the Committee's silencing of CDC experts and the exclusion of liaison representatives from medical groups directly responsible for patient care.

The panel's departure from using sound, reliable data, opting instead to cherry-pick selective studies in forming its guidance, poses a serious risk to public health. The American people deserve recommendations grounded in transparency and comprehensive evidence-based analysis. Anything less risks diminishing public trust in the CDC's role as the gold standard for public health guidance.

Several states and medical societies have begun issuing their own guidance, reflecting a loss of confidence in the ACIP's ability to provide science-based recommendations. This erosion of trust risks producing a fragmented state-by-state approach to immunization policy; a patchwork that leaves gaps in protection and undermines efforts to safeguard American children and families.

Pediatricians, schools, and parents are placed in the impossible position of navigating conflicting guidance, which increases the risk of outbreaks of vaccine preventable diseases, unnecessary hospitalizations, and deaths. The CDC itself estimates that routine childhood vaccinations will have prevented approximately 508 million cases of illness, 32 million hospitalizations, and

1,129,000 deaths over 2 decades.

This breakdown in process and consistency is especially troubling as we are entering the respiratory viral season, and COVID-19 remains a serious public health threat. No compelling evidence was presented to justify shifting from a broad COVID-19 vaccination recommendation to a shared clinical-decision making approach. The American Academy of Pediatrics (AAP), American Medical Association (AMA), and the Infectious Diseases Society of America (IDSA) have all raised grave concerns that these changes could limit vaccine access, delay protection, and narrow families' choices in health care.⁵

To recommit to its role as a trusted, evidence-driven authority and to ensure that future vaccine recommendations uphold scientific integrity and public confidence, we respectfully urge that the CDC:

- Reinstate all 17 ACIP members that were fired without justification on June 9th, 2025, ensuring that any new members are properly vetted for conflicts of interest and are committed to upholding scientific integrity.
- Recommit to transparency and scientific rigor in the ACIP process by providing adequate notice of agenda items, ensuring full participation of CDC experts and liaison representatives in working groups and public meeting discussions, and continuing to utilize standardized methodologies such as GRADE.
- Provide clear, evidence-based communication to both health care providers and the public regarding the recently accepted ACIP recommendations, to support informed decision-making and maintain public trust in the CDC as the nation's leading authority on public health guidance.

National Housing Emergency

Dear President Trump:

Access to affordable housing is critical for our nation's long-term success. For too long, rising home prices and rents have kept home ownership out of reach for teachers, nurses, firefighters, and millions of other Americans, forcing families to choose between saving for their children's education, affording needed healthcare, and keeping a roof over their heads.

These heartbreaking financial decisions have meant too many families have given up on the American dream, an America where any child can grow up to have a better future than their parents. That is why the New Democrat Coalition has for years called for policies to make owning a home more accessible for more Americans by building more affordable housing, improving availability of capital for homebuyers, and lowering overall housing costs. We write to urge your administration to take immediate action to increase affordable housing production and lower housing costs for Americans.

Past comments from the Secretary of the Treasury indicate that the administration is planning to declare a "national housing emergency" to address the rising costs of housing. We need more than declarations and hollow promises. We agree with the Secretary's comments that this is an "all hands on deck" challenge and believe there are concrete steps the Administration and Congress should take to meet this ongoing crisis. However, details on actual policies that would expand affordable housing options have not been provided. In fact, recently announced policies at the Department of Housing and Urban Development would do the opposite, and reverse progress made in fighting homelessness and go against Congressional instruction.

There are numerous existing policy actions within your authority that you and your administration can act on today, to help build more housing and lower the cost of buying, renting, or selling a home. We urge your administration to take concrete steps to tackle the housing crisis by focusing on proven and practical solutions, including:

Reverse the proposed cuts and changes to the Department of Housing and Urban Development's (HUD) Continuum of Care Program announced on November 13, 2025, which puts 170,000 people at immediate risk of homelessness.

Develop best practices for zoning and land-use policies, including model codes at the HUD in consultation with agencies such as the Department of Transportation and Department of Commerce, which will help a teacher afford to live in the same community where she works, rather than commuting two hours each day.

Prioritize federal funds for projects that include planning, permitting, and zoning reforms to promote more streamlined development, including updating grant criteria to reward jurisdictions with simplified codes, which will help cut through the red tape that adds tens of thousands of dollars in costs to every new home.

Update Federal Housing Administration (FHA) mortgage disclosures to include Department of Veteran Affairs' (VA) Home Loans alongside FHA and conventional loan options to maximize transparency, which will show veterans that VA loans often offer better terms than conventional options—ensuring our service members aren't missing out on benefits they've earned.

Improve data collection efforts at the Census Bureau and HUD to better understand how and where housing is being lost and not replaced so Congress and the Administration can respond urgently when a community loses 100 affordable units and only builds back 20.

Exempt housing construction materials from tariffs to lower construction costs by thousands of dollars per home, savings that developers can pass directly to homebuyers.

Enhance data transparency by requiring the Federal Housing Finance Agency, HUD, VA, and Department of Agriculture to release public loan-level appraisal data that identifies lenders and appraisers, but protects homeowner privacy, ensuring that a family's zip code or last name doesn't determine whether they can get a fair mortgage.

Provide significant funding anti-discrimination programs at HUD to ensure that all Americans can buy, rent, or sell homes at fair prices, which safeguard all Americans, regardless of race, religion, gender, disability, or marriage status.

The housing crisis demands specific action with real impact. We strongly encourage your administration to work collaboratively with Congress to implement these measures and other forward-looking policies to address the nation's housing challenges. By pursuing these practical reforms, we can deliver real results for American families while respecting constitutional limits and building the bipartisan consensus necessary for lasting solutions.

Advancing Markets for Producers Initiative Timeline

Dear Mr. Vaden:

Thank you for your September 5, 2025, letter responding to a request for clarification on the Advancing Markets for Producers (AMP) initiative, which was sent on May 5, 2025.

Your letter states that amendments to Partnership for Climate Smart Commodities (PCSC) agreements are being reviewed on a rolling basis and that projects will receive payments once their project-description amendments to meet USDA's new AMP guidelines are executed. You also stated that execution of amendments were expected by September 30, 2025.

Our understanding is that projects are still waiting for USDA to process their amendments. The lengthy delay in the transition to AMP presents significant challenges for producers who have been waiting for months for USDA to approve their project amendments. Many have been forced to lay off staff and stall projects, which is especially frustrating for producers working diligently to meet the new AMP requirements and resume their conservation work.

While we understand that the lapse in federal appropriations beginning October 1, 2025, may have affected USDA's ability to process amendments during the government shutdown, we strongly urge USDA to move swiftly to execute project amendments now that the federal government has resumed operations. We respectfully request a written update by no later than December 8, 2025, on USDA's progress in processing project amendments and a timeline for when producers can expect amendments to be executed and payments to resume.

Producers across the country are eager to restart their important work under the new AMP initiative. We appreciate your partnership to ensure program participants have the information and support they need to swiftly move forward with their projects.

Sincerely,

Short Timelines for Continuums of Care

Dear Secretary Turner:

We write to express our deepest concerns regarding the timing of the fiscal year 2025 (FY25) funding competition for the Continuum of Care (CoC) Program and its impact on the continuation of housing services for more than 750,000 veterans, unaccompanied youth, people with disabilities, those fleeing domestic violence and other struggling Americans served through this program nationally. On November 13, 2025, the Department of Housing and Urban Development (HUD) issued the long-awaited Notice of Funding Opportunity (NOFO) for the FY25 CoC Program grant cycle, which provides 60 calendar days for applicants to submit their application to the Department, with an application closing date of January 14, 2026, and an anticipated award date of May 1, 2026. Concurrently, nearly \$3.7 billion in CoC grants awarded nationally during the FY24 cycle will begin expiring on December 31, 2025. The timing of the FY25 CoC NOFO represents the most delayed issuance of a NOFO for the CoC Program over the last 10 years, and consequentially, will result in the most prolonged funding gap for this critical homelessness prevention program.

While we support a competitive process that allows applicants to complete their applications within a reasonable amount of time; since 2016, the average time HUD has historically allowed for applicants to complete the CoC Program application is approximately 80 calendar days, with competition deadlines concluding no later than November of the respective calendar year in which the competition was held. The only exception to this precedent was in FY21, during which the first Trump administration requested for Congress to not subject the FY20 CoC funding cycle to competition given the time constraints of completing a NOFO during a Presidential transition year, which Congress ultimately adopted in section 419 of division L of the Consolidated Appropriations Act of 2021 (P.L. 116-260). Building on this precedent, section 166 of S.2882/H.R. 5450, if enacted, would have prevented a delay in awarding FY25 CoC funding in an effort to prevent a gap in services. We believe that the timing of the issuance of the NOFO, combined with major policy changes for the FY25 competition, will cause major disruptions to homeless services at the local level through the Winter and into Spring 2026, threatening housing assistance for at least 170,000 people currently served through the CoC Program.

We urge the Department to strongly reconsider the feasibility of completing the new FY25 CoC competition in a fair and timely manner without causing major disruptions to the program beginning January 1, 2026. We respectfully request the Department submit to the House Committee on Appropriations no later than November 28, 2025, a list of all CoC grants that will expire between December 31, 2025-December 31, 2026, including the grant award amount, project type and CoC location. We also request the number of staff assigned to the Departmental review of the FY25 applications, the expected date(s) for executing grant agreements, and timing of when FY25 grantees would begin obligating funds.

These grants serve as a lifeline for more than 400 communities across the country and we are prepared to work with you to help ensure resources appropriated by this Congress continue to serve those most in need without delay.

We appreciate your attention to this critical and timely matter.
Sincerely,

Relief for Small and Medium-Sized Farmers, Family Farmers and Specialty Crop Farmers

Dear President Trump,

Farmers and working families are struggling to make ends meet right now. The trade war is driving up costs for Americans in every corner of the country, pushing too many to the brink. Families are facing historically high grocery prices and exponentially more expensive healthcare. Farmers are grappling with rising input costs and production expenses for fertilizer, seeds, fuel, and equipment, low crop prices and declining profit margins, labor shortages, and high land costs and limited land access. The combination of these factors threatens farmers' survival and viability, particularly small farms, medium farms, family farms, and specialty crop farms across the United States. These farmers and working families need relief now.

A new U.S. Department of Agriculture (USDA) forecast shows farm production expenses increasing by \$12 billion compared to last year, up to \$467.40 billion. Current input price hikes are expected for seed, chemicals, custom operations, and repairs and maintenance. Many fertilizers have seen sharp price increases; for example, gulf diammonium phosphate prices rose from about \$583 per ton in January to nearly \$800 in August, a 36 percent increase in less than eight months. Small and family farmers feel the burden of high input costs and production expenses, exacerbated by limited access to credit and less bargaining power to negotiate better prices and production contracts.

No farmer should lose land, and no farm should be lost as a result of recent economic volatility. Meanwhile, the United States lost more than 140,000 farms between 2017 and 2022, and more than 2,000 acres of farmland are paved over or otherwise developed every single day. During this same period, Texas lost nearly 18,000 farms, Oklahoma lost 8,153 farms, and Missouri lost 7,433 farms. Specialty crop states like Maine lost 564 farms and Connecticut, 460 farms. An alarming trend across specialty crop states in New England – 80 percent of farmland has been lost over the last 60 years.

This is a crisis, and it is worsening every day. If your Administration moves forward with plans to provide economic relief to large farmers suffering due to high input costs and lost export markets, you must not forget about small and medium-sized farms, family farms, and specialty crop farmers. These farmers are vital to local economies and are the backbone of our nation's food supply. They provide fresh fruit and vegetables to local stores, feed our families, and power rural communities by creating jobs and supporting local businesses. The loss of even more small farms will devastate communities, restrict the food supply, and have long-term economic and food security ramifications for the United States and for the world.

Specialty crop farmers and family farms have been left behind by our farm safety net for far too long. When President Abraham Lincoln created the USDA in 1862, he called it "The People's Department." People across the country need your help from family farmers to working families. These farms are the roots of American agriculture and are essential to our country's future.

Extension of Deadlines for the Reimbursement Transportation Cost Program

THE HONORABLE RICHARD FORDYCE
Under Secretary for Farm Production and Conservation
U.S. Department of Agriculture
1400 Independence Ave
Washington, DC 20250

Dear Mr. Fordyce:

We write with an urgent request to extend the deadlines for producers to enroll in the Reimbursement Transportation Cost Payment Program (RTCP) for Fiscal Year (FY) 2026, and to allow them to submit supporting documentation for reimbursement through RTCP for FY 2025, until at least 30 days after Farm Service Agency (FSA) offices reopen following the current lapse in federal appropriations.

RTCP provides vital reimbursements to geographically disadvantaged farmers and livestock producers outside of the contiguous United States to help cover a portion of the cost of transporting agricultural commodities or inputs. This year, staffing shortages at FSA offices created long delays for farmers seeking to participate in this program, and through no fault of their own, some producers were unable to meet the September 30, 2025, deadline to enroll in RTCP.

Furthermore, due to the current lapse in federal appropriations, FSA offices have been closed and unable to receive supporting documentation from farmers seeking reimbursement for costs incurred in FY 2025. We request USDA extend the deadline for producers previously enrolled in RTCP to submit documentation for reimbursement through this program.

Extending these deadlines would offer a lifeline to geographically disadvantaged producers who play a critical role in enhancing food security in rural and remote communities. We appreciate your consideration of this request and look forward to working with you to support farmers and ranchers operating outside of the contiguous United States.

Opposing the Cancellation of Bike Infrastructure Projects

Dear Secretary Duffy:

As congressional supporters of bike infrastructure funding, we write with serious concerns over the Department of Transportation ignoring Congressional and local priorities through its cancellation of numerous bike and pedestrian projects. Congress supports investments in making bicycling safer through several funding mechanisms because we see the returns in stronger local economies, healthier residents, and safer roads.

Reports indicate that DOT cancelled discretionary grants because they were awarded to bicycling-related projects. For example:

1. Reporting indicates an \$11.7 million project to add bike lanes in Fairfield, Alabama, was cancelled because it ran “counter to DOT’s priority of preserving or increasing roadway capacity for motor vehicles.”
2. A news report about a cancelled BUILD grant worth \$675,000 in McLean County, Illinois notes that “the Transportation Department told the county that the grant no longer aligned with its priorities.”
3. In Albuquerque, New Mexico, local reporting on a cancelled \$11.5 million BUILD grant to construct a seven-mile rail trail indicates, “DOT’s withdrawal letter provided little justification beyond stating the department is focusing on car-based projects rather than people-based projects like the Rail Trail, according to the city.” The article states the trail “is estimated to generate \$1 million to \$3.2 million in annual economic impact and increase property values in the area.”
4. And in Connecticut, the cancellation of a \$5.725 million grant for a greenway was explained as not aligning with the department’s priorities to improve the quality of life of the American people. If that is a priority for transportation grants, then numerous studies have shown shared trails contribute greatly to improved quality of life.

These congressionally funded discretionary grant programs were specifically authorized and funded to support multimodal and bicycling projects. In the case of BUILD, Safe Streets and Roads for All, the Reconnecting Communities Program, and others, these programs reflect the will of Congress to support local communities’ road safety needs and the will of local communities who sought these grants.

We understand that these discretionary grants have been signed and agreed upon by both parties, including your agency, and they reflect valuable work and resources invested by local communities. Grantees have often already incurred costs upon the expectation of their grant agreement being executed, and so far grantees have yet to be offered a recourse to appeal their cancellation.

Cancelling these grants is not in the best interest of the U.S. Department of Transportation, the communities we represent, or the quality of life of the American people. Communities should be able to rely on an agreement signed by the federal government to build safer roads and trails for everyone.

These are common sense improvements in American communities, chosen as priorities by American communities. Bike infrastructure investments generate economic activity and save vulnerable road users' lives.

We ask that the U.S. Department of Transportation reconsider its cancellation of the funding agreements it signed with communities regarding non-vehicular modes of transportation, and continue to sign agreements for future projects related to bicycling and walking infrastructure.

Thank you for your full and fair consideration of this matter, consistent with applicable statute and agency guidelines. We look forward to an update on these grant agreements in the near future and how you plan to support bike infrastructure projects.

Opposing Endangered Species Act Regulations Revisions

Dear Secretaries Burgum and Lutnick:

We write to express our strong opposition to the proposed rules (FWS-HQ-ES-2025-00291; FWS-HQ-ES-2025-00392; FWS-HQ-ES-2025-00443; FWS-HQ-ES-2025-00484) to amend the regulations for implementing sections 4 and 7 of the Endangered Species Act (ESA). These sweeping changes would fundamentally weaken our nation's most important wildlife conservation law at a time when one million species face extinction globally.⁵ We urge the National Marine Fisheries Service and the Fish and Wildlife Service ("the Services") to withdraw these proposed rulemakings and instead work to implement the ESA as Congress intended: any regulatory changes should further the objectives of the ESA to conserve species and prevent extinction.

The ESA is one of America's most successful and widely supported environmental laws. It has prevented more than 99 percent of listed species from going extinct and has helped hundreds move toward recovery.⁶ The law operates efficiently, with Section 7 consultations typically completed in just two weeks for informal review and two months for formal review, and only 0.3% of federal projects were halted between 2010-2017 due to the consultation process.⁷ The proposed rules would erode this framework and create severe consequences for imperiled species and the communities that value them.

In particular, the proposals would undermine environmental review requirements, eliminate long-standing protection for threatened species, and block both species listing and critical habitat designation. The proposed Section 7 changes would allow federal agencies to exclude project impacts from ESA consultation by claiming effects "would occur regardless of whether the proposed action goes forward." This loophole could exempt major federal actions, such as highways, pipelines, and development projects, from meaningful review and eliminate mitigation requirements that have prevented extinctions for species like the Virginia northern flying squirrel.

The rescission of the "blanket 4(d) rule" is equally concerning. This long-established rule prevents threatened species from sliding toward extinction by extending baseline protections against take to all threatened species. Removing it would require resource-strapped agencies to write individual rules for hundreds of species—including the piping plover, southern sea otter, and Florida manatee—creating dangerous protection gaps while threatened species await rulemaking that could take years, losing valuable time to help them recover.

The proposed Section 4 revisions complicate the process for listing species and designating critical habitat by allowing economic considerations to influence listing decisions that Congress required to be based solely on science. The revisions also create arbitrary barriers to designate unoccupied critical habitat, an authority Congress explicitly provided and one that is increasingly essential as climate change forces species to shift their ranges. With roughly 90 percent of listed

species threatened by habitat loss, restricting the designation of critical habitat would severely undermine recovery efforts.

These proposals come at a time when the Services are already grappling with unprecedented budget cuts and workforce reductions that severely strains their ability to meet existing statutory obligations. Undertaking a regulatory overhaul under these circumstances is not only impractical but contradicts the spirit of the ESA. Several of the proposals would slow or reverse conservation progress while imposing substantial new administrative burdens at a time of diminished capacity. With reduced staff and resources, the Services should prioritize addressing the backlog of species awaiting protection and advancing recovery efforts for those already listed, rather than redirecting attention to rewriting long-standing and effective regulations.

Habitat destruction and climate change are accelerating species extinction to alarming rates, and we should be working to uphold and strengthen the ESA, not weaken it. We urge your agencies to abandon this misguided effort and focus instead on strengthening science-driven conservation, ensuring adequate staffing and resources for the Services, and upholding the integrity of one of our nation's most important environmental laws.

Fair Farm Aid for Specialty Crop Producers

Dear Secretary Rollins,

We write to express our concerns that the Trump Administration's recently announced farm aid package fails to provide adequate support for specialty crops and other sectors of the agricultural economy. While we recognize the need for the \$11 billion dedicated to the Farmer Bridge Assistance (FBA) program, the remaining \$1 billion that may or may not go towards specialty crops, coupled with the lack of clarity surrounding eligibility, distribution, and timing, falls far short of the relief these farmers need. This level of uncertainty and the disproportionate allocation itself are unacceptable for an industry already under significant strain.

Over the past year, specialty crop producers have endured severe economic hardship. Many operations have faced supply-chain disruptions, rising input costs, labor shortages, and unstable market conditions. Specialty growers also continue to operate without the same depth of risk-management tools, crop-insurance coverage, and market-stabilization support available to other sectors, leaving many more vulnerable when markets shift or disasters strike. These challenges have been severely exacerbated by the instability and uncertainty created under the Trump Administration, whose irrational tariffs and erratic behavior have disrupted foreign markets and reduced revenues for specialty crop growers.

By setting aside only \$1 billion for specialty crops and others excluded from FBA and failing to provide any level of clarity surrounding this funding, the Administration is effectively choosing winners and losers in the farm economy. USDA's own data shows that specialty crop exports totaled \$24.6 billion in FY23, almost 14% of our nation's total agricultural exports¹. Reserving just \$1 billion for specialty crops, in addition to other producers excluded from the FBA program, severely underestimates both need and the role that specialty crops and other sectors play in the nation's food system.

Further, this farm aid package is particularly concerning given that its total pales in comparison to the Trump Administration's bailout for Argentina, raising questions about why American producers are being asked to settle for far less relief than what has been provided foreign nations. Such an approach risks leaving specialty crop producers as an afterthought rather than recognizing them as a core component of a healthy, diverse U.S. food system.

Without meaningful support, specialty crop producers and others excluded from FBA will continue to face severe economic instability without an economic backstop. President Trump must also consider the long-term harm his tariffs are doing to the American agricultural economy. If he does not reverse course, farm aid will continue to be necessary

for years to come, and as we have heard from farmers time and time again: they do not want bailouts, they want robust markets to sell their products.

As USDA works to implement this farm relief package, we respectfully request that you provide the following information and commitment as soon as possible:

1. A detailed breakdown of how the \$1 billion will be allocated, including timelines, payment formulas or criteria, eligibility thresholds, and how funds will be distributed by crop types and sectors.
2. An explanation of what data USDA has collected, or plans to collect, to assess the economic losses for specialty crop producers, and how that data will inform disbursement decisions.
3. Clarification on whether payments for specialty crops will require acreage reporting or other administrative steps similar to the row-crop program and how these requirements would be communicated to farmers, as well as a transparent timetable for rolling out payments to specialty crop producers, and clear public guidance on application procedures, eligibility, and oversight to ensure equitable distribution.
4. A commitment to consider expanding funding for specialty crops beyond the initial \$1 billion, given the breadth of losses, the number of crops and producers affected, and the long-term value of specialty crops to U.S. food security and rural economies.

As USDA continues working to implement this farm aid package, we urge you to treat specialty crop producers, and others excluded from FBA, with the same urgency, dignity, and commitment as row-crop producers included in FBA. Now is not the time to divide the agricultural economy, it is a time to recognize the critical role all of American agriculture plays for our country. Equitable assistance is not only fair, it is essential to preserving the diversity, resilience, and sustainability of American agriculture.

Thank you for your attention to this urgent matter, and we stand ready to work with you and our colleagues to ensure that specialty crop farmers and other sectors excluded from FBA receive the relief they deserve from this Administration's harmful trade policies.

Sincerely,
[[SIGNATURES]]

Delegation Letter to FEMA and DHS Expressing Concerns about FEMA Grant Delays and Challenges in Hawaii

Dear Secretary Noem and Ms. Evans:

We write today to express our deep concern regarding execution challenges with several Federal Emergency Management Agency (FEMA) grants and the negative effects on the people and institutions of Hawai‘i.

We have heard from various state and local agencies and nonprofits that they have experienced significant delays and obstacles with the Emergency Food and Shelter Program (EFSP), the Targeted Violence and Terrorism Prevention (TVTP) Grant Program, the Homeland Security Grant Program (HSGP) and the Emergency Management Performance Grant (EMPG) Program. These grants are critical to the execution of much-needed assistance in Hawai‘i, but as explained below the related funds have not been properly awarded and obligated.

EFSP Funding. FEMA announced the Fiscal Year (FY) 2024 EFSP funding (Phase 42) on December 6, 2024, with Hawai‘i allocated a total of \$285,947 through Aloha United Way. After the announcement, the first step is typically to submit a plan to the EFSP National Board Program through an online portal, after which the funds are released. However, FEMA has not created an option for funding recipients to do so, and the steps to proceed have been unavailable all year.

In a letter dated September 16, 2025, the Department of Homeland Security wrote to Congress regarding EFSP: “As reviews are conducted, FEMA continues to process and release funding for grantees that meet all statutory and programmatic requirements to avoid disruption of vital services to eligible communities.” However, Aloha United Way, like other EFSP funding recipients around the country, still does not have access to its funds and has not received any communication regarding any statutory or programmatic requirements from FEMA noting any noncompliance.

While Aloha United Way administers EFSP funding for Hawai‘i, the organization distributes the funds to several key organizations that depend on this funding, including the Institute for Human Services, the Hawai‘i Foodbank, The Salvation Army and two federally qualified health centers – the Waimānalo and Wai‘anae Coast Comprehensive Health Centers. These organizations provide critical support for some of the most vulnerable in our communities.

For example, in FY 2023 the Hawai‘i Foodbank provided 150,000 meals on O‘ahu and Kaua‘i Islands with EFSP funds. Without access to FY 2024 EFSP funds all year, it was unable to serve as many meals in 2025. As yet another example, local service providers like the East and West Hawai‘i Domestic Abuse Shelters now have less capacity to provide meals and support to survivors escaping violence. Aloha United Way reports that food assistance is now the number one reason Hawai‘i residents call their 211 Statewide Helpline, surpassing housing assistance for the first time in many years. This truly underscores the need for food assistance, including through EFSP funding, in our communities.

Additionally, the Government Accountability Office found that FEMA violated the Impoundment Control Act by failing to award appropriated FY 2025 funds to the EFSP National Board Program in a timely manner.^[1] This has resulted in real harm as delays in both FY 2024 and FY 2025 EFSP funding are now having tangible and harmful effects on communities in Hawai‘i and across the country.

TVTP Funding. The State of Hawai‘i Office of Homeland Security was awarded \$803,330 in FY 2024 TVTP funding to support the nation’s first-ever targeted violence prevention implementation plan.^[2] The plan is an effort to preemptively address mass shootings and other violent acts by ensuring the state has the resources needed to handle unexpected incidents.^[3] The TVTP funding is intended to support payroll costs for two positions, as well as a framework for extending targeted violence prevention best practices, training and resources to the Territory of Guam.

Despite the award to a project that directly implements the statutory intent of the TVTP Program – preventing targeted violence and terrorism – the State of Hawai‘i’s FY 2024 TVTP funding was unfortunately abruptly terminated in July 2025. The Department of Homeland Security (DHS) has claimed that this termination, along with nearly \$18 million in funding for other awardees, was “slashing waste” from projects that do not “prevent terrorism or targeted violence.”^[4]

We question DHS’s reasoning for concluding that supporting the implementation of the nation’s first-ever targeted violence prevention plan is not preventing targeted violence. We are also concerned to hear that a 2025 TVTP Notice of Funding Opportunity was not published in Grants.gov, only afforded a three-day turnaround and was only advertised to certain states. This approach not only runs the risk of eroding trust in DHS’s grantmaking process, but also jeopardizes the efforts to prevent targeted violence that DHS aims to prioritize.

HSGP and EMPG. There is significant confusion around the FY 2025 periods of performance (POP) for HSGP components – State Homeland Security Program and Urban Area Security Initiative – and EMPG. Typically, both grant programs carry three-year POPs to afford emergency managers and public safety partners adequate time to plan, coordinate with partners, procure resources and adapt to the highly dynamic nature of emergency management.

However, when FEMA sent award notices in September 2025, it detailed just a one-year POP, which is highly unusual and operationally unrealistic given that emergency grant managers have historically planned for three-year POPs. In the case of the EMPG Program, both FY 2024 and FY 2025 funding are scheduled to end on the same day: September 20, 2026. This is unfortunately nowhere near enough time for awardees like the Hawai‘i Emergency Management Agency to complete its proposed projects, some of which were planned to run through 2027.

This shortened period of performance puts an unexpected burden on any subrecipients, like the City and County of Honolulu’s Department of Emergency Management. In its case, for the last several years \$500,000 in EMPG funding has been used to directly fund relevant staff salaries. Under the new timeline, these positions may no longer be financially sustainable, putting certain Hawai‘i residents at risk of losing their jobs and leaving communities across the state more vulnerable to emergencies due to reduced staffing and diminished capacity.

For HSGP, pending litigation may alter SHSP and UASI allocations, introducing further uncertainty for public safety agencies that depend on these funds to sustain intelligence and information sharing, violent crime reduction and counter-transnational drug trafficking operations. Compounding the problem, many jurisdictions, including Hawai‘i, cannot access previously awarded funds (FY2021–FY2024) due to federal freezes and staffing issues at FEMA because of the government shutdown.

Taken together, these examples suggest that FEMA’s current grant-making operations are experiencing significant difficulties marked by challenges in timelines, communication and procedural consistency. These have unfortunately extended beyond routine administrative matters and are having concrete negative effects on our constituents, communities and local governing institutions.

With all of this in mind, we request that you respond to the following questions by December 31, 2025:

1. Why did FY 2024 EFSP awardees not receive their funding in a timely manner?
2. What steps are DHS and FEMA taking, in coordination with the EFSP National Board Program, to ensure that FY 2024 EFSP awardees receive their funding expeditiously and that the FY 2025 EFSP funding process experiences no further delays?
3. Why did DHS and FEMA terminate the State of Hawai‘i Office of Homeland Security’s FY 2024 TVTP grant that supported the implementation of the nation’s first targeted violence prevention plan?
4. How does DHS and FEMA plan to support targeted violence prevention in Hawai‘i and other localities across the country?
5. Why did DHS, through FEMA, only allow a one-year POP for FY 2025 HSGP and EMPG awards?

6. Given that the one-year POP decision for HSGP and EMPG may reduce the capacity of emergency managers nationwide and potentially heighten community vulnerability, how does DHS and FEMA plan to address these potential impacts?

We look forward to engaging constructively with DHS and FEMA to clarify these matters and implement the solutions needed to correct them, all toward our mutual goal of making Americans and their communities safer across the nation.

^[1] Government Accountability Office. “Department of Homeland Security – Application of the Impoundment Control Act to Federal Emergency Management Agency Fiscal Year 2025 Federal Assistance Appropriations,” September 15, 2025, <https://www.gao.gov/assets/890/881507.pdf>.

^[2] Department of Homeland Security. “Fiscal Year 2024 Targeted Violence and Terrorism Prevention Grantee Abstracts,” last updated December 12, 2024, <https://www.dhs.gov/fiscal-year-2024-targeted-violence-and-terrorism-prevention-grantee-abstracts>.

^[3] Department of Homeland Security. “State of Hawai‘i Office of Homeland Security Publishes a New Targeted Violence Prevention Plan,” April 10, 2024, <https://www.dhs.gov/archive/news/2024/04/10/state-hawaii-office-homeland-security-new-targeted-violence-prevention-plan>.

^[4] Department of Homeland Security. “DHS Axes Wasteful, Misdirected Grants, Saves Taxpayers \$18.5M,” July 17, 2025, <https://www.dhs.gov/news/2025/07/17/dhs-axes-wasteful-misdirected-grants-saves-taxpayers-185m>.

Urging Federal Cooperation with State and Local Law Enforcement Regarding Minnesota Killings

Dear Attorney General Bondi, Secretary Noem, and Director Patel:

We write to demand immediate and full cooperation by the Department of Justice (DOJ), the Federal Bureau of Investigation (FBI), and the Department of Homeland Security (DHS) with Minnesota state and local prosecutors investigating the lethal shootings of Renée Good (January 7, 2026) and Alex Pretti (January 24, 2026) in Minneapolis, Minnesota.

In the immediate aftermath of these shootings, federal officials advanced definitive, inflammatory narratives while key evidence remained in federal custody. In both cases, publicly available video evidence has raised serious questions about the accuracy of those narratives. Shortly after Ms. Good was killed, DHS Secretary Noem claimed she was engaged in an act of “domestic terrorism,” well before any conclusion of the sort could have been drawn.¹ President Trump described her as “a professional agitator” who “violently, willfully, and viciously ran over the ICE Officer,” just six hours after her death, as investigations were ongoing.² And yet, numerous analyses have concluded Ms. Good was attempting to turn her car away from the ICE agent who fatally shot her as she drove past him.³

Secretary Noem claimed Mr. Pretti “attacked” officers and was brandishing a gun.⁴ White House Deputy Chief of Staff Stephen Miller labeled Mr. Pretti “an assassin” who “tried to murder federal agents” and Former Border Patrol Commander at Large Gregory Bovino claimed Mr. Pretti “wanted to do maximum damage and massacre law enforcement.”⁵ Contrary to these claims, bystander videos reviewed and verified by Reuters show Mr. Pretti as brandishing nothing other than his phone, and trying to help others who had been pushed to the ground by federal agents. In fact CBPs Office of Professional Responsibility in their notification of Mr. Pretti’s death to congress does not mention Pretti brandishing a weapon or even approaching agents.⁶ ⁷

After Mr. Pretti was killed, federal agents took witnesses into custody at the Whipple Building and held them for several hours before releasing them.⁸ Federal officers blocked Minnesota’s Bureau of Criminal Apprehension from accessing the scene of the shooting, even though they obtained a judicial warrant for access.⁹ The concerns that the federal government is mishandling the investigation is so strong that a federal judge issued an order blocking the administration from “destroying or altering evidence” related to the shooting.¹⁰ Bizarrely, the administration is appealing this order.¹¹

Congress is deeply concerned that the federal government has compromised the appearance and reality of impartiality in these investigations through premature, inflammatory public statements that prejudice disputed facts and stigmatize those killed before any independent review is complete. Senior officials have publicly labeled conduct related to these incidents as “domestic terrorism,” asserted conclusions about motive and intent, and framed federal officers as the primary “victims,” even as credible reporting has disputed these claims and local and state officials have raised questions about what the evidence shows.¹² These statements create an unacceptable risk that political messaging rather than facts will shape investigative decisions. These actions not only undermine public confidence in law enforcement and the rule of law—they heighten the need for the federal government’s immediate preservation and

full production of all evidence, recordings, reports, forensic records, and interagency communications to neutral, unbiased Minnesota prosecutors.

The current situation is untenable and deeply alarming. No law enforcement agency is above the law. When federal officers use deadly force against civilians, there must be transparency, rigorous evidence preservation, and meaningful investigation and accountability. State and local prosecutors have the authority to investigate potential violations of state criminal law, and those investigations cannot proceed if federal agencies obstruct, delay, destroy, or selectively disclose evidence. As the Hennepin County Attorney's Office has emphasized publicly, state and local law enforcement retain jurisdiction to investigate potential criminal offenses by federal agents, and those investigations can be hindered when the federal government refuses to cooperate.¹³

Accordingly, we demand that DOJ, FBI, and DHS immediately preserve and produce to the Office of the Minnesota Attorney General and the Hennepin County prosecutors the following, in full and without delay:

1. All evidence and investigative materials. Immediately preserve and produce to the Office of the Minnesota Attorney General and the Hennepin County prosecutors all evidence and investigative materials in DOJ, DHS, and FBI custody related to the killing of Renée Good and Alex Pretti.
2. All video and audio recordings. Turn over all video and audio within your possession or control, including: body-worn camera footage, officer-held cell phone footage, dash camera footage, surveillance footage from any federal facilities or partner agencies, and any recorded 911/dispatch/radio traffic and interview recordings.
3. All reports and witness materials. Produce all reports and witness materials, including but not limited to: FBI FD-302 Forms (or equivalent), written statements, interview notes, tip-line submissions, scene logs, evidence inventories, and any use-of-force summaries or preliminary findings.
4. All forensic and physical evidence records. Produce all forensic and physical evidence records, including but not limited to: firearms and ballistics testing, autopsy-related materials, lab results, chain-of-custody documentation, and any digital forensics (phone data, location data, extraction reports).
5. All interagency communications. Produce all interagency communications concerning the incidents, including but not limited to: emails, texts, messaging-app communications, call logs, briefing materials, and any directives or guidance exchanged among DOJ, FBI, DHS, ICE, and any other federal personnel. These demands apply to both fatal shootings: the killing of Renée Good and the killing of Alex Pretti. These demands also apply to materials held by any components, task forces, joint units, or partner entities operating under or alongside DHS and DOJ: ICE, CBP, Border Patrol, FBI joint units, and any deputized or crossdesignated personnel.

In addition to production, we demand written confirmation within 48 hours that DOJ, FBI, and DHS have issued and enforced litigation holds and preservation orders covering all relevant evidence that these federal agencies and those working on their behalf "removed from the scene and/or evidence that it has taken into its exclusive custody," including: cell phone camera, body camera, and dash camera systems; surveillance systems; phones and messaging applications used by involved personnel; dispatch and radio

systems; investigative case files; physical evidence, evidence lockers, and chain-of-custody records; and any contractor-held digital systems.¹⁴

We further demand that no federal agency take any action that could impair Minnesota's ability to conduct an independent investigation, including restricting access to scenes, witnesses, evidence, recordings, or federal personnel, or attempting to preempt or pressure state and local prosecutors' ongoing investigations.

Please provide your written response and confirmation of preservation and production steps by Wednesday, February 4th, 2026.

Title X Family Planning Program Application Guidance

Dear Secretary Kennedy:

As members of the Democratic Women's Caucus and Reproductive Freedom Caucus, we write to express our grave concern that the Department of Health and Human Services (HHS) has so far failed to release the Title X Family Planning Program (Title X) non-compete continuation application guidance, jeopardizing Year 5 funding for the program. Title X is our nation's only federal program dedicated to family planning. This is only the latest in a string of attacks on Title X funding from the self-proclaimed "pro-family" Trump administration. We call on HHS to immediately award a one-year full funding extension to all current Title X grantees as the funding process cannot be effectively executed before their funding runs out on March 31.

In the notices of their awards, Title X grantees were told that non-compete continuation application guidance was required to be released by HHS no later than December 31, 2025. To date, that guidance has not been released. With their Year 4 funding ending on March 31, Title X grantees are presently unable to apply for their Year 5 funding, which they need to continue serving their patients. Though grantees are typically afforded 90 days to complete these applications, that is no longer an option with the extensive delay. The longer this delay goes on, the more uncertainty grantees face about the release of Year 5 funding by April 1, 2026.

If the administration fails to meet the April 1 deadline for releasing Title X funding, the repercussions for critical health care would be catastrophic. For more than 50 years, Title X has served as a cornerstone of safety-net care. Title X-funded health centers are lifelines in their communities, providing high-quality family planning and sexual health care, including cancer screenings, testing and treatment for sexually transmitted infections, HIV testing, contraceptive services and supplies, pregnancy testing, and other essential health care services.

The bipartisan Title X program, championed by then-Congressman George H.W. Bush and signed into law by President Nixon, served 2.8 million people in 2023. For many of those patients, especially in rural and underserved communities, Title X health centers are their only source of health care. In 2023 alone, Title X supported 3,853 health centers across all 50 states, the District of Columbia, and U.S. territories and performed 461,085 cervical cancer screenings.¹ These screenings have helped lower cervical cancer rates by more than half since the mid-1970s.² In a time when maternal mortality rates are increasing in states across the country, we know that one-third of annual maternal deaths could be prevented if women had effective contraception,³ and nearly three quarters of women begin or continue a contraceptive method after going to a Title X-funded clinic.⁴ Without timely access to the Year 5 funding of grants they have already been awarded, Title X clinics will be left without the needed support to continue to provide these screenings, contraceptive supplies, and other critical services.

The failure to release guidance and open applications is yet another example of this administration's ongoing assault on the Title X program, birth control, and reproductive health

care access more broadly. In March 2025, HHS illegally withheld \$65.8 million in Congressionally appropriated funding for the Title X program from 16 grantees with grants in 23 states, threatening essential health care access for an estimated 842,000 people, or 30 percent of all Title X patients. Many of these affected grantees still struggle to sustain the financial burden caused by that extended delay in funding. The attacks on reproductive health care from this administration and congressional Republicans continued with an estimated 15 million Americans poised to lose health insurance under Trump's One Big Beautiful Bill Act, Republicans' failure to extend Affordable Care Act tax credits, and a budget proposal and partisan spending bill for FY2026 that sought to eliminate the Title X program entirely. The current delay in Title X funding shows that once again, HHS is willing to undermine the health and well-being of the 2.8 million Americans who utilize Title X services⁵ and is willing to let more women and families suffer in this continued Republican-led health care crisis.⁶

1 U.S. Department of Health and Human Services, Office of Population Affairs. (2024, October). *2023 Title X family planning annual report: Title X providers continue to rebuild and grow*. <https://opa.hhs.gov/about/news/eupdates/2023-title-x-family-planning-annual-report-title-x-providers-continue-rebuild>.

2 American Cancer Society. (2026, January 14). *Key statistics for cervical cancer*. <https://www.cancer.org/cancer/types/cervical-cancer/about/key-statistics.html>.

3 Kaiser Family Foundation. (2024, January 2). *The U.S. government and international family planning and reproductive health efforts [Fact sheet]*. <https://www.kff.org/global-health-policy/the-u-s-government-andinternational-family-planning-reproductive-health-efforts/>.

4 Guttmacher Institute. (2025, February). *Features and benefits of the Title X program [Fact sheet]*. <https://www.guttmacher.org/fact-sheet/features-and-benefits-title-x-program>.

5 U.S. Department of Health and Human Services, Office of Population Affairs. (2024, October). *2023 Title X family planning annual report: Title X providers continue to rebuild*. <https://opa.hhs.gov/about/news/e-updates/2023-title-x-family-planning-annual-report-title-x-providers-continue-rebuild>

6 U.S. House of Representatives, House Budget Committee Democrats. (2026, January 23). *The Trump-Republican cost of living crisis*. <https://democrats-budget.house.gov/legislation/costoflivingcrisis>.

There is no time to waste. Undermining Title X will unquestionably result in the loss of health care for patients who depend on it. We urge you to award all Title X grantees a full funding extension for the next year before April 1. Do not stifle the life-saving work of Title X-funded centers that have helped women and families across our country for decades.

We look forward to your prompt reply confirming that the issue has been addressed.

Sincerely,

[SIGNATURES]

**Letter to the Department of the Interior Regrading Erasure of Accurate Information about
Native Americans at National Park Units.**

Dear Secretary Burgum and Ms. Bowron,

We write to you to express our concern surrounding the recent removal of historically and culturally accurate information pertaining to the history of Native Americans at National Park units across the country.

On March 27, 2025, President Trump signed Executive Order (EO) 14253, titled the “Restoring Truth and Sanity to American History”, which directed the Secretary of Interior to review public monuments, memorials, statues, markers, or others with similar properties within the Department’s jurisdiction, “to restore Federal sites dedicated to history, and revitalize public monuments that remind Americans of their extraordinary heritage, consistent progress toward becoming a more perfect Union...”

Under these directives, a dangerous precedent has been set. Across the country, administration officials have instructed National Park Service (NPS) staff to edit, or in some cases, remove signage in National Parks in Arizona, Texas, Colorado, Montana, Wyoming, and Utah, including the entire removal of a display at the Grand Canyon detailing the forced removal of Native Americans in the region. Additionally, one exhibit at Little Bighorn Battlefield National Monument was ordered to be changed for discussing the history of Federal Indian Boarding Schools that used forced assimilation and sought to erase Native culture, language, and heritage.

Not only are these actions harmful and undermine the unique government-to-government relationship central to Indian Country and the federal government, but they are not aligned with the National Park Service Organic Act and subsequent congressional intent for NPS operations. The U.S. Code directs the NPS, “to conserve the...historic objects... and to provide for the enjoyment... in such manner and by such means as will leave them unimpaired for the enjoyment of future generations.” It adds that the NPS shall, “provide state-of-the-art... interpretation of and research on the resources of the National Park System,” and “assure that the management of units of the National Park System is enhanced by the availability and utilization of a broad program of the highest quality science and information.”

Impeding Americans from learning about the full history of these sites erases important stories and undermines our relationship with Native communities. As we celebrate America’s 250th anniversary, we should applaud our progress by embracing our history not ignoring it. Therefore, we request an answer to the following questions by April 24, 2026:

1. How many NPS exhibits have been edited or removed as a result of EO 14253?
2. Please share the nature of these exhibits, the edits, and the unit each is located in.

3. Have exhibits dealing with Native history been edited or removed by this administration under any authority?
4. Did the NPS consult with any relevant Native communities before making these changes?
5. How have these changes impacted Tribal co-stewardship agreements in NPS units?

Additionally, we ask that you reverse course and immediately reinstate historically and culturally accurate information about Native communities at affected NPS units. Thank you for attention to this urgent matter.

Opposing the U.S. Forest Service Reorganization

Dear Secretary Rollins and Chief Schultz:

We write to express our strong opposition to the proposed reorganization of the U.S. Forest Service announced by the Department of Agriculture on March 31, 2026. The Forest Service manages more than 193 million acres of public lands across our nation, making it the federal government's second-largest public lands agency. The decision to relocate the agency's headquarters and eliminate its world-class research program undermines our efforts to confront the dual crises of climate change and catastrophic wildfires while worsening the already severe loss of staff and expertise since the start of President Trump's second term.

The United States is about to enter what many predict will be a devastating fire season, driven by extremely dry vegetation and a severe snow deficit directly linked to climate change. This reorganization proposal would close 57 of the agency's 77 research stations across 31 states, including stations that study wildfire, drought, pests, and climate change—all of which pose immediate and growing threats to our national forests and nearby communities—and threaten to take decades of staff expertise with them. Already, this administration's efforts to dismantle the Forest Service have already led to a nearly 40 percent reduction in hazardous fuels work, leaving forests, public lands, and surrounding communities vulnerable, and the proposed reorganization threatens to make that damage even worse.

Public land agencies across the nation—including the Forest Service—are already reeling from devastating staff losses that began in February 2025, when the agency illegally fired thousands of staff. This was swiftly followed by the systematic harassment, intimidation, and pressure on staff to resign or retire, leading to the loss of more than 25 percent of Forest Service personnel, including “red card” staff qualified to assist with the agency's wildfire response efforts. Additionally, the administration has repeatedly proposed slashing the agency's budget. President Trump's FY 2027 budget proposed a 75 percent across-the-board cut, the wholesale elimination of Forest Service research and state, private, and tribal forestry programs, and the transfer of wildfire management responsibilities to the Interior Department.

Relocating the Forest Service's headquarters would further weaken the agency by driving out experienced staff, disrupting operations, compromising institutional knowledge, and ultimately rendering its mission unachievable. During the first Trump administration, the Department of the Interior moved the Bureau of Land Management from Washington, D.C. to Grand Junction, Colorado – a decision that resulted in an exodus of 87 percent of staff and a generational loss of expertise from which the agency has never recovered. The Government Accountability Office found that the implementation was thinly justified and implemented in a haphazard manner.²

The proposed Forest Service reorganization follows the same destructive pattern. It threatens to permanently cripple the agency, sever fire management from public land stewardship, and gut the research that underpins science-based forest management, including wildfire response. It is

also the latest in a series of attacks on the Forest Service carried out without necessary congressional approval or input. We therefore ask that you provide Congress with the details of any consultations, comment opportunities, analysis, and decision-making processes related to this proposal so that Congress can fully evaluate it and represent the interests of our constituents and the American people, who have a direct stake in keeping Forest Service lands public, accessible, and healthy.

Our nation's public forests are not just a lumber yard for the timber industry to exploit. They provide us with clean air and water, offer unmatched outdoor recreational opportunities, and fortify communities and ways of life across the country. We urge you to halt all reorganizational efforts and immediately consult with both parties in Congress on a responsible path forward for the Forest Service.

Sincerely,

Opposing Onerous Additional Information Requirements for Visas to Visit the US

Dear Secretary Noem and Commissioner Scott:

I write in strong opposition to the Department of Homeland Security's Notice of Proposed Rule Making (NPRM) regarding Arrival and Departure Record (Form I-94) and the Electronic System for Travel Authorization (ESTA), published in the Federal Register on December 10, 2025. While I recognize the Department's responsibility to protect our nation's borders, I am deeply concerned that the proposed expansion of data collection requirements risks imposing unnecessary burdens on lawful international travelers and could have disproportionate economic consequences for the State of Hawai'i.

Travel and tourism remain the primary economic driver for Hawai'i. Because of its geographic isolation and limited economic diversification, lawful domestic and international travel is foundational to our fiscal stability, workforce participation and small business ecosystem. In 2025, Hawai'i welcomed approximately 9.6 million visitors and Honolulu's industry and visitor spending generated \$12 billion in economic activity, supported 64,000 jobs and contributed \$1.9 billion in federal, state and local tax revenue.

International travel remains an important component of Hawaii's visitor industry. While overall visitor spending has increased, key international markets remain significantly below pre-pandemic levels. As Hawai'i continues its recovery and works to rebuild these relationships, maintaining a predictable and efficient entry process for lawful travelers is critical to supporting jobs, small businesses and public revenues across our islands.

The NPRM's proposed requirement that ESTA applicants disclose five years of social media identifiers, extensive historical contact information, detailed biographical information about family members and expanded biometric identifiers represents a fundamental shift in the entry process for lawful travelers. While security enhancements are important, the breadth of these requirements risks creating a perception of complexity, intrusiveness and unpredictability.

For a destination as remote as Hawai'i, where international visitors must already undertake long-haul travel, even marginal deterrent effects can have disproportionate economic consequences for our state. Tourism supports tens of thousands of local jobs, sustains small businesses across our islands, and generates critical public revenues that fund essential services. At a time when our visitor industry is continuing its recovery, any federal policy that meaningfully alters the entry process should be carefully calibrated to strengthen security without unintentionally discouraging lawful travel.

For these reasons, I respectfully urge the Department to reconsider and revise this proposal to ensure that enhanced security measures are narrowly tailored and do not unintentionally deter lawful travel. I further request meaningful consultation with Hawaii's state and local leaders, hospitality industry representatives and economic stakeholders before finalizing any changes to ESTA or I-94 requirements.

Opposing Department of Justice *Olmstead v. L.C.* Slip Opinion

Dear Acting Attorney General Blanche:

We write to express our outrage concerning the U.S. Department of Justice’s June 18 opinion, titled “Application of the Rehabilitation Act and Americans with Disabilities Act to State Institutionalization of Patients with Severe Mental Illness or Disabilities,” which would undermine both the scope and enforcement of the integration mandate under Title II of the Americans with Disabilities Act (ADA) and Section 504 of the Rehabilitation Act. The opinion represents a dramatic departure from decades of federal law, regulations, and judicial precedent protecting the civil rights of people with all types of disabilities and must be withdrawn.

For more than 50 years, federal civil rights laws have recognized that unnecessary segregation and institutionalization constitute discrimination. In 1977 and 1978, the then-Department of Health, Education, and Welfare promulgated regulations requiring recipients of federal financial assistance to provide services to individuals with disabilities in the most integrated setting appropriate to their needs. Congress subsequently ratified and strengthened these requirements when it amended Section 504, and later purposefully included the principles in the ADA in 1990.

In enacting the ADA, Congress explicitly found that “historically, society has tended to isolate and segregate individuals with disabilities” and determined that such segregation constitutes a serious and pervasive form of discrimination. The ADA was designed not merely to prohibit intentional exclusion, but to ensure that people with disabilities have meaningful opportunities to live, work, learn, and participate fully in community life as full members of their communities.

In 1999, the Supreme Court affirmed these principles in *Olmstead v. L.C.*, holding that unjustified institutional isolation of individuals with disabilities is discrimination under the ADA. The Court recognized that institutionalization perpetuates harmful stereotypes about the capabilities of people with disabilities and severely diminishes opportunities for family relationships, employment, economic independence, educational advancement, and participation in community life.

For more than 25 years, federal courts across the country, Republican and Democratic administrations alike, the Department of Justice, and Congress have interpreted and implemented the *Olmstead* decision to require states and public entities to provide services in integrated settings when appropriate. This long-accepted interpretation has enabled hundreds of thousands of Americans with disabilities to avoid harmful and unnecessary institutionalization and remain connected to their families, schools, workplaces, neighborhoods, and chosen communities. The Department’s recent opinion rejects this settled understanding and threatens to undermine one of the most important civil rights protections for people with disabilities. Notably, the opinion itself acknowledges that its interpretation is “out of step with common understanding of that decision within Federal courts.” Such an admission should give serious pause before the Department reverses decades of enforcement efforts or undertakes further regulatory actions. In

order to protect the civil rights of disabled people, DOJ must meaningfully enforce the integration mandate. Instead, on July 20, DOJ issued a notice stating that guidance on enforcing Olmstead and the integration mandate, which DOJ relied upon for the past 15 years, was not enforceable, and DOJ would no longer rely upon it in its enforcement of Title II of the ADA; the notice also stated that DOJ plans to revisit the guidance.

The consequences of weakening the integration mandate would be profound. Millions of Americans with disabilities rely on home and community-based services supporting them to be among their families, maintain employment, pursue education, and participate in civic life. The Department's new interpretation risks creating, supporting, and encouraging policies that steer individuals into segregated settings such as nursing homes, psychiatric facilities, and segregated classrooms. Such a result would be inconsistent with federal law, contrary to congressional intent, and harmful to people with disabilities and their families. We cannot return to a time when people with disabilities were denied basic civil rights, ripped away from their families, and institutionalized against their will.

The disability community has spent decades advancing the promise that disability should never be grounds for exclusion from community life. The integration mandate is a cornerstone of that promise, and weakening it would reverse decades of bipartisan progress. People with disabilities belong in their communities, with the services and support they need. They deserve clear assurance that the federal government will continue to defend their right to live, receive services, and participate fully in society.

Therefore, we urge the Department of Justice to:

1. Immediately rescind its June 18, 2026 opinion concerning the integration mandate under Title II of the ADA and Section 504;
2. Reaffirm the Department's longstanding commitment to enforcing Olmstead v. L.C. and the integration mandate;
3. Continue vigorous enforcement efforts to prevent unnecessary institutionalization and segregation of people with disabilities; and
4. Engage with people with disabilities, family members, advocates, providers, and state and local governments to strengthen community-based supports and services.

To better understand the basis for the Department's actions and the implications of this opinion, please provide responses to the following questions and requests no later than August 5, 2026:

1. Provide all memoranda, legal analyses, briefing materials, draft opinions, and other documents from within the Department or received by the Department related to or relied upon in the development and drafting of the June 18, 2026 opinion, including any internal

or external instructions, responses, and feedback related to the final opinion and any draft iterations.

2. Identify companies and organizations that provided legal analyses, briefing materials, or other communication related to the development of the OLC opinion, such as the Cicero Institute, an organization founded by Joe Lonsdale, co-founder of Palantir, that advocates for criminalizing homelessness; Social Purpose Corrections, an organization headed by a former CoreCivic warden; or any other entity that owns, operates, or plans to expand segregated settings for individuals with disabilities.

3. Identify all Department officials, political appointees, and outside individuals, including from the White House, who participated in initiating, drafting, reviewing, approving, or advising on the opinion.

4. Identify every pending or completed Department investigation, settlement agreement, consent decree, statement of interest, technical assistance document, or enforcement action that may be affected by the opinion.

5. Explain whether the Department intends to modify, withdraw, or cease enforcement of any existing Olmstead-related settlements, consent decrees, or agreements as a result of the opinion.

6. Describe any consultations conducted with disability rights organizations, individuals with disabilities, state and local governments, providers, researchers, or other stakeholders prior to issuance of the opinion.

7. Provide all communications between the Department and the White House, the Office of Management and Budget, and the Department of Health and Human Services related to the opinion.

8. Explain whether the Department conducted any analysis of the opinion's impact on:

- a. Individuals receiving home and community-based services;
- b. Individuals at risk of institutionalization;
- c. Individuals involved in psychiatric institutions, nursing facilities, segregated day programs, correctional settings, and segregated educational placements;
- d. State Medicaid programs; and
- e. Existing federal disability rights enforcement efforts.

9. Provide any estimate prepared by the Department regarding the number of individuals with disabilities who may be affected by changes in federal enforcement resulting from the opinion.

The integration mandate has transformed the lives of countless Americans with disabilities by expanding access to community living, employment, education, and self-determination. We urge the Department to honor both the letter and spirit of the ADA by rescinding this opinion and reaffirming its commitment to the civil rights of people with disabilities.

Opposing H.R. 1 Medicaid Community Engagement Requirements Interim Rule

Dear Administrator Oz:

We write to express our profound concern regarding the Centers for Medicare and Medicaid Services' (CMS) interim final rule titled "Medicaid Community Engagement Requirement for Certain Individuals." This interim rule will create an undue burden for beneficiaries with serious health care needs and put people at risk of losing coverage, while also creating significant implementation challenges for states. Therefore, we urge CMS to revise this rule, and until such changes are made, call on CMS to authorize states to delay implementation.

Pursuant to P.L. 119-21, the interim final rule requires beneficiaries to document at least 80 hours per month of "qualifying activities." However, the rule also creates a new definition of "medical frailty" that goes well beyond the plain statutory language, adding a requirement that a medical condition must significantly impair a person's ability to comply with the work requirement in order to qualify them for an exemption. This new requirement does not adequately consider the complex nature of illnesses like cancer or any number of serious illnesses or chronic conditions, which can exhibit periodic or intermittent symptoms.

Furthermore, this rule will require beneficiaries to frequently prove and verify their exemptions in order to maintain coverage, which will cause confusion, create bureaucratic burdens for patients seeking care, and, as a result, will lock patients out of life saving treatments.

Forcing vulnerable patients to exhaustively document their symptoms simply to maintain access to basic healthcare is both imprudent and inconsistent with Federal law. Diagnoses such as an aggressive cancer require patients to receive care as soon as possible, and as you know, any delays to treatment put patients at heightened risk. These and other rapidly progressing conditions become significantly less amenable to treatment in their later stages, meaning a patient's current capacity to work does not reflect the urgency of their medical needs.

Further, this rule will create significant administrative and financial changes for states as it departs significantly from preliminary guidance that your agency provided to states as they rushed to prepare to implement this new requirement. States relied on CMS's feedback to develop screening tools, code lists, and internal policies to implement a medically frail exemption tied to having certain medical conditions. However, the change of the definition in the rule – requiring states to make a subjective decision about an individual's inability to comply with the work requirements – will require states to make significant changes to their implementation plans at this late date.

While there is no way to prevent some eligible people from losing coverage due to the flawed nature of the underlying policy, which in and of itself exacts draconian cuts to healthcare programs and strips access to affordable care for millions of Americans, CMS has an obligation to implement the law in question as written. And, as noted, the new rule appears to be

inconsistent with the plain language of H.R. 1, adding a new, restrictive standard that will add to the number of people losing coverage. Indeed, the evidence clearly demonstrates that creating more documentation requirements and adding complexity to the enrollment process will have a devastating effect.

Therefore, in sum, we urge CMS to reconsider its interim rule to protect people with serious medical needs. CMS should also delay implementation of the new work requirements pending these changes. We look forward to your response.

Opposing Office of Management and Budget Federal Grants Proposed Rule

Dear Director Vought:

We write in strong opposition to the Office of Management and Budget's proposed rule titled "Regulation for Federal Financial Assistance," released on May 29, 2026. This proposal would represent the most sweeping and destructive transformation of the federal financial assistance system in modern history and would subordinate nonpartisan, merit-based grantmaking to political control, exposing the entire framework to serious constitutional challenge. With more than \$1 trillion in annual Federal awards at stake, the consequences would be felt by every state, federally recognized tribe, city, county, research university, hospital, and countless nonprofits, community organizations, and private firms that deliver critical scientific studies and essential public services.

Congress has long appropriated grant funding with the expectation that the executive branch would implement it for the benefit of all our constituents. This proposal represents an attempt to completely undermine the Congressional power of the purse and the separation of powers, as outlined further below.

I. Subjecting Congressionally-Mandated Spending to Excessive Political Control

Under the proposed regulations, senior executive branch political appointees would be required to approve every discretionary grant award before it is made. At the same time, independent, objective peer review—the mechanism that has long ensured that federal research and program dollars are allocated based on expertise and evidence—would be reduced to a non-binding suggestion that receives no deference from political appointees. The practical result would be a dramatic erosion in the rigor and credibility of federally funded science and research.

Also concerning, the proposal would authorize agencies to terminate any discretionary grant at any time if the grant is deemed no longer to serve "agency priorities or the national interest," a standard so open-ended as to be nearly unlimited. This would expose ongoing grants that grantees and program beneficiaries rely on to cancellation based on nothing more than shifting political winds, which may benefit Republican priorities in the near term but could change drastically between administrations. When contractors observe that federally funded projects can be reversed or defunded between administrations, they become reluctant to invest the upfront costs of bidding, staffing, and mobilizing for contracts that may be canceled or restructured before completion, making the financial risk outweigh the potential reward.

Making matters worse, the existing right to an administrative hearing before termination would be eliminated through the proposal's amendment of section 200.342. This would leave grantees with no meaningful avenue to contest such decisions without incurring expensive litigation costs.

Taken together, these provisions would give political appointees extraordinary, largely unchecked authority over spending that Congress has mandated for specific purposes. The

Constitution vests the power of the purse squarely with Congress, not with the executive. These proposed rules directly violate the separation of powers by granting the executive unchecked and unilateral power over all federal financial assistance. OMB and the other 41 federal agencies would need additional statutory authority to effectuate these regulations, something that Congress could not grant, even if it wanted to, without amending the Constitution to grant the executive Branch this kind of unfettered power. Any final rule should explicitly cite the specific statutory authority that OMB and each of the 41 federal agencies believe they have that would support such a gross expansion of executive control.

II. Conditioning Federal Funds on the Surrender of Constitutional Rights

The proposed revisions of section 200.300 would tie eligibility for Federal funding to recipients' compliance with vague, sweeping prohibitions on policies that the current Administration disfavors, including "unlawful DEI," "gender ideology," and "religious discrimination." These terms are poorly and vaguely defined, giving political appointees open-ended discretion to cut off funding based on their assessment of a recipient's viewpoints, internal policies, institutional commitments, or because an award serves marginalized communities.

This approach is unconstitutional, including by violating First Amendment rights to protect against viewpoint discrimination. The government cannot use the leverage of federal funding to coerce recipients into abandoning First Amendment-protected speech or association, nor can it condition benefits on viewpoint-based litmus tests that have no grounding in statute. These provisions invite immediate legal challenge and, if allowed to stand, would have a severe chilling effect on the academic, scientific, and civic institutions that depend on federal financial support.

III. Direct Threat to Services Communities Are Counting on Right Now

States, localities, tribal governments, school systems, health systems, and community organizations have already built programs, hired staff, and made commitments in reliance on existing funding arrangements. The proposed changes, particularly the expanded termination authority, could disrupt or abruptly halt billions of dollars currently flowing to critical public health programs, K-12 and higher education, scientific research, public safety initiatives, and local economic development. The populations served by these programs, often among the most vulnerable in our society, would bear the consequences directly and immediately.

This administration's unprecedented campaign to terminate grant awards that would have reduced pollution, lowered energy costs, and protected communities from more extreme weather has already put Americans' health and jobs at risk while driving up household energy bills. A recent study from the Environmental Data and Governance Initiative found that EPA environmental justice grants alone represented at least \$6.4 billion in economic opportunity and 65,000 jobs, with economic impacts evenly distributed across Republican and Democratic Congressional districts.

IV. Dramatic Expansion of Administrative Burden

Despite OMB's characterization of these changes as administrative improvements with little or no impact, the actual effect would be immense. The proposed rules layer on substantial new compliance obligations at every level of the grants system through changes to section 200.303, including:

- Mandatory enrollment in DHS E-Verify for all recipients and subrecipients;
- Required pre-disbursement screening through Treasury's Do Not Pay system before states may pass through federal funds to subrecipients; and
- Written justifications accompanying every payment request.

These requirements would impose serious costs on the organizations least equipped to absorb them — small nonprofits, rural service providers, tribal governments, and community health centers. Furthermore, several reforms previously adopted to streamline grant administration and reduce paperwork would be reversed under this proposal, directly contradicting OMB's stated rationale. Rather than making the grants process more accessible, these rules would make it more cumbersome, more costly, and less functional for the entities doing the work, not to mention creating administrative delays at the agency level.

Given these considerations, we oppose the proposed Regulation for Federal Financial Assistance rule, which would concentrate political control over federal spending, undermine constitutionally protected rights, disrupt billions of dollars in existing awards, and increase the compliance burden on the organizations and governments that serve the public. We respectfully but strongly urge OMB to withdraw this rulemaking in full.

Opposing Mass Reassignment of Social Security Administration Staff

Dear Commissioner Bisignano:

We write to express our deep concern with the Social Security Administration's decision to reassign thousands of Social Security Administration (SSA) employees away from their primary, essential duties in order to address excessive wait times on SSA's toll-free number for customer service. While we understand the need to reduce wait times for calls, the blanket reassignment of personnel from other high priority tasks appears to have exacerbated backlogs and extended overdue processing times in other critical areas of the SSA. We, along with our constituents, are gravely concerned that these reassignments are creating new barriers to prompt service and delivery of benefits to the public, and request additional information on the full impact of this policy.

On February 4th, 2026, SSA reassigned employees from its Disability Adjudication, Financial and Management, Field Office Services, Risk and Quality, Digital Services, and Chief Information Officer units to assist in monitoring its public call-in phone line¹. This is not the SSA's first attempt to backfill staff to address problems created by the Administration's reduction of more than 10% of SSA staff in the past year. Those staff cuts have resulted in longer wait times, reduced in-person services, office closures, and service delays for beneficiaries.

Previously, the SSA had moved 1,000 field office customer support representatives to assist with customer calls. Those employees included benefits authorizers, claims authorizers, and postentitlement technical experts, who process claims and appeals to help seniors and Americans with disabilities receive their benefits. As with the current reassignments, employees were moved to undertake unfamiliar, complex tasks, creating inefficiencies in their new roles while impeding their ability to complete their preexisting tasks.

These employee reassignments have the potential to cause massive service delays and add to SSA's already overwhelming case backlog, which stands at 6 million pending cases at SSA processing centers and 12 million transactions in field offices. While on paper, the reassignment may shorten wait times for calls regarding unprocessed claims and paperwork, if the people responsible for processing those claims are unable to do their jobs, it will only delay the receipt of benefits and lead to worse outcomes for the individuals SSA is meant to serve.

Reassigned employees report that they are not being adequately trained before being assigned to phone duty. Several employees at processing centers said they received only three hours of training before being placed on the phone the same day – there are also reports that employees have been given bizarre and sometimes dangerous instructions for dealing with individuals in crisis or with acute, time-sensitive needs. SSA has claimed that all reassigned employees receive 8 hours of training, but even this amount is insufficient to address the complexity and variety of requests that come into SSA on a given day. Previously, when employees were temporarily assigned to phones during emergency situations, they received months of training and shadowed

a full-time phone operator. A low call wait time means virtually nothing if callers are speaking with untrained employees regarding work that has been stopped due to their reassignment.

The reassignment to the call-in line of high-level employees who process urgent claims and deliver needed benefits, with virtually no training, is a major cause for concern, particularly in light of staffing cuts in early 2025. The loss of 7,400 employees, including thousands of experienced frontline workers and seasoned phone operators, through buyouts and layoff threats, has jeopardized the processing of benefit claims. As of August 2025, the Strategic Organizing Center estimated an average ratio of 4,000 beneficiaries for every one field office employee – a truly unprecedented and unmanageable workload. Under these circumstances, reassigning staff away from critical benefit processing is deeply harmful to the 73.9 million retirees, disabled workers, their spouses, and their children who rely on Social Security’s assistance.

To assess the full impact of your broad reassignments on customer service and the claims backlog, we ask that you answer the following questions:

1. What does the training given to displaced staff include?
 - a. How long are displaced staff trained for before being put on the phones? i. What is the least amount of training someone has received before answering a call?
 - b. How does this training differ from training for dedicated call center staff?
 - c. What are the gaps that SSA has identified in training?
 - d. What does supervision look like for displaced staff versus dedicated call center staff?
 - e. Press reporting on training for handling troubled callers has been very concerning. What training did displaced staff receive specifically for handling distressed/unsafe callers and what is the ongoing support available to that staff?
2. What impact does SSA project the staff reassignments will have on field office appointment times?
 - a. What is the average time it takes per office to schedule a benefit claim appointment? What percent of appointments are scheduled within 28 days?
 - i. What percentage of disability beneficiaries receive their benefits on time/within 2 weeks?
 - b. What impact does SSA project the staff reassignments will have on claims processing?
 - c. What impact does SSA project the staff reassignments will have on other SSA functions? Please specify.
 - d. Did SSA study or otherwise assess the impact on operations from the previous round of reassignments? What did SSA learn?
3. What has the impact of this reassignment been on caller satisfaction rates?
 - a. What types of issues can displaced staff handle? What types of issues are they unable to handle?
 - b. Did SSA study or otherwise assess caller satisfaction from the previous round of reassignments, versus caller satisfaction for dedicated call center staff?

- c. Did SSA study or otherwise assess call duration from the previous round of reassignments, versus call duration for dedicated call center staff?
 - d. Did SSA study or otherwise assess call resolution or caller callbacks from the previous round of reassignments, versus call resolution or caller callbacks for dedicated call center staff?
- 4. What other assessments is the SSA conducting to track the efficacy and impact of reassignments?
 - a. If SSA is not making assessments to determine the efficacy of staff reassignments, why has SSA made that decision?
 - b. If SSA has not made these assessments already, is it able to do so? Why or why not?

We appreciate your attention to this matter and look forward to your swift response.

Opposing the Decision not to Renew USMCA

Dear Ambassador Greer,

Following the Administration's decision not to renew the United States-Mexico-Canada Agreement (USMCA) for another 16 years, we write to express our strong support for retaining and enhancing, not exiting, the existing agreement. USMCA is a cornerstone of North American competitiveness, American agriculture, and an essential tool for cross-border cooperation. The more the renewal negotiations drag on, the more uncertainty compounds across supply chains and puts at risk the 13 million American jobs and \$2 trillion in trilateral trade this agreement supports.¹ While there are important issues that need to be addressed, the core agreement must be retained to enable American workers, businesses, and communities to continue to prosper in the future.

The decision not to extend USMCA has profound consequences for American businesses and consumers, creating the kind of uncertainty that discourages investment, unnecessarily complicates supply chains, and decreases U.S. competitiveness. Most supply chains require thirty-year lead times to be built, not just five, especially in manufacturing industries where factories can take years to become operational. The longer the negotiations drag on, the more uncertainty will result, and there will be fewer incentives to invest.² A destabilized USMCA would ripple through the entire economy and weigh on growth and employment in every sector.³ Leaving USMCA will result in job losses in any industry dependent on trade with Mexico and Canada, including the agricultural, automobile, and advanced manufacturing sectors.

Over time, the supply chain disruptions and the absence of tariff-free trade will raise costs for consumers whose cars, groceries, and other household goods depend on tightly interconnected production networks.⁴ Affordability has become a central concern for our constituents. Creating more frictions between Mexico, Canada, and the U.S. is going to make things more expensive here at home. Therefore, what might have seemed like an inconsequential deadline will likely result in profound economic impacts for decades to come.

With these consequences in mind, we urge you to use this review process to quickly reach a consensus with Mexico and Canada to strengthen the agreement and address key outstanding issues. These include our Section 232 "national security" tariffs, which were imposed without congressional oversight or efforts to coordinate with our neighbors. Additionally, any revisions to rules of origin and regional value content should be carefully calibrated to ensure that the continent remains an attractive destination for investment while also ensuring that labor concerns are addressed. Further, we should work with our trading partners to prevent any country, particularly China, from getting a duty-free back door into the North American market.

Finally, the U.S. relationship with Canada and Mexico goes beyond trade. President Trump has repeatedly threatened to annex Canada and turn it into the 51st U.S. state, as well as threatened to bomb targets in Mexico. At this precarious moment for cross-border relations, it is more

important than ever that we renew confidence in our North American partnerships. That starts with quickly reaching an agreement to retain and, if possible, enhance the USMCA.

We look forward to your prompt response as talks continue with Mexico and Canada in the coming weeks and months.

1<https://www.csis.org/analysis/united-states-has-opted-not-extend-usmca>

2<https://time.com/article/2026/07/02/us-declines-renewal-trade-pact-mexico-canada-impact/>.

3<https://www.atlanticcouncil.org/blogs/econographics/the-five-stages-of-a-usmca-shakeup/>.

4<https://time.com/article/2026/07/02/us-declines-renewal-trade-pact-mexico-canada-impact/>

Sincerely,

Opposing Reopening the Pacific Marine National Monuments to Commercial Fishing

Dear President Trump,

We are writing to express our strong opposition to your executive proclamation, “Restoring American Commercial Fishing in the Pacific,” to reopen three Pacific marine national monuments, including Papahānaumokuākea National Marine Sanctuary and Marine National Monument, Rose Atoll Marine National Sanctuary and Marine National Monument and the Mariana Trench Marine National Monument to commercial fishing operations.

The Pacific marine monuments reflect years of bipartisan support for the protection of America’s special places, rich in historical and biological significance. Home to an unparalleled array of turtles, seabirds, and whales – even one of the oldest organisms on the planet, black coral – the waters of the Pacific marine national monuments offer a critical baseline for scientific research to study changing ecosystems, such as the impact of ocean warming and increased acidification. Given their immense cultural and scientific value, we must ensure these extraordinary ecosystems remain protected.

Opening the Pacific marine national monuments to commercial fishing undermines the United States’ longstanding leadership in marine conservation and sustainable fisheries management and harms thousands of species these areas protect, including fish populations on which the fishing industry relies. Research from the University of Hawai‘i found that marine protected areas, such as Papahānaumokuākea National Marine Sanctuary and Marine National Monument, provide measurable benefits for highly migratory species, including commercially valuable fish such as ‘ahi (bigeye tuna).¹ No-fishing zones create spillover benefits beyond their boundaries, supporting healthier fish populations and demonstrating that strong marine protections can benefit both conservation goals and sustainable fisheries.

While we support America’s fishing communities and seafood industry, these goals should not come at the expense of protecting some of our nation’s most unique and ecologically significant marine ecosystems. In fact, marine monuments help sustain fisheries by protecting healthy fish populations that spill over into adjacent fishing grounds, benefiting commercial harvests, a well documented phenomenon known as the “spillover effect.” The Hawai‘i longline fleet’s consistent ability to reach its annual catch limit for big-eye tuna, or ‘ahi, despite the prohibition on commercial fishing in protected waters is testament to the fact that these protections have not impeded the industry’s success. Opening these areas to commercial fishing would risk undermining these long-term benefits for little economic gain.

In addition, we are concerned that this proclamation attempts to exercise authority reserved to Congress. Under the Constitution, Congress—not the President—has plenary authority over federal lands and waters. While the Antiquities Act grants presidents limited authorities to establish national monuments and protect objects of scientific, historical and cultural importance,

it does not extend to eliminating monuments or stripping away their protections. That authority resides with Congress alone.

It is also important to recognize the level of collaboration, consultation, and public engagement involved in the designation and expansion of these marine monuments. Throughout the designation processes, a wide range of stakeholders, including conservation organizations, scientists, Native Hawaiian representatives and fishing communities, provided input through public meetings, consultations and formal comment opportunities. The Office of Hawaiian Affairs became a co-trustee of Papahānaumokuākea National Marine Sanctuary and Marine National Monument to ensure that Native Hawaiian perspectives and cultural values are incorporated at all levels of decision-making regarding the Monument. Fishing communities were also engaged throughout these processes, and proposed boundaries for areas such as the Pacific Remote Islands and Papahānaumokuākea expansions were modified to address stakeholder concerns, including those raised by the fishing industry.

We urge your administration to reconsider its position on reopening Pacific Marine Monuments to commercial fishing. We have an obligation to protect our oceans and its marine species for future generations, ensuring that the long-term health of our planet takes precedence over short term interests.

1 Medoff, Sarah, John Lynham, and Jennifer Raynor. 2022. “Spillover Benefits from the World’s Largest Fully Protected MPA.” *Science* 378 (6617): 313–16.
<https://doi.org/10.1126/science.abn0098>.

Sincerely,

Transparency on the Iran MOU

President Trump,

We, the undersigned members of the New Democrat Coalition, write to request an urgent briefing regarding the recently announced Memorandum of Understanding (MOU) between the United States and Iran and your strategy in the region for the coming weeks.

After more than fifteen weeks of conflict, the American people deserve relief from this unauthorized war that has driven up costs at home, harmed our military readiness and national security, and upended the global economy. Since the beginning of the conflict, gas prices have risen significantly across the nation, reaching a peak of \$4.56 per gallon in May – a 53% increase from before the war. This conflict also drove up transportation costs, leading to the increase in the price of groceries, household items, and fertilizers. The losses were also felt across our military, with fourteen servicemembers killed, hundreds wounded, and our missile stockpiles depleted, severely impacting our military readiness.

We welcome serious diplomatic efforts to end the war with Iran and prevent further damages impacting Americans. However, this MOU reads more like a surrender than a path to enduring peace. The reported terms would see a hardline Iranian regime empowered by increased control over the Strait of Hormuz and enriched with hundreds of billions in direct funds, unfrozen assets, and sweeping sanctions relief—already announced by OFAC—without any concrete concessions on nuclear material, ballistic missiles, or support for terrorist proxies.

Within hours of signing the MOU, the agreement was undermined by renewed hostilities in Lebanon, which Iran cited as justification for restricting traffic through the Strait of Hormuz. In addition, your public threats to resume strikes against Iran prompted the Iranian delegation to threaten to leave talks, undermining the diplomatic process. Your Administration's claims are necessary to end the war and raising concerns over the lack of enforcement mechanisms for the agreement. These events underscore the urgent need for Congressional oversight.

Accordingly, we echo the request made by our New Democrat Coalition Colleagues Ranking Member of the House Foreign Affairs Committee Gregory Meeks (NY-05), Ranking Member of the House Armed Services Committee Adam Smith (WA-09), and Ranking Member of the House Permanent Select Committee on Intelligence Jim Himes (CT-04), that your Administration provide a briefing to Members of Congress immediately and make available the full text of the Memorandum of Understanding, including any side agreements, implementation arrangements, or commitments made by the United States or Iran. Further, Congress should be briefed periodically on the status of negotiations with Iran throughout the 60-day ceasefire.

At a minimum, the briefing should address the following questions:

- What commitments has Iran agreed to regarding its nuclear program, enriched uranium stockpile, ballistic missile program, and support for proxy militias across the region?

- Who is responsible for paying the \$300 billion for the reconstruction and economic development of Iran? What costs will be incurred by the American people?
- What sanctions relief, Iranian access to frozen assets, or other economic commitments has the Administration agreed to provide Iran?
- What enforcement mechanisms are included in the agreement and what are the consequences of violating them?
- What is your Administration's plan for reaching a permanent agreement during the 60-day ceasefire period?
- What specific military objectives did the United States achieve in Iran?
- What has been the total monetary and material cost of the war, including military operations, munitions, asset damage, and related costs?
- What is your plan to keep Congress informed on the status of negotiations with Iran throughout the 60-day ceasefire?

Additionally, this agreement and any final deal must be brought before Congress in accordance with the Iranian Nuclear Agreement Review Act of 2015. The American people deserve to know whether this agreement will actually permanently end the war, prevent Iran from acquiring a nuclear weapon, and protect the national security of the United States. We support diplomacy as the right path forward, but believe it must also be accompanied with transparency, accountability, and a clear strategy.

We urge your Administration to provide Congress with a full briefing without delay.
Sincerely,

[[SIGNATURES]]

In strong support of the E-Rate program

Dear Chairman Carr,

We write to express our strong support for the E-Rate program in response to the FCC's recent Notice of Proposed Rulemaking (NPRM) considering whether the E-Rate program should be terminated or restricted to rural areas.

E-Rate is a \$3.2 billion-a-year program that provides libraries and schools with discounts of 20 to 90% on telecommunications services and equipment, depending on the percentage of low income students they serve. Unlike most federal programs, E-Rate is not funded through annual taxpayer appropriations. Instead, Congress structured the program to be financed through mandatory contributions from telecommunications carriers through the Universal Service Fund. The E-Rate program has helped libraries and schools afford broadband connectivity since its creation in the Telecommunications Act of 1996, when only 14% of libraries and schools had internet access. Today, that figure is nearly 100%, and the program supports over 12,500 libraries and 106,000 schools nationwide. E-Rate has also been instrumental in bringing broadband to entire communities. For example, six tribal libraries and two schools in New Mexico used E-Rate funding to build two tribally operated modern fiber networks spanning 120 miles and six sovereign nations.

The FCC has overseen the E-Rate program through both Democratic and Republican administrations, and the program has historically enjoyed broad bipartisan support. The FCC itself has acknowledged E-rate's importance, calling it an "extraordinary success as the federal government's largest education technology program." The program has also become a model for other federal initiatives. In 2025, the Government Accountability Office reviewed five federal programs for compliance with requirements to prevent waste, fraud, and abuse, and E-Rate was the only program to receive a perfect score.

As reflected in the FCC's FY2025 Eligible Services List, E-Rate primarily supports broadband connectivity and the network infrastructure needed to deliver it. Eligible services include internet access, data transmission, fiber connections, routers, switches, cabling, wireless access points, firewalls, and other networking equipment and services. By contrast, end-user devices such as laptops, tablets, desktop computers, and email services are not eligible for E-Rate funding. You have publicly stated that you are reviewing the E-Rate program due to concerns about students' screen time. However, the FCC's own eligible services list demonstrates that E-Rate remains focused on broadband connectivity and network infrastructure – not classroom devices or content that could reasonably be characterized as contributing to students' rising screen time. It would also be unreasonable to conclude that, because libraries and schools have achieved historically high levels of connectivity, the E-Rate program is no longer needed.

These gains are a direct result of sustained E-Rate investments, and there is no realistic scenario in which 21st century

libraries and schools can operate without reliable broadband infrastructure. Eliminating or significantly reducing E-Rate would not reduce students' screen time – it would simply make it more difficult for schools to provide secure internet access, administer online assessments, protect against cyber threats, communicate with families, and carry out essential day-to-day operations. Continual upgrades to infrastructure will also be essential to ensure that students are not able to access inappropriate material or websites on school networks.

Cuts to E-Rate would place significant financial strain on schools across the country, particularly those serving low-income communities. As such, we respectfully urge the Commission to preserve the E-Rate program and address any concerns regarding student screen time through policies that do not undermine the digital infrastructure on which libraries and schools depend. Sincerely,

[[SIGNATURES]]

Opposing the USPS' Proposed Rule

RE: Proposed Rule—Ballot Mail [2026-10968] Dear Postmaster General Steiner:

We write in strong opposition to the proposed rule the United States Postal Service (Postal Service) recently published, which seeks to disenfranchise voters and undermine voting by mail in the 2026 elections and beyond. The proposed rule, titled “Ballot Mail for Federal Elections,” is unconstitutional and illegal.¹ We strongly urge the Postal Service to rescind this proposed rule and immediately refuse illegal orders from the President.

1. The Proposed Rule Usurps the Express Constitutional Authority of the States and Congress and Violates the Separation of Powers

A. The Constitution expressly places authority over the time, place, and manner of federal elections with the states and with Congress.

The Constitution’s text is clear: “The Times, Places and Manner of holding Elections for Senators and Representatives, shall be prescribed in each State by the Legislature thereof; but the Congress may at any time by Law make or alter such Regulations.”² Because “Times, Places and Manner” are “comprehensive words,”³ the “substantive scope” of the states’ and Congress’s authority “is broad.”⁴ Among other things, this includes “notices, registration, supervision of

¹ U.S. Postal Service, *Ballot Mail for Federal Elections*, 91 Fed. Reg. 32915 (June 2, 2026) (proposed rule) (online at www.federalregister.gov/documents/2026/06/02/2026-10968/ballot-mail-for-federal-elections).

² U.S. Const. art. I, § 4, cl. 1. As a practical matter, this has been applied to all federal elections, including presidential elections. See, e.g. *Ex parte Coy*, 127 U.S. 731, 751–52 (1888); *Burroughs v. United States*, 290 U.S. 534, 545 (1934).

³ *Smiley v. Holm*, 285 U.S. 355, 366 (1932).

⁴ *Arizona v. Inter Tribal Council of Arizona, Inc.*, 570 U.S. 1, 8 (2013).

voting, protection of voters, prevention of fraud and corrupt practices,”⁵ and the mechanisms for voting by mail that the Postal Service attempts to regulate with this proposed rule.⁶

Congress therefore has coextensive and preemptive control over these matters even when the states have regulated in the first instance—and when they have not. Thus, as the Supreme Court has explained, Congress’s power over national elections is “paramount,” as the Clause vests in Congress “supervisory control over the subject” and Congress “may make entirely new regulations, or add to, alter, or modify the regulations made by the State.”⁷

Both the executive order and the proposed rule illegally intrude upon this authority. The Postal Service proposes to arrogate to itself the authority to determine whether to deliver ballot mail to either a voter or to an elections office, effectively supplanting state law promulgated under the

states' Elections Clause authority. Any power to preempt or alter such state regulations lies with Congress alone, not the President or the Postal Service.

B. The federal executive has no constitutional role in regulating federal elections.

Not only does the Constitution place authority over federal elections with the states and Congress, it excludes the federal executive from this legislative function. The federal executive is mentioned nowhere in the Elections Clause nor in any of the other constitutional clauses concerning regulation of federal elections.⁸ Nor is regulation of federal elections mentioned anywhere in the clauses of the Constitution that *do* set out the scope of executive power. The Supreme Court has recognized that this kind of “constitutional silence on” a “profoundly important issue” is “equivalent to an express prohibition” on exercising power.⁹

Whatever authority Article II's Take Care Clause grants the President, it does not override the express text of the Elections Clause or empower him to make up implied authorities out of whole cloth. That is true no matter how much a President may personally want to “take over” and “nationalize” federal elections.¹⁰ And if the President cannot do it, the Postal Service

⁵ *Smiley v. Holm*, 285 U.S. at 366 (1932).

⁶ *Arizona v. Inter Tribal Council*, 570 U.S. at 15.

⁷ *Ex parte Siebold*, 100 U.S. 371, 372 (1879); see also *Foster v. Love*, 522 U.S. 67, 69 (1997); *Inter Tribal Council of Ariz.*, 570 U.S. at 8 (recognizing the Elections Clause confers on Congress “the power to alter [state] regulations or supplant them altogether”).

⁸ See U.S. Const. art. I, § 4, cl. 1; U.S. Const. art. I, § 2, cl. 2; U.S. Const. art. II, § 1, cl. 2.

⁹ *Clinton v. City of New York*, 524 U.S. 417, 439 (1998). Like the presidential actions that the Supreme Court found violated bicameralism and presentment in *Clinton*, the allocation of power to the states and to Congress in the Elections Clause also was “the product of the great debates and compromises that produced the Constitution itself.” *Id.* at 440; see, e.g., 2 Farrand, Records of the Federal Convention of 1787, at 240–42; The Federalist No. 59 (“[T]here were only three ways, in which this power could have been reasonably modified and disposed, that it must either have been lodged wholly in the National Legislature, or wholly in the State Legislatures, or primarily in the latter, and ultimately in the former. The last mode has with reason been preferred by the Convention.”).

¹⁰ Brookings, *Does President Trump Have The Authority to "Nationalize" Voting?* (Feb. 11, 2026) (online at www.brookings.edu/articles/does-president-trump-have-the-authority-to-nationalize-voting/).

certainly cannot absent a statutory grant of authority from Congress on the subject—which the Postal Service lacks.¹¹

Only Congress and states have authority to regulate federal elections, not the Executive. When Congress has regulated federal elections in the past, it has done so by statute. The federal statutes that govern federal elections—the Voting Rights Act of 1965, the Uniformed and Overseas

Citizens Absentee Voting Act of 1986 (UOCAVA), the National Voter Registration Act of 1993 (NVRA), and the Help America Vote Act of 2002 (HAVA)—were each enacted through a deliberative process of bicameral negotiation. Each passed both chambers with bipartisan majorities. Each was signed by a President of one of the two parties, in cooperation with congressional leaders of both. No President has ever asserted independent Article II authority to write new federal election rules—until now.

The proposed rule is simply lawless and ultra vires, both for the President and for the Postal Service. Proceeding to finalize this rule would be an ill-fated attempt to aggrandize the executive at the expense of congressional authority and the Framers’ design.

- C. It is clear from historical practice and Congress’s prior exercise of the Elections Clause that the proposed rule, and its implementation this election year, violate congressional authority and intent.

When Congress acts under the Elections Clause, it sets out federal requirements precisely while still respecting the principles of federalism that informed the framers’ allocation of power to the states. The NVRA is a good example. That statute sets an exact federal floor for state voter registration deadlines (no more than 30 days before an election) but leaves broad discretion for states to set their own policies within that window.¹² Similarly, the NVRA requires states to create a state-administered centralized database of registered voters and sets forth standards for verifying identify, while leaving to state discretion exactly what forms of verification are acceptable.¹³

Further, any attempt by the Postal Service to implement the proposed rule for the 2026 midterm elections would blatantly contradict Congress’s judgment, exercised repeatedly over decades, that federal preemption of election procedures must not take effect until at least the next election cycle. This enables both election administrators and voters to avoid chaos and confusion, and it enables an orderly transition without undue administrative burdens. This congressional judgment of delayed implementation also protects against undue influence of self-serving political interests that might drive reforms not in the public interest, but in the interest of changing the rules of the game for short-term advantage. The proposed rule’s illegality—and folly—is highlighted by the Postal Service’s rush to rewrite election rules before the fall.

The proposed rule therefore is unconstitutional and contrary to law because it attempts to coerce the states and override the state discretion Congress intentionally preserved, and on a

¹¹ Cf. *West Virginia vs. EPA*, 597 U.S. 697, 721 (2022).

¹³ *Id.* § 20507(a)(1), (5).

timeline Congress would never have set. Moreover, the proposed rule attempts to set new precise requirements and assert executive authority over subject matter that Congress has already regulated by statute. In an area such as the time, place, and manner of federal elections that the Constitution expressly commits to Congress, the executive cannot end run around the express commitment of authority to Congress simply because the President wants Congress to make different choices.

D. The proposed rule intrudes into Congress’s express authority under the Postal Clause.

This rule is doubly problematic under the plain text of Article I as it trespasses not only on the Elections Clause authority of states and Congress but also on Congress’s Postal Clause power to “establish post offices and post roads.”¹⁴ For well over a century, the Supreme Court has recognized Congress’s authority as extremely broad: “The validity of legislation describing what should be carried, and its weight and form, and the charges to which it should be subjected, has never been questioned . . . The power possessed by Congress embraces the regulation of the entire Postal System of the country.”¹⁵ As with the Elections Clause, it is Congress, not the executive, that has authority to determine whether and what mail will be carried, as well as “what shall be excluded.”¹⁶

Over half a century ago, Congress exercised this authority to structure the Postal Service to have meaningful independence while under the purview of Congress, not as an executive branch agency under the political control of the President. The Postal Reorganization Act of 1970 transformed the agency into an independent entity statutorily charged with providing “prompt, reliable, and efficient services to patrons in all areas and . . . all communities.”¹⁷ Congress granted the Postal Service—and the President—no authority to make their own judgments about who can send and receive mail in general, never mind election mail, when eligibility and administration are constitutionally excluded from the executive branch’s purview. This proposed rule illustrates a danger that Congress guarded against when exercising its express Postal Clause authority over fifty years ago—that the transmittal of mail would not be universal and neutral, but driven by political, policy, or regional biases of whoever happens to be in power.

2. The Postal Service Is Acting Beyond Its Statutory Authority

A. Statutory Authority

Congress passed the Postal Reorganization Act of 1970, which created the modern Postal Service as an independent entity of the executive branch. Congress developed the Postal Reorganization Act to safeguard quality mail service, ensure self-sufficiency, and provide

¹⁵ *U.S. Postal Service v. Council of Greenburgh Civic Assoc.*, 453 U.S. 114, 126 (1981) (quoting *Ex parte Jackson*, 96 U.S. 727, 732 (1878)).

¹⁶ *Ex parte Jackson*, 96 U.S. 732 (1878).

¹⁷ 39 U.S.C. § 101(a).

reasonable rates.¹⁸ The Postal Reorganization Act codified several chapters in Title 39 of the U.S. Code, including the Postal Service’s main policy mandate and general powers.

At its core, Congress authorized the creation and authority of the Postal Service with a statutory universal service obligation (USO), which requires the Postal Service to “provide prompt, reliable, and efficient services to patrons in all areas and [to] render postal services to all communities.”¹⁹ Through its USO, the Postal Service powers communities and links geographic, economic, and cultural divides. Moreover, Congress prohibited the Postal Service from “mak[ing] any undue or unreasonable discrimination among users of the mails.”²⁰ According to 39 U.S. Code § 101(b), the Postal Service must maximize “effective and regular postal services,” especially to rural America and hard-to-reach areas.²¹

The Postal Service’s statutory authority to adopt and amend rules and regulations “as may be necessary in the execution of its functions under this title and such other functions as may be assigned ... under any provisions of law” does not override constitutional limits.²² Moreover, no part of Title 39 authorizes or permits the Postal Service to impose these inescapable burdens on election officials and voters.

B. Application to Proposed Rule

The proposed rule “Ballot Mail for Federal Elections” is not authorized by Congress, and it directly undermines all aspects of the statutory USO. This rule would require all mail-in and absentee ballots to be mailed in an envelope with an official election mail logo, to be automation compatible, to have a unique Intelligent Mail barcode (IMb), and to have its design reviewed by the Postal Service. It requires states to provide State Mail-In and Absentee Participation Lists (State Lists) “at least 30 days before the date of the federal election, to the extent practicable, or by the date on which mail-in or absentee ballots may begin to be mailed under state law.” Every State’s chief election official would be required to be registered through the Postal Service’s Federal Ballot Mail Portal before the Postal Service processes outbound ballots. The proposed rule would require states to develop and provide State Lists to the Postal Service to verify that the voter’s information on a mail-in or absentee ballot matches the name and information on the respective State List and to determine whether it can accept and process the mail. It would require any ballot mail that does not comply with this regulation to be returned to sender, and any state that fails to submit the required information would have their ballots withheld by the Postal Service.

¹⁸ Government Accountability Office, *Statement of William J. Anderson, Director, General Government Division, Before the Committee on Post Office and Civil Service* (Dec. 10, 1981) (online at www.gao.gov/assets/117/1125.pdf).

¹⁹ 39 U.S.C. § 101(a).

²⁰ 39 U.S.C. § 403(c).

²¹ 39 U.S.C. § 101(b).

²² 39 U.S.C. § 401.

²³ U.S. Postal Service, *Ballot Mail for Federal Elections*, 91 Fed. Reg. 32915 (June 2, 2026) (proposed rule) (online at www.federalregister.gov/documents/2026/06/02/2026-10968/ballot-mail-for-federal-elections).

If enacted, this rule would violate the statutory USO. Mail delivery will be less prompt, less reliable, less efficient, highly irregular, and discriminatory. According to the statutory USO, the Postal Service must maximize “effective and regular postal services” to rural America and hard-to-reach areas.²⁴ Rural, remote, and small communities—areas that depend heavily on the Postal Service—experience ballot access issues and lack the technical capabilities and resources to rapidly scale up the redesign of ballots with unique IMBs.²⁵ The Postal Service does not provide any supplemental funding for jurisdictions to change their ballot design. As a result, smaller jurisdictions would have substantially more difficulty complying with the proposed rule, resulting in large amounts of outbound ballots not being processed despite otherwise being lawful mail products.

Congress has not provided the Postal Service with this authority you have now claimed to collect state data, audit ballot mail, and withhold ballot delivery. Congress specifically outlined in the Postal Reorganization Act that the Postal Service must not make any unreasonable discrimination among mail users.²⁶ Rendering a ballot nonmailable under this rule—that otherwise is an allowable mail product—is in direct contravention of the USO. Moreover, Congress has already specifically identified nonmailable matter by statute.²⁷ Ballots are not on that list, and the Postal Service has no authority to change the definition of nonmailable matter in this way.

3. Proposed Rule Risks Turning the Postal Service into an Election Administration Gatekeeper

Under the proposed rule the Postal Service would assume an unlawful and unprecedented role in federal election administration, a role it was neither designed nor intended to perform.

The proposed rule’s attempt to usurp control over federal elections was crystal clear in the Postmaster General’s congressional testimony last week, where he admitted under oath that the Postal Service would refuse to deliver mail ballots under the proposed rule if a state declines to turn its absentee voter lists over to the federal government.²⁸

Dating back more than 150 years, the Postal Service has performed a limited but essential service in elections by acting as a neutral carrier of ballots and other materials.²⁹ The Elections

²⁵ Aspen Institute, *Supporting Ballot Access in Rural Communities* (Sept. 3, 2025) (online at www.aspeninc.org/supporting-ballot-access-in-rural-communities/); Secure Democracy, *Report Shows Rural Voters Rely on Vote by Mail and Early Voting* (June 23, 2022) (online at <https://securedemocracyusa.org/new-report-rural-voters/>); Center for American Progress, *Enhancing Accessibility in U.S. Elections* (July 8, 2021) (online at www.americanprogress.org/article/enhancing-accessibility-u-s-elections/).

²⁶ 39 U.S.C. § 403(c).

²⁷ See 39 U.S. Code § 3001 *et seq.*

²⁸ *Postmaster General Confirms Plan to Hold Back Mail Ballots Under Proposed Rule*, New York Times (June 24, 2026) (online at <https://www.nytimes.com/2026/06/24/us/politics/postmaster-mail-ballot-rule-trump-elections.html>).

²⁹ *Voting by Mail Dates Back to America's Earliest Years. Here's How It's Changed Over the Years*, TIME (Dec. 12, 2023) (online at <https://time.com/5892357/voting-by-mail-history/>).

Clause of the U.S. Constitution, meanwhile, grants states (subject to congressional override) the power to determine voter eligibility, distribute ballots, and set election procedures.³⁰ The proposed rule upends the relationship between states and the Postal Service by forcing state election officials to provide voter- and ballot-specific information directly to the Postal Service as a condition of participating in the agency's proposed ballot-mail system—in direct contrast to the purely voluntary election mail best practices previously advocated by the Postal Service.³¹

The proposed rule's requirements would subordinate state and local election officials to a power of compliance. While state and local election officials would remain legally responsible for overseeing elections, this power would in practice be conditioned on compliance with ballot mail standards established and administered by the Postal Service. These changes grant the Postal Service sweeping new powers to determine how elections are administered, without legal justification.³² In doing so, the proposed rule risks turning the Postal Service from an impartial service provider into a gatekeeper for federal, state, and local elections.

4. The Proposed Rule Poses Insurmountable Implementation and Accuracy Challenges for Election Administrators

Even if the Postal Service had legal authority to promulgate this rule—and it does not—the implementation, compliance, and cost challenges would be practically insurmountable for many election administrators. This is true even if the rule did not become effective until next election cycle.

Among other challenges discussed in this comment, the proposed rule would require compliance with currently voluntary ballot-marking practices, for both inbound and outbound election mail. Although certain jurisdictions meet these standards voluntarily, many others do not. These are disproportionately small and rural jurisdictions. As a practical matter, many rural jurisdictions in

particular will be unable to implement the proposed requirements on a fall timeline or absent spending taxpayer funds they may not have. For example, many rural election offices do not use an established vendor for their ballot design or printing. These jurisdictions would need to design and order new ballot envelopes before early voting begins, imposing potentially unfunded costs on rural communities that are already deprived of resources due to underfunding of HAVA grants.

The proposed rule's mandate of untested and certainly inaccurate voter lists compounds the compliance burdens and challenges for election administrators and will almost certainly result in disenfranchising American citizens.

³⁰ Cornell Law School, *Congress and the Elections Clause* (online at www.law.cornell.edu/constitution-conan/article-1/section-4/clause-1/congress-and-the-elections-clause) (accessed June 24, 2026).

³¹ See U.S. Postal Service, *Facilitating the Processing and Delivery of Return Ballots from Voters Using Prepaid Postage* (online at <https://about.usps.com/what/government-services/election-mail/pdf/election-mail-prepaid-reply-mail-info.pdf>) (accessed June 24, 2026).

³² See U.S. Postal Service, *2026-2027 Official Election Mail Guide* (online at <https://about.usps.com/kits/kit600.pdf>) (accessed June 24, 2026).

The rule also provides little detail about how the Postal Service will make decisions about which ballots to accept or reject, including who will make those decisions, according to what criteria, and on what timeline. The absence of such details should be independently fatal to the proposed rule, but the need for that explanation is even more critical because neither the Postal Service nor any other federal agency is equipped to handle these tasks in which they have no experience or expertise. This is not a coincidence—in the NVRA and other exercises of Congress's Elections Clause authority, Congress made clear that responsibility for voter list maintenance lies with the states.

For example, the proposed rule states that ballots the Postal Service determines are not in compliance with the newly mandatory envelope design elements, or that are addressed to individuals not on the proposed rule's newly mandated eligibility lists “will be returned to the authorized ballot mailer” for the “errors” to be addressed. This would delay delivery in both directions and disenfranchise voters through no fault of their own, or even the election administrator. It's not clear how or how quickly these “noncompliance” determinations will be made, or how anyone could have the opportunity to cure.

This vagueness about how to comply is problematic enough for election administrators who are under state-law and other obligations to ensure the ability of their eligible residents to vote by mail. It is even worse when the federal government implicitly threatens investigation or prosecution for noncompliance, as the executive order does. Moreover, the vagueness of how the Postal Service plans to implement its new requirements makes it difficult for any commenters to

understand the precise impact of the rule on the ability of Americans to vote by mail or offer alternatives.

As in every election year, election administrators must spend the critical period over the summer and early fall preparing for the election with limited time and resources, even under standard and well-worn election procedures. To burden these administrators in the pre-election period with additional, novel requirements to create and comply with new eligibility lists, and to redesign and reprint envelopes, is simply absurd.

5. Proposed Rule Creates Timing Risks and Other Burdens for Election Officials and Voters

The Postal Service claims sweeping new election administration powers under the proposed rule that lack basic constitutional and legal justification. The proposed rule would also in practice impose substantial new administrative obligations on election officials during periods of high pressure and under severe time constraints. To comply with Postal Service requirements, jurisdictions would be required to generate ballots with unique outbound and return IMBs, link those identifiers to individual voters, transmit such information through a Federal Ballot Mail Portal, and maintain participation records based on voter requests. These requirements represent a significant and unfunded expansion of administrative responsibilities beyond those currently imposed under state election laws.

The burden associated with these requirements are particularly acute for smaller jurisdictions, rural election offices, and election administrators operating with limited

technological resources. Implementing the proposed requirements may require significant investment in new technologies and staff training, with these costs borne exclusively by election officials rather than the Postal Service.³³

While we agree that barcoding and ballot tracking capabilities are an important recent innovation, such mandatory requirements, implemented hurriedly and without appropriate resources, also introduce multiple new opportunities for delays in the vote-by-mail process. For example, minor errors in voter records or barcode assignments that do not constitute voter fraud or ineligibility would require corrective action for a mail ballot to be delivered by the Postal Service. Given the compressed timelines involved in state election administration, such trivial errors may in practice disenfranchise voters—excluding them from the electoral process entirely.³⁴ The right to vote is a critical function of democracy and must be protected. This proposed rule would lead to voter suppression and compromise a bedrock of our democracy.³⁵

Finally, the proposed rule raises serious administrative and timing concerns given the proximity of the 2026 midterm elections, especially for states that practice universal mail-in voting. With the 2026 midterms just months away, such major changes to election mail requirements would cause significant disruption in preparations at the state and local level. This disruption would be especially acute for states that permit elections to be conducted entirely by mail: California,

Colorado, Hawaii, Nevada, Oregon, Utah, Vermont, and Washington state.³⁶ In the likely event of delays or acute failures in the implementation of the new system, voters in these states would have no other means to participate in elections.

Nearly one-third of Americans voted by mail in the last presidential election, and some voter populations historically use mail-in voting at far higher rates, including voters with disabilities and senior voters.³⁷ Nine states vote solely by mail-in ballots.³⁸ The composition of and verification standard for the State Lists will open the door to malicious action or errors through a new point of failure. If the Postal Service has determined that a state has failed to comply with the provisions of this rule, bulk ballots would be rejected by the Postal Service,

³³ See The Center for Election Innovation and Research, *Who Pays for Election Administration?* (Oct. 2025) (online at <https://electioninnovation.org/research/who-pays-for-election-admin/>); The Center for Election Innovation and Research, *Who Pays for Ballots?* (Oct. 2025) (online at <https://electioninnovation.org/research/who-pays-for-ballots/>); *USPS Mail-In Voting Rules Spark Election Official Concern*, KXAN Austin (June 1, 2026) (online at www.yahoo.com/news/politics/articles/usps-mail-voting-rules-spark-224142964.html).

³⁴ NAACP, *NAACP Moves to Halt USPS Mail-In Ballot Proposed Rule* (June 3, 2026) (online at <https://naacp.org/articles/naacp-moves-halt-usps-mail-ballot-proposed-rule>).

³⁵ See Brookings, *Mail Voting in the U.S.: Data Points to Very Low Fraud and Significant Benefits for Voters* (Nov. 6, 2025) (online at www.brookings.edu/articles/mail-voting-in-the-us-data-points-to-very-low-fraud-and-significant-benefits-to-voters/); Brookings, *How Widespread Is Election Fraud in the United States? Not Very* (Oct. 28, 2024) (online at brookings.edu/articles/how-widespread-is-election-fraud-in-the-united-states-not-very/).

³⁶ National Conference of State Legislatures, *Table 18: States with Mostly Mail Elections* (Apr. 6, 2026) (online at www.ncsl.org/elections-and-campaigns/table-18-states-with-all-mail-elections).

³⁷ States United Democracy Center, *Nearly 1 in 3 Americans Voted by Mail in 2024* (Apr. 13, 2026) (online at <https://statesunited.org/resources/americans-vote-by-mail-2024/>).

³⁸ *NAACP v. U.S. Postal Serv.*, 496 F. Supp. 3d 1 (D.D.C. 2020).

potentially compromising the USO. This is yet another example where ballots may be stopped, even with the best intentions, and eligible voters disenfranchised.

6. Privacy and Cybersecurity Concerns

Through the President's executive order and proposed rule, the Postal Service is setting new standards for illegal government surveillance and intrusion into Americans' lives.

The proposed rule requires states to provide lists including names and addresses of individuals receiving mail-in or absentee ballots through a new Federal Ballot Mail Portal. The Postal Service, however, has no power to require states to comply with this rule nor collect this type of state-level data. The rule states that the Postal Service will create systems of records notices pursuant to the Privacy Act. However, the proposed rule fails to detail how it will safeguard and

protect such sensitive voter information, agency access to such data and information, how such data may be used outside “law enforcement efforts,” and the extent to which this data may be shared with other non-governmental organizations.³⁹

The proposed rule suggests that State List information may be shared with federal law enforcement efforts. The Postal Service already maintains a wide swath of personal information on individuals present in the United States, but use of that data is highly restricted. Data may only be shared in very limited situations with comprehensive protection of personal information.⁴⁰

This Administration cannot be trusted to safeguard the privacy of sensitive government data. Department of Government Efficiency (DOGE) employees embedded within SSA gained high level access to Americans’ sensitive data and violated numerous privacy and cybersecurity laws—including the Federal Information Security Modernization Act, the Privacy Act, and the Computer Fraud and Abuse Act.⁴¹ DOGE employees reportedly gained access and transferred confidential data within the National Labor Relations Board and tried to cover up their actions, in potential violation of the law.⁴² A federal judge found that the Office of Personnel Management violated the law when DOGE employees bypassed critical privacy and cybersecurity standards to access sensitive and personal information of millions of federal employees and retirees.⁴³

³⁹ U.S. Postal Service, *Ballot Mail for Federal Elections*, 91 Fed. Reg. 32915 (June 2, 2026) (proposed rule) (online at www.federalregister.gov/documents/2026/06/02/2026-10968/ballot-mail-for-federal-elections).

⁴⁰ *There Are Rules Governing How USPS Manages Personal Information*, U.S. Postal Service Link (July 29, 2025) (online at <https://news.usps.com/2025/07/29/there-are-rules-governing-how-usps-manages-personal-information/>); U.S. Postal Service, *AS-353, Guide to Privacy, the Freedom of Information Act, and Records Management* (Jan. 2025) (online at https://about.usps.com/policy/as353_pol.pdf).

⁴¹ See Letter from Ranking Member Robert Garcia, Committee on Oversight and Government Reform, to The Honorable Frank Bisignano, Social Security Administration (Mar. 9, 2026) (online at <https://oversightdemocrats.house.gov/imo/media/doc/2026-03-09garciatobisignanoletterredogessa.pdf>).

⁴² Brookings, *A Whistleblower’s Disclosure Details How DOGE May Have Taken Sensitive Labor Data* (Apr. 15, 2025) (online at www.brookings.edu/articles/privacy-under-siege-doges-one-big-beautiful-database/).

⁴³ *Judge Finds OPM Broke Law in Granting Data Access to DOGE*, Federal News Network (June 9, 2025) (online at <https://federalnewsnetwork.com/management/2025/06/judge-finds-opm-broke-law-in-granting-data-access-to-doge/>).

Committee Democrats received reports that members of DOGE were scheming to combine sensitive information held by SSA, the IRS, the Department of Health and Human Services, and

other agencies into a single cross-agency master database—without regard for important cybersecurity and privacy considerations, and potentially in violation of the law.⁴⁴

The Postal Service has failed to identify how it would protect and safeguard personal voter information as part of its proposed rule. It has failed to define all law enforcement uses of this data, and any other access to this sensitive information about the American electorate. Taken together, this proposed rule represents another effort by the President Trump’s Administration to deepen its surveillance agenda.

7. Conclusion

The Postal Service may support the right to vote by effectively and efficiently performing its regular operation, but it has no authority to undermine it. The Postal Service has a constitutional and statutory obligation to transmit mail and not interfere in U.S. elections. To protect the sanctity of our elections, defend the right to vote, safeguard sensitive data, and comply with the law, we urge you to rescind this proposed rule.

Sincerely,

[[SIGNATURES]]

cc: The Honorable James Comer, Chairman

The Honorable Bryan Steil, Chairman Committee on House Administration

The Honorable Doug Tulino

Deputy Postmaster General, Chief Operating Officer and Chief Human Resources Officer
U.S. Postal Service

The Honorable Amber F. McReynolds, Chair Board of Governors, U.S. Postal Service

The Honorable Derek T. Kan, Vice Chair Board of Governors, U.S. Postal Service

The Honorable Ronald A. Stroman Board of Governors, U.S. Postal Service

The Honorable Daniel M. Tangherlini Board of Governors, U.S. Postal Service

⁴⁴ See also Brookings, *Privacy Under Siege: DOGE’s One Big Beautiful Database* (June 25, 2025) (online at www.brookings.edu/articles/privacy-under-siege-doges-one-big-beautiful-database/).

Protecting Minority-Owned Small Businesses

Dear Mr. President,

For decades, the federal government has recognized a simple truth: equal opportunity cannot exist where equal access has never been granted. From the Small Business Act of 1953 to the establishment of the Disadvantaged Business Enterprise program in 1983, this nation made a sustained commitment to ensuring that minority-owned small businesses could compete, contribute, and thrive in the American economy. That commitment was not charity, rather, these investments in economic opportunity sprang from an acknowledgment that centuries of exclusion will not self-correct without deliberate policy changes.

Today, more than 1.3 million minority-owned small businesses stand as testament to the hard work of entrepreneurial Americans, and the promise of what that commitment made possible.¹ Despite this success your administration is dismantling the programs which supported this economic development. Through a coordinated series of executive actions, regulatory reversals, and budget eliminations, you are systematically stripping away the programs that made minority entrepreneurship in America possible. We write today to call on you to rescind and reverse these harmful actions.

For sixty years, federal contracting law has operated on a foundational principle: that the government has not only the authority, but the obligation, to remedy the effects of historic discrimination in the marketplace. On March 26, 2026, you discarded that principle. Your Executive Order entitled “Addressing DEI Discrimination by Federal Contractors” does not protect against discrimination but reinstitutionalizes it. The order prohibits federal contractors from conducting targeted outreach to vendors of color, establishing mentoring or leadership development programs for underrepresented entrepreneurs, or directing any resources toward inclusion. Contractors who fail to comply face cancellation, suspension, and permanent debarment. What is being called a civil rights measure is, in practice, a mechanism to push qualified people of color back out of contracting opportunities they have been historically denied. That is not reform but regression.

Likewise the Department of Transportation’s Disadvantaged Business Enterprise (DBE) program was not an accident of policy but a deliberate answer to a documented problem. For more than forty years, the DBE and Airport Concessions DBE program served as the primary pathway for minority and women owned firms to access airport contracting opportunities that had been closed to them. In October 2025, your administration issued an Interim Final Rule gutting the programs. Every firm, whether newly applying or currently certified, must now prove disadvantage on a strictly individual basis, with no consideration of race or gender and no technical assistance to navigate the process. The burden is enormous and the support is nonexistent. In Georgia alone, only a fraction of DBE-certified businesses have successfully recertified under the new rules. Forty years of progress has been undone by a rule change that offers no guidance or recognition of why these programs existed in the first place.

Similarly, the Small Business Administration's 8(a) Business Development Program did not emerge from good intentions alone but from evidence. Decades of documented exclusion from federal contracting had made clear that without deliberate intervention, minority entrepreneurs would remain locked out of the marketplace regardless of their qualification. For over fifty years, this program worked. Then in January 2026, your administration went beyond what any court required and declared the entire framework a burden on white Americans, stripping race from eligibility determinations entirely. The results have been immediately severe. Under the pretense of fraud and abuse associated with DEI favoritism, approximately 4,300 firms were required to submit years of financial records under a sweeping data call. Over 1,000 were suspended for missing the compliance deadline. More than 600 are now being terminated. In 2025, only 65 businesses were admitted to the program - down from more than 700 the year prior. I have even heard from an 8(a)-certified woman-owned business owner in my district who watched her annual revenue fall from over \$1 million to \$297,000 after her federal contracts were terminated for convenience. She is not an outlier but an example of what this policy looks like in practice.

Your administration has also moved to eliminate the Minority Business Development Agency (MBDA), the only federal agency created specifically to support the growth of minority-owned businesses. In March 2025, you signed an Executive Order targeting MBDA for elimination and placed its staff on leave. By October 2025, reduction-in-force notices had been issued to all remaining employees¹⁰. Though a federal court blocked the shutdown in November 2025, sweeping workforce shifts have hampered its capacity to carry out its mission. Then you released your FY2027 budget which calls the agency "divisive." Labeling MBDA's mission discriminatory and attacking its capital access programs does not reflect a good-faith legal concern. These actions reflect a deliberate choice to abandon minority entrepreneurs and to use the language of civil rights to do it.

Let us be clear about what is happening here. Your administration is not protecting civil rights; rather it's weaponizing the language of civil rights to dismantle the very infrastructure built to make them real. We are not fooled and we reject that framing entirely. We call on you to rescind the March 26, 2026 Executive Order, to direct Secretary Sean Duffy to restore the DOT's DBE and ACDBE programs with race-conscious eligibility intact, direct Administrator Kelly Loeffler to reinstate the SBA 8(a) program's original mission, and fully restore the Minority Business Development Agency.

Entrepreneurs of color built their businesses despite every barrier this country placed in front of them, and they will continue to thrive, despite these discriminatory policies.

Sincerely,
[[SIGNATURES]]

Opposing the "Regulation for Federal Financial Assistance" Rule

The Honorable Russell Vought
Director
Office of Management and Budget
725 17th Street NW
Washington, DC 20503

Dear Director Vought:

We write in strong opposition to the Office of Management and Budget's proposed rule titled "Regulation for Federal Financial Assistance," released on May 29, 2026. This proposal would represent the most sweeping and destructive transformation of the federal financial assistance system in modern history and would subordinate nonpartisan, merit-based grantmaking to political control, exposing the entire framework to serious constitutional challenge. With more than \$1 trillion in annual Federal awards at stake, the consequences would be felt by every state, federally recognized tribe, city, county, research university, hospital, and countless nonprofits, community organizations, and private firms that deliver critical scientific studies and essential public services.

Congress has long appropriated grant funding with the expectation that the executive branch would implement it for the benefit of all our constituents. This proposal represents an attempt to completely undermine the Congressional power of the purse and the separation of powers, as outlined further below.

I. Subjecting Congressionally-Mandated Spending to Excessive Political Control

Under the proposed regulations, senior executive branch political appointees would be required to approve every discretionary grant award before it is made. At the same time, independent, objective peer review—the mechanism that has long ensured that federal research and program dollars are allocated based on expertise and evidence—would be reduced to a non-binding suggestion that receives no deference from political appointees. The practical result would be a dramatic erosion in the rigor and credibility of federally funded science and research.

Also concerning, the proposal would authorize agencies to terminate any discretionary grant at any time if the grant is deemed no longer to serve "agency priorities or the national interest," a standard so open-ended as to be nearly unlimited. This would expose ongoing grants that grantees and program beneficiaries rely on to cancellation based on nothing more than shifting political winds, which may benefit Republican priorities in the near term but could change drastically between administrations. When contractors observe that federally funded projects can be reversed or defunded between administrations, they become reluctant to invest the upfront costs of bidding, staffing, and mobilizing for contracts that may be canceled or restructured before completion, making the financial risk outweigh the potential reward.

Making matters worse, the existing right to an administrative hearing before termination would be eliminated through the proposal's amendment of section 200.342. This would leave grantees with no meaningful avenue to contest such decisions without incurring expensive litigation costs.

Taken together, these provisions would give political appointees extraordinary, largely unchecked authority over spending that Congress has mandated for specific purposes. The Constitution vests the power of the purse squarely with Congress, not with the executive. These proposed rules directly violate the separation of powers by granting the executive unchecked and unilateral power over all federal financial assistance. OMB and the other 41 federal agencies would need additional statutory authority to effectuate these regulations, something that Congress could not grant, even if it wanted to, without amending the Constitution to grant the executive Branch this kind of unfettered power. Any final rule should explicitly cite the specific statutory authority that OMB and each of the 41 federal agencies believe they have that would support such a gross expansion of executive control.

II. Conditioning Federal Funds on the Surrender of Constitutional Rights

The proposed revisions of section 200.300 would tie eligibility for Federal funding to recipients' compliance with vague, sweeping prohibitions on policies that the current Administration disfavors, including "unlawful DEI," "gender ideology," and "religious discrimination." These terms are undefined, giving political appointees open-ended discretion to cut off funding based on their assessment of a recipient's viewpoints, internal policies, or institutional commitments.

This approach is unconstitutional and violates First Amendment rights to protect against viewpoint discrimination. The government cannot use the leverage of federal funding to coerce recipients into abandoning First Amendment-protected speech or association, nor can it condition benefits on viewpoint-based litmus tests that have no grounding in statute. These provisions invite immediate legal challenge and, if allowed to stand, would have a severe chilling effect on the academic, scientific, and civic institutions that depend on federal financial support.

III. Direct Threat to Services Communities Are Counting on Right Now

States, localities, tribal governments, school systems, health systems, and community organizations have already built programs, hired staff, and made commitments in reliance on existing funding arrangements. The proposed changes, particularly the expanded termination authority, could disrupt or abruptly halt billions of dollars currently flowing to critical public health programs, K-12 and higher education, scientific research, public safety initiatives, and local economic development. The populations served by these programs, often among the most vulnerable in our society, would bear the consequences directly and immediately.

This administration's unprecedented campaign to terminate grant awards that would have reduced pollution, lowered energy costs, and protected communities from more extreme weather has already put Americans' health and jobs at risk while driving up household energy bills. A recent study from the Environmental Data and Governance Initiative found that EPA

environmental justice grants alone represented at least \$6.4 billion in economic opportunity and 65,000 jobs, with economic impacts evenly distributed across Republican and Democratic Congressional districts

IV. Dramatic Expansion of Administrative Burden

Despite OMB's characterization of these changes as administrative improvements with little or no impact, the actual effect would be immense. The proposed rules layer on substantial new compliance obligations at every level of the grants system through changes to section 200.303, including:

- Mandatory enrollment in DHS E-Verify for all recipients and subrecipients;
- Required pre-disbursement screening through Treasury's Do Not Pay system before states may pass through federal funds to subrecipients; and
- Written justifications accompanying every payment request.

These requirements would impose serious costs on the organizations least equipped to absorb them — small nonprofits, rural service providers, tribal governments, and community health centers. Furthermore, several reforms previously adopted to streamline grant administration and reduce paperwork would be reversed under this proposal, directly contradicting OMB's stated rationale. Rather than making the grants process more accessible, these rules would make it more cumbersome, more costly, and less functional for the entities doing the work, not to mention creating administrative delays at the agency level.

Given these considerations, we oppose the proposed Regulation for Federal Financial Assistance rule, which would concentrate political control over federal spending, undermine constitutionally protected rights, disrupt billions of dollars in existing awards, and increase the compliance burden on the organizations and governments that serve the public. We respectfully but strongly urge OMB to withdraw this rulemaking in full.

[[SIGNATURES]]

Opposing Roadless Rule

Dear Secretary Rollins and Chief Schultz,

As Members of Congress representing a broad range of communities, stakeholders, and outdoor interests, we write in strong support of the U.S. Forest Service's Roadless Area Conservation Rule ("Roadless Rule") and in firm opposition to the Department of Agriculture's proposal for rescission. We urge the Department to halt this effort and instead focus on effective implementation of this longstanding and successful policy.

Since its adoption in 2001, the Roadless Rule has served as a cornerstone of public lands conservation, now protecting approximately 44 million acres of National Forest System lands across 37 states. These areas provide clean drinking water, critical wildlife habitat, carbon storage, and world-class recreation opportunities. Iconic landscapes such as the Tongass National Forest in Alaska, the Gila National Forest in New Mexico, and the George Washington National Forest in Virginia exemplify the ecological, cultural, and economic importance of these lands.

The Roadless Rule was developed through one of the most robust public processes in federal rulemaking history. The Forest Service received 1.6 million public comments - approximately 95 percent in support - and held over 600 public meetings nationwide. In contrast, the current rescission effort has lacked meaningful public engagement. The Department provided just 21 days for public comment on the Notice of Intent in 2025 and has yet to hold any public meetings. Despite these limitations, more than 600,000 comments were submitted, with over 99 percent opposing rescission. This overwhelming and bipartisan public support underscores the continued popularity and importance of the Roadless Rule. Unsurprisingly, at just 30 days, the ongoing comment period for the DEIS and proposed rule is equally insufficient, and we encourage the USFS to extend the comment period to 120 days for a fair and transparent process.

Given the extraordinary public interest in the Roadless Rule and the significant consequences that its repeal would have for communities across the country, the Forest Service should also conduct a robust series of in-person public meetings before finalizing any rescission. Additionally, Tribes are entitled to the opportunity to engage in robust consultation, as the repeal of the Rule will have dramatic consequences on their way of life. When the Roadless Rule was originally developed, the aforementioned 600 public meetings ensured that affected communities, Tribes, local governments, industry, recreation interests, and conservation organizations had the opportunity to engage directly with the agency. The proposal to repeal the Rule warrants the same level of public engagement. Public meetings should be held in regions where National Forest System roadless areas are most affected, providing local communities with a meaningful opportunity to ask questions, provide testimony, and ensure the administrative record reflects the perspectives of those who will experience the greatest impacts. A transparent, accessible, and geographically representative public engagement process is essential to maintaining public confidence in the rulemaking process and ensuring the agency fully considers the consequences of such a consequential policy change.

The enduring support for the Roadless Rule is rooted in its clear and measurable benefits. Over the past 25 years, the rule has helped protect watersheds, biodiversity, and ecosystem integrity by limiting road construction and large-scale logging in undeveloped areas. Forest Service data show that watersheds within roadless areas are far more likely to be in “properly functioning” condition compared to those outside of them, which are more often classified as “at risk” or “impaired.”

These healthy ecosystems support a wide array of wildlife. Roadless areas provide habitat for hundreds of species listed or proposed for protection under the Endangered Species Act, including grizzly bears, lynx, and other sensitive species, and disproportionately support species of conservation concern. In addition, these areas play a vital role in climate resilience and carbon storage. For example, the Tongass National Forest alone stores over 1.5 billion metric tons of carbon and sequesters millions more annually.

Claims that the Roadless Rule impedes wildfire management are not supported by the evidence. The rule explicitly allows for wildfire prevention, suppression, and hazardous fuels reduction. In fact, nearly 2 million acres of roadless areas have undergone fuel treatments in recent years. Forest Service data also show that roadless areas account for a significant share of fuel treatment activities relative to their forest coverage. Research further indicates that wildfire risk is comparable inside and outside of roadless areas and that roads are not necessary to maintain forest health.

Moreover, scientific studies demonstrate that wildfire ignitions occur far more frequently in roaded areas due to human activity. By limiting road construction, the Roadless Rule helps reduce ignition risks from sources such as vehicles, campfires, and other human causes.

Finally, the economic benefits of the Roadless Rule are substantial. By avoiding the construction and maintenance of new roads, the rule saves taxpayers billions of dollars. The Forest Service already faces a road maintenance backlog of nearly \$6 billion across its existing system. Expanding road networks into remote and often economically unviable areas would only increase these costs. At the same time, protected roadless areas support recreation, tourism, and outdoor economies, while safeguarding clean water and subsistence resources that communities rely on. When it comes to outdoor recreation, our national forests encompass more than 25,000 miles of trails, 8,500 climbing routes, 1,000 miles of whitewater, and more than 10,000 miles of mountain biking trails across the country, all of which support a \$1.3 trillion outdoor recreation economy. Additionally, hunters and anglers across the nation access these public lands where backcountry provides ample fishing and hunting. The Roadless Rule protects drinking water in 354 municipal watersheds, saving downstream communities millions of dollars in water filtration costs.

After 25 years of successful implementation, the conclusion is clear: the Roadless Rule is effective, widely supported, and essential to responsible forest management. Rescinding it would undermine decades of progress and impose unnecessary environmental and fiscal costs.

We respectfully urge the Department to end its unjustified rescission of the Roadless Rule.

Opposing USPS Mail In Voting Restrictions

Postmaster General David P. Steiner
475 L'Enfant Plaza SW
Washington, DC 20260

Postmaster General Steiner:

We write to express our grave concerns with the United States Postal Service's (USPS) Final Rule entitled "Ballot Mail For Federal Elections"¹ issued on August 21, 2026. If implemented, this rule would throw our nation's entire election system into a state of uncertainty and chaos just weeks before states begin sending mail-in ballots to millions of voters.² The implementation of this rule would also further undermine public trust in the USPS's ability to deliver election mail to the tens of millions of Americans who utilize the Postal Service to cast their ballot every election cycle.

As you know, during the 2024 election cycle USPS delivered 99.22 million ballots for Americans from every corner of the country as well as our servicemen and women serving our nation overseas. USPS delivered 99.88% of election mail within seven days of being sent, and 97.73% within three days, with the average time to deliver ballots from voters to election officials being 1 day.³ USPS was similarly effective in delivering mail-in ballots during the 2022 midterm and 2020 general election and has been relied on to deliver absentee ballots since the Civil War.⁴

Voter fraud through vote-by-mail is incredibly rare. In 2025, the nonpartisan Brookings Institution found that there are on average four cases of voter fraud for every 10 million mail-in votes, comprising about 0.000043% of total mail-in votes cast. Contrary to claims by President Trump and his allies that mail-in voting encourages fraud, Brookings found that universal vote-by-mail states had the lowest percentage of election mail fraud.⁵

The evidence is clear: voting by mail is safe, effective, and helps to ensure everyone is able to execute their constitutional right to vote. USPS has played an essential role in elections for generations – and it is our fear that this final rule risks harming the democratic process and severely damaging USPS's relationship with the millions of Americans who rely on USPS to deliver ballots every election cycle.

This administration's actions appear to be a misguided effort to correct a problem that does not exist. As mentioned above, every neutral and nonpartisan study on vote-by-mail shows that there has never been systemic fraud associated with voting by mail. However, the primary comments

¹ [2026-17238.pdf](#) pg. 1

² [Table 7: When States Mail Out Absentee/Mail Ballots](#)

³ [2024 Post-Election Analysis Report](#)

⁴ [Voting By Mail History: When Mail-In Ballots Started in U.S.](#)

⁵ [Mail voting fraud: Data points to low risk and high benefits for voters | Brookings](#)

in support of the rule discussed “voter fraud as a significant problem and lauded the proposed rule for helping to restore voters’ confidence in election integrity.”⁶ We believe that it is telling that the primary supporters of the rule are arguing in its favor almost exclusively on the grounds that it would help eliminate an exceedingly rare problem.

Although we believe that this rule is unconstitutional and illegal, we also have grave concerns with how this rule would be implemented given the extremely short time frame before election mail is sent by states and voters. Under this rule, USPS would be asking its employees – many of whom are already overworked and understaffed – to essentially act as election judges by and cross referencing mail-in ballots that have already been mailed by voters with lists provided by states. It is irresponsible to impose these additional and undefined responsibilities that would be outside the normal expectations of a USPS employee.

Given the Postal Service’s current financial crisis – which you are asking for support from Congress to solve⁷ – and subpar on-time delivery rates⁸, it does not make sense to dedicate limited USPS resources to implement this rule, especially when USPS’s existing election mail procedures have proved to be extremely effective. This rule is a solution in search of a problem. For these reasons, we respectfully ask that you halt the implementation of this final rule. We also ask that you respond to the following questions no later than Tuesday September 8, 2026:

1. Has the USPS commissioned or completed a comprehensive financial analysis on the implementation costs of this rule? If so, please provide it to Congress.
2. Prior to issuing this rule, did anyone at USPS coordinate with or seek input from the White House about the contents of the rule; if so, in what form and at what level?
3. Prior to issuing this rule, did anyone at USPS coordinate with or seek input from local and state election officials about the contents of the rule, specifically surrounding implementation?
4. How many USPS employees are expected to participate in the ballot verification process, and how will USPS fund additional training for employees without disrupting existing mail operations?
5. Given that multiple states begin mailing absentee ballots in a matter of days, under this rule, how does the Postal Service intend to deliver ballots in states that have already printed envelopes for the 2026 general election that do not comply with the envelope design standards required under the final rule?

Thank you for your time and consideration. We look forward to receiving your response.

⁶ [2026-17238.pdf](#) Pg. 3

⁷ [062426-pmg-steiner-hsgac-hearing-testimony.pdf](#)

⁸ [fy2026-q3-single-piece-first-class-mail-quarterly-performance.pdf](#)

Sincerely,

[[SIGNATURES]]

cc:

The Honorable Donald J. Trump, President of the United States of America

The Honorable Markwayne Mullin, United States Secretary of Homeland Security Douglas Tulino,
Deputy United States Postmaster General

Amber F. McReynolds, Chair, USPS Board of Governors Derek T. Kan, Vice-Chairman, USPS Board
of Governors Ronald Stroman, Member, USPS Board of Governors Daniel Tanghrelini, Member,
USPS Board of Governors Robert G. Taub, Vice Chair, Postal Regulatory Commission

Thomas G. Day, Commissioner, Postal Regulatory Commission Ann C. Fisher, Commissioner,
Postal Regulatory Commission Ashley E. Poling, Commissioner, Postal Regulatory Commission