

Congressional Comments to OMB on Proposed Rule on Regulation for Federal Financial Assistance, Docket No. OMB-2026-0034

House / Senate	Letter Lead(s)	Additional Cosigners	Position	Link
Senate	Charles E. Schumer (D-NY) Minority Leader	46	Opposes: “Your proposal exceeds OMB’s authority, will make it impossible for grant recipients to faithfully carry out the funding priorities that Congress establishes in statute, and would turn federal grants into a new cudgel for the President to unilaterally advance his partisan agenda and punish political rivals.”	https://downloads.regulations.gov/OMB-2026-0034-57381/attachment_1.pdf
Senate	Cory A. Booker (D-MD)	N/A	Opposes: “This rule makes federal grants an instrument of political reward and retribution. It corrupts the integrity of a system that has, for generations, produced the world’s preeminent scientific enterprise and kept communities safe. It will harm the scientists, students, patients, communities, local governments, crime victims, and law enforcement officers who depend on a fair and functioning federal grant system.”	https://downloads.regulations.gov/OMB-2026-0034-57473/attachment_1.pdf
Senate	Susan M. Collins (R-ME) Chair Committee on Appropriations	N/A	Opposes portions: “I request that OMB extend the comment period for the rule by no less than 90 days and withdraw portions of the rule that would unduly burden scientific and biomedical research and small communities.”	https://downloads.regulations.gov/OMB-2026-0034-57378/attachment_1.pdf

Bicameral	Adam B. Schiff (D-CA) United States Senator Zoe Lofgren (D-CA-18) Member of Congress California Democratic Congressional Delegation	42	Opposes: “With such funding uncertainty and unpredictability, California and the rest of the country will backslide behind other nations in the areas of health, innovation, research, and scientific development.”	https://downloads.regulations.gov/OMB-2026-0034-57367/attachment_1.pdf
Bicameral	Patty Murray (D-WA) Ranking Member Subcommittee on Energy and Water Development Senate Committee on Appropriations Marcy Kaptur (D-OH-9) Ranking Member Subcommittee on Energy and Water Development House Committee on Appropriations	N/A	Opposes: “By allowing an Administration to arbitrarily terminate or withhold awarded grant funds based on shifting political whims, this proposed rule would freeze critical energy and water investments needed to lower everyday costs for Americans and improve affordability for working families. Furthermore, turning grant funding meant to support reliable Federal partnerships into a political “slush fund” will drive away private capital, stifle domestic innovation, and severely undermine America’s global competitiveness.”	https://downloads.regulations.gov/OMB-2026-0034-57359/attachment_1.pdf
House	Troy A. Carter, Sr. (D-LA-2) Nikki Budzinski (D-IL-13)	125	Opposes: “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.”	https://downloads.regulations.gov/OMB-2026-0034-57376/attachment_1.pdf
House	Jamie Raskin (D-MD-8) Suzan DelBene (D-WA-01) Lori Trahan (D-MA-03)	122	Opposes: “We vehemently oppose this proposed rule change and urge you to consider its deeply harmful effects on medical research and on the millions of Americans who are waiting on life saving cures.”	https://downloads.regulations.gov/OMB-2026-0034-57379/attachment_1.pdf

House	Sarah McBride (D-DE-1)	15	Opposes: “OMB’s proposed rule contains more than 120 changes to the current Uniform Guidance, including revisions that risk destabilizing research innovation, cutting out international partners, and injecting partisan politics into the grant review process. Furthermore, we are concerned that the proposed changes could weaken the federal research partnerships foundational to America’s global leadership in agriculture, science, and innovation.”	https://downloads.regulations.gov/OMB-2026-0034-57382/attachment_1.pdf
House	Diana DeGette (D-CO-1) Ranking Member Subcommittee on Health Committee on Energy and Commerce	13	Opposes: “The proposed rule fails at its stated purpose of improving transparency, accountability, and oversight for federal awards. Instead, it usurps the ability of federal agencies to carry out their congressionally directed missions and injects the whims of political appointees into all federal agency grantmaking processes.”	https://downloads.regulations.gov/OMB-2026-0034-57377/attachment_1.pdf
House	Zoe Lofgren (D-CA-18) Ranking Member Committee on Science, Space, and Technology	13	Opposes: • Setting a Double Standard for Political Influence on Grantmaking • Allowing Terminations for Political Reasons • Ignoring Laws that President Trump Disagrees With • Kneecapping Crucial International Collaborations • Creating New Avenues to Penalize Out-of-Favor Institutions and Research • Hobbling Independent Oversight Entities • Disallowing the Use of Funds for Basic Scientific Activities • Replacing Career Scientist Expertise with Political Whims • Free Speech Concerns	https://downloads.regulations.gov/OMB-2026-0034-57372/attachment_1.pdf

House	Seth Moulton (D-MA-6) Members of the MA Congressional Delegation	6	Opposes: “We urge OMB to withdraw these proposed changes and preserve the longstanding principles that have made America’s federal research investments the envy of the world. Federal funding should continue to be based on merit, expertise, and public benefit—not political considerations.”	https://downloads.regulations.gov/OMB-2026-0034-51061/attachment_1.pdf
House	Richard E. Neal (D-MA-1) Ranking Member Committee on Ways and Means	N/A	Opposes: “The long-term effects on Americans’ health, wellbeing, and economy are far too great to move forward with this senseless NPRM.”	https://downloads.regulations.gov/OMB-2026-0034-57373/attachment_1.pdf
House	Robert “Bobby” Scott (D-VA-3) Ranking Member Committee on Education and Workforce	N/A	Opposes: “The sweeping changes by the Proposed Rule would ultimately upend the continuity of federal programs, harming individuals’ and communities’ access to essential services, as well as federally supported research that is used to inform virtually every sector of our lives as well as policymaking at all levels of government.”	https://downloads.regulations.gov/OMB-2026-0034-57383/attachment_1.pdf
House	Jake Auchincloss (D-MA-4) Lori Trahan (D-MA-3)	N/A	Opposes: “The proposed rule will not only jeopardize the nation’s preeminent global position in research and innovation but will also harm key industries, including transportation, education, and food assistance.”	https://downloads.regulations.gov/OMB-2026-0034-57374/attachment_1.pdf
House	Lizzie Fletcher (D-TX-7)	N/A	Opposes: “By putting political judgment ahead of scientific expertise, OMB’s proposed rule makes federal funding less predictable and harms our communities. Researchers, universities, and nonprofit organizations would have less confidence that their work won’t face suspension or termination before completion based on changing agency priorities or political action.”	https://downloads.regulations.gov/OMB-2026-0034-57351/attachment_1.pdf

House	Shri Thanedar, PhD (D-MI-13)	N/A	Opposes: “The added burdens on grant recipients, the risks to research independence, the serious constitutional concerns, and the tunnel-vision approach to federally funded research would weaken American innovation, harm our institutions, and undermine the country’s long-term security.”	https://downloads.regulations.gov/OMB-2026-0034-57371/attachment_1.pdf
House	Laura A. Gillen (D-NY-4) Brian Fitzpatrick (R-PA-1)	N/A	Urges OMB to Reconsider: “This proposal would undermine the independent, merit-based process for awarding federal cancer research projects, and we urge thoughtful reconsideration.	https://downloads.regulations.gov/OMB-2026-0034-57375/attachment_1.pdf
House	Don Bacon (R-NE-2)	N/A	Urges OMB to Reconsider: “I urge OMB to extend the comment period by at least 120 days. [...] I also urge OMB to carefully consider and address the substantive concerns raised by stakeholders.”	https://downloads.regulations.gov/OMB-2026-0034-57380/attachment_1.pdf
House	Michael V. Lawler (R-NY-17)	N/A	Urges OMB to Reconsider: “While I certainly support many of the Administration’s objectives in this proposed rule, I am concerned that certain provisions could impede the flow of federal money to nonprofits, local governments, and other grant recipients as Congress intended.”	https://downloads.regulations.gov/OMB-2026-0034-57368/attachment_1.pdf

Not yet posted to Regulations.gov:

House	Robert Garcia (D-CA-42) Ranking Member Committee on Oversight and Government Reform Hakeem Jeffries (D-NY-8) Minority Leader House Oversight Minority Members	150	Opposes: “We write with serious concern and strong opposition to the Trump Administration’s proposed rule to gut the federal grantmaking process, which would politicize all federal grant funding and subject billions of taxpayer dollars to overtly partisan purity tests. Federal grants drive lifesaving discoveries, serve as a lifeline for families and communities, and help address Americans’ needs and challenges on critical issues including public health, public safety, child care, education, and infrastructure.”	https://oversightdemocrats.house.gov/imo/media/doc/2026-07-13garciaetallettertoombregantsproposedrule.pdf
Bicameral	Michael Cloud (R-TX-27) Jim Banks (R-IN)	32	Supports: “We comment OMB for seeking to ensure that all assistance disbursed by the federal government aligns with the Constitution and with federal law.”	https://static.dailysignalmedia.org/Letter-to-OMB-re-Grantmaking-Changes-1.pdf