September 22, 2026

The Honorable Chris Wright
Secretary
U.S. Department of Energy
1000 Independence Avenue SW
Washington, DC 20585

Dear Secretary Wright:

We write to address your termination of Department of Energy (DOE) grants and the stunning discrepancies between what you have told members of our Committee and what DOE has told federal courts. In letters, hearings, and questions for the record, we have asked you and DOE employees to explain and justify DOE cancelling grants to states that did not support Donald Trump in the 2024 election. In response, you and DOE employees repeatedly stated that politics played no role in the cancellation of grants and claimed that the suspension or termination of grants was based on a rigorous internal process. But now DOE representatives have said the exact opposite in court, finally admitting that DOE grants were terminated purely for partisan reasons. And documents in other litigation also recently revealed threats to grants in Colorado specifically for partisan purposes.

On December 23, 2025, the Department of Energy admitted in litigation that a "primary reason" for the cancellation of certain grants was "whether the grantee was located in a 'Blue State.'"[1] DOE then went even further in another case, stipulating that the termination of certain DOE grants "was based *solely* on the political identity of the grant recipient's state…"[2] These admissions directly contradict representations made by DOE to the Committee on at least three occasions:

- April 10, 2026, correspondence from DOE, signed by Principal Deputy General Counsel Jeffrey Novak, in response to a letter from Committee Ranking Members regarding grant cancellations;

[1] Stipulation Regarding Consolidation Under Rule 65(a)(2) (December 23, 2025), *City of St. Paul, Minnesota, et al. v. Wright,* D.D.C. 2025 (No. 1:25-cv-3899-APM).

[2] Parties' Stipulations and Agreement to Obviate Discover as to DOE and DOE's Stipulations of Fact and Agreement to Produce Grants Spreadsheet (July 15, 2026), *Thakur v. Trump,* N.D. Cal (No. 3:25-cv-04737-RFL).

- April 16, 2026, testimony by you in a hearing before the Subcommittee on Energy;

- July 17, 2026, responses to Questions for the Record of Alex Fitzsimmons, DOE Director of the Office of Cybersecurity, Energy Security, and Emergency Response.

Each instance is concerning on its own. Taken together, they show a calculated effort to mislead the Committee and the American people about your agency's willingness to carry out President Trump's partisan revenge, harming businesses, and driving up energy prices in the process.

False Testimony to the Committee

At an April 16, 2026, hearing before Committee's Subcommittee on Energy, Subcommittee Ranking Member Castor challenged you about the termination of DOE grants in October 2025: "…many of the grants you cancelled were done so just because they were in states led by Democrats. Is that fair in the United States of America for you just simply to make a political decision to kill clean energy projects, increase electric bills simply for political purposes?"[3]

You responded, "So the statement is false. All of the 2,240 decisions we made did not involve politics at all."[4]

As your own agency has now clearly stated in court filings, however, it was *your* statement that was false. According to a recent court stipulation signed by DOE counsel, DOE sent two lists of 2,432 total grants to the Office of Management and Budget (OMB) with recommendations to "retain, modify, or terminate" each grant.[5] Those lists recommended 624 grants for cancellation.[6] OMB returned a list of 284 grants to cancel.[7] All but one of those 284 grants were connected to states that did not vote for Donald Trump in the 2024 election and had two Democratic-caucusing Senators.[8] You then cancelled each of these 284 grants in October 2025.[9]

---

[3] House Committee on Energy and Commerce, *Hearing on The Fiscal Year 2027 Department of Energy Budget*, 119th Cong. (April 16, 2026).

[4] *Id.*

[5] *See* note 2.

[6] *Id.*

[7] *Id.*

[8] *Id.*

[9] *Id.*

In contrast, the other approximately 340 grants that DOE had proposed for cancellation have not been cancelled.[10] Each of those grants had a connection to a state "that awarded its electoral votes to President Trump in the 2024 election or has at least one Republican-caucusing Senator."[11]

Most damning, however, is the unvarnished admission by DOE that the termination of the grants in October 2025 was not "based on any programmatic, statutory, cost-reduction, or performance-based factor."[12] Rather, DOE stipulated that "the inclusion of the grants in the October notice tranche *was based solely on the political identity of the grant recipient's state*, i.e., whether the recipient's location and/or place of performance was in a Blue State or a non-Blue State."[13]

As the Secretary of Energy, you are responsible for the actions taken by DOE, including the termination of grants solely for political reasons. It does not matter whether the idea to cancel grants to Blue States originated with DOE or was based on feedback from OMB—as the Secretary of Energy, you are responsible for the final decision and action taken by your agency.

This is not just our interpretation of the law; this is also what multiple DOE officials have told the Committee. In response to a letter that we sent you raising concerns about grant cancellations and workforce reductions, your Principal Deputy General Counsel Jeffrey Novak wrote that DOE is responsible for "*making (and implementing) the ultimate decision* whether to retain, modify or terminate awards."[14] This position was echoed nearly verbatim by Alex Fitzsimmons in responses to questions for the record submitted by Ranking Member Pallone; when asked in writing about the role of politics in cancelling grants, Fitzsimmons responded that "program offices developed proposals to retain, modify, or terminate projects which were then presented to a cross-functional committee for feedback, *with program offices then making (and implementing) the final decisions* whether to retain, modify or terminate projects."[15]

According to any reasonable interpretation of DOE's role in grant cancellations—including the words of DOE's own employees—your testimony before the Committee was false. You claimed that DOE's decisions regarding grants did not involve politics. But your decision to terminate grants on the basis of their connection to Blue States unambiguously involved politics and the decision to make those terminations was—in the words of multiple DOE employees—a

---

[10] *See* note 2.

[11] *Id.*

[12] *Id.*

[13] *Id.*

[14] Letter from Jeffrey Novak, Principal Deputy General Counsel, Department of Energy, to Rep. Frank Pallone Jr., Ranking Member, House Committee on Energy and Commerce (April 10, 2026) (*See*, Appendix A).

[15] House Committee on Energy and Commerce, *Protecting America's Energy Infrastructure in Today's Cyber and Physical Threat Landscape*, Question for the Record Responses, 119th Cong. (Jan. 13, 2026) (*See*, Appendix B).

DOE decision, regardless of any request or recommendation from OMB.[16] And that even assumes that DOE's initial recommendations to OMB were not based on politics, which is an assumption that we are unwilling to make given your utter lack of candor and credibility.

False Written Responses from DOE Officials

Your office also was dishonest in an April 10, 2026, response to a letter raising concerns about these grant cancellations.[17] In that response, Principal Deputy General Counsel Jeffrey Novak wrote that "under the [Portfolio Review Process], financial assistance awards are assessed against a number of criteria including whether a project has achieved the milestones set forth in the terms of the award, whether a project remains technically and economically feasible; and whether pursuant to 2 CFR 200,340(a)(4), a project continues to effectuate the purpose of the program or the Department's priorities."[18]

But that same individual, Jeffrey Novak, later personally signed a stipulation stating that DOE "accepts that" the grants that were terminated in October 2025 were not "based on any programmatic, statutory, cost-reduction, or performance-based factor" but instead were "based solely on the political identity of the grant recipient's state."[19] These two positions are entirely inconsistent.

Separately, in a written response to questions for the record from a January 13, 2026, hearing before the Subcommittee on Energy, Alex Fitzsimmons also sought to falsely describe the Portfolio Review Process as free from politics. He wrote that the review criteria "do not include political geography or a financial assistance award recipient's location" but also that "program offices then [made] (and implement[ed]) the final decisions whether to retain, modify or terminate projects."[20] Again, this entirely conflicts with DOE's stipulation in *Thakur*, which clearly states that the termination of grants in October 2025 "was based solely on the political identity of the grant recipient's state…"[21]

Ongoing Political Threats to Colorado DOE Funding

Recent reporting and court filings demonstrate that DOE's willingness to play politics with critical federal funding is still ongoing and was not limited to your October 2025 termination of grants to Blue States. Late last year, President Trump pushed members of his Administration to punish Colorado in apparent retaliation for the prosecution and conviction of

---

[16] *See* note 3.

[17] *See* note 14.

[18] *Id*.

[19]*See* note 2.

[20] *See* note 15.

[21] *See* note 2.

Tina Peters on multiple felony counts for breaching election security in an effort to substantiate conspiracy theories about the 2021 election, in which Trump lost to Joe Biden.[22]

On December 15, 2025, then-Deputy Chief of Staff to Stephen Miller, Emily Underwood, called a meeting with representatives from multiple agencies, including DOE.[23] The email scheduling that call stated that its purpose was to "prioritize Colorado for the purposes of ensuring grants and federal support are in line with Administration priorities."[24] The participants were instructed to "come prepared to discuss immediate actions that your department or agency can take with respect to Colorado."[25]

The following day, December 16, Deputy General Counsel Jeffrey Novak sent an email scheduling a meeting with a number of DOE staff with the subject line "*MANDATORY PER WHITE HOUSE REQUEST – PLEASE COME TO GC'S FRONT OFFICE NOW* Portfolio Review Process."[26] That invitation attached a Microsoft Excel spreadsheet, presumably containing a list of DOE funding for Colorado that DOE staff would potentially cut.[27]

Also on December 16, a reporter from The Washington Free Beacon posted on X that "Department of Energy sources tell me that the agency is scrapping $615M in Biden-era green funding earmarked for Colorado."[28] President Trump posted a screenshot of that post on Truth Social and OMB Director Russ Vought retweeted that post, tacitly confirming the threat.[29]

On December 16 and 17, numerous emails were sent between DOE staff and to individuals at the White House and OMB with the subject lines "Grant Terminations" and "DOE Cuts."[30] According to the privilege log produced in litigation, the Trump Administration claims that those emails and documents are "Reflecting deliberations related to the agency decision-making process regarding potential termination of DOE financial awards to Colorado entities."[31]

---

[22] *Colorado Was Targeted as Trump Fumed Over Election Denier, Email Shows, New* York Times (August 18, 2026).

[23] Plaintiff's Motion for Order to Make Proposed Further Findings, Ex. 1 (Aug. 19, 2026), *Colorado v. Trump*, D. Colo. (No. 1:25-cv-03428-RBJ).

[24] *Id.*

[25] *Id.*

[26] Plaintiff's Motion for Order to Make Proposed Further Findings, Ex. 2 (Aug. 19, 2026), *Colorado v. Trump,* D. Colo. (No. 1:25-cv-03428-RBJ).

[27] *Id.*

[28] Thomas Catenacci (@ThomasCatenacci), X (Dec. 15, 2025, 10:17 AM) (https://x.com/ThomasCatenacci/status/2000948491724710177)

[29] Second Amended Complaint for Declaratory and Injunctive Relief (May 6, 2026), *Colorado v. Trump,* D. Colo. (No. 1:25-cv-03428-RBJ) at 92.

[30] Plaintiff's Motion for Order to Make Proposed Further Findings, Ex. 4 (August 19, 2026), *Colorado v. Trump,* D. Colo. (No. 1:25-cv-03428-RBJ).

[31] *Id.*

These actions and the potential termination of Colorado's grants continue to be, in that state's words, "a threat hanging over Colorado."[32] They also demonstrate DOE's continued willingness to aid President Trump in his personal, political vendettas rather than carrying out its duties to serve the American people.

In order to explain the glaring discrepancies between your testimony to the Committee and representations that DOE has made in court, we request that you provide dates for a briefing from you, Principal Deputy General Counsel Jeffrey Novak, and Associate Deputy Secretary of Energy Alex Fitzsimmons. We are deeply disturbed by the apparent deception from you and your deputies, and it is necessary that you explain yourself to us directly. Additionally, please provide responses to the below requests by October 6, 2026.

1. Provide all documents and communications regarding OMB's recommendation to terminate or cancel approximately 284 grants in October 2025.

2. Provide a list of all meetings where any representatives of DOE and OMB discussed the termination or cancellation of DOE grants. For each meeting, include:

    a. The date of the meeting;

    b. The meeting location (or, if the meeting took place virtually, which meeting platform was used);

    c. Names, titles, and affiliations of each person who attended the meeting;

    d. A detailed description of the meeting's purpose and discussions; and

    e. Subject line or title of the meeting invitation, if sent electronically

3. Provide all documents and communications relating to all meetings described in response to Request 2, including but not limited to notes, transcripts, records, agendas, minutes, or memoranda.

4. Provide all documents and communications regarding Secretary Wright's testimony before the Commerce's Subcommittee on Energy on April 16, 2026, that relate to the termination or cancellation of grants in October 2025.

5. Provide all documents and communications regarding DOE's April 10, 2026, response letter to Ranking Member Pallone signed by Jeffrey Novak, including all prior drafts of the response.

[32] *See* note 29 at 91.

6. Provide all documents and communications regarding Alex Fitzsimmons's written responses to Questions for the Record for the January 13, 2026, hearing before the Committee's Subcommittee on Energy.

7. Provide all documents and communications relating to the stipulation signed by Principal Deputy General Counsel Jeff Novak in *Thakur v. Trump*.

8. Provide all memoranda, policies, procedures, and other documentation regarding the procedures for implementing the Portfolio Review Process.

9. Provide a list of all individuals involved in DOE's Portfolio Review Process. For each individual, provide:

    a. The individual's name;

    b. The individual's title;

    c. The individual's role in the Portfolio Review Process; and

    d. The dates in which the individual was involved in the Portfolio Review Process.

10. Provide a list of all grants to the state of Colorado or entities based in or conducting project activities in Colorado that were identified for potential termination due to the White House's December 15 request.

11. Identify the official(s) responsible for choosing the Colorado grants for potential termination Colorado based on the White House's December 15 request.

12. Provide the names and positions of officials who attended meetings with or communicated with the White House regarding its December 15 request to "identify actions against Colorado."[33]

13. Provide all communications relating to the potential termination of grants to Colorado based on the White House's December 15 request.

[33] *See* note 23.

If you have any questions about this request, please contact the Committee Democratic staff at (202) 225-2927.

Sincerely,

Frank Pallone, Jr.
Ranking Member

Kathy Castor
Ranking Member
Subcommittee on Energy

Yvette D. Clarke
Ranking Member
Subcommittee on Oversight and Investigations

cc: The Honorable Brett Guthrie
Chairman

The Honorable Robert E. Latta
Chairman
Subcommittee on Energy

The Honorable John Joyce
Chairman
Subcommittee on Oversight and Investigations

Appendix A

Department of Energy
Washington, DC 20585

April 10, 2026

The Honorable Frank Pallone, Jr.
Ranking Member, Committee on Energy and Commerce
United States House of Representatives
Washington, DC 20515

Dear Congressman Pallone:

I am responding on behalf of Secretary Wright to your letter requesting information regarding changes to funding programs and staffing at the Department of Energy (DOE).

DOE Workforce

DOE is committed to ensuring it has a robust workforce that can carry out its statutory mission. In fiscal year (FY) 2025, DOE experienced a significant number of staff departures due to attrition, the Deferred Resignation Program (DRP), and planned retirements. From January 1, 2025, to present, DOE processed 1,869 furloughs, 872 terminations, 5,249 employees placed on administrative leave, and 3,042 DRP separations. However, as the government-wide hiring freeze has since lifted, DOE is ramping up hiring activities to ensure that offices have adequate staff to devote to mission critical work.

Review of Financial Assistance Programs

"Green energy" financial assistance programs have a troubled history dating back to the Solyndra scandal. As detailed in the 2015 report summarizing a four-year-long criminal investigation conducted by the Federal Bureau of Investigation and DOE's Inspector General, employees in DOE's Loan Program Office—under pressure from Administration officials to approve a $535M loan guarantee that would purportedly create more than 4,000 jobs and help build a clean energy economy—overlooked red flags regarding Solyndra's financial condition and sales prospects.[1] Solyndra went bankrupt having generated just 585 jobs, all of which vanished along with $529M of taxpayer funds.[2]

These failures extend well beyond Solyndra. For example, a 2012 analysis revealed that $21B spent through 19 DOE programs touted as having the potential to create five million new "green jobs" revealed that these programs employed just 28,854 people.[3] Likewise, the Department of Labor Inspector General released a 2012 report flagging concerns with $500M in grants to support "green energy" training programs that yielded job placement at just 10% of target; negligible retention, which was just 2% as September 2011 and 16% as of 2013; and the fact that more than half of participants were already employed, with no evidence that the training was required for their continued employment or advancement.[4]

Problems with "green energy" financial assistance programs have persisted, yielding a series of OIG and GAO reports between 2012-21.[1] Indeed, concerns regarding the appropriation of tens of billions of dollars in additional funding for "green energy" programs prompted OIG to issue a 2022 Special Report to draw the "immediate attention and consideration of Department leadership to prevent similar problems from recurring."[2]

With the change of Administration in January 2025, current DOE leadership inherited not just this problematic legacy, but also an active portfolio consisting of nearly $100B in "green energy" awards, loans, and loan guarantees that were doled out between Election Day and Inauguration[5]—many through irregular processes, terms, and conditions—and in an operating environment that DOE's Inspector General determined as lacking adequate compliance controls.[6]

Against this backdrop and as part of the Administration's commitment to ensure better stewardship of taxpayer funds, the Department adopted the Secretarial Policy on Ensuring Responsibility for Financial Assistance in May 2025. A copy of the policy is attached.

Pursuant to this policy, the Department created a Portfolio Review Process or "PRP" that tasked program offices with reviewing their financial assistance portfolios against a number of criteria; developing proposals to retain, modify or terminate awards; presenting these proposals for feedback and recommendations to a cross-functional committee; and making (and implementing) the ultimate decision whether to retain, modify or terminate awards. A copy of the PRP charter is attached.

---

[1] *See* Audit Report on The Department of Energy's Industrial Carbon Capture and Storage Program Funded by the American Recovery and Reinvestment Act (OAS-RA-13-15, March 2013); Special Report on The Department of Energy's Continued Support of the Texas Clean Energy Project Under the Clean Coal Power Initiative (OIG-SR-16-02, April 2016); Audit Report on The Office of Fossil Energy's Oversight of the Texas Clean Energy Project Under the Clean Coal Power Initiative (DOE-OIG-18-17, February 2018); Report to Congressional Committees on Carbon Capture and Storage: Actions Needed to Improve DOE Management of Demonstration Projects (GAO-22-105111, December 2021); Audit Report on Follow-up Audit of the Department of Energy's Financial Assistance for Integrated Biorefinery Projects (IG-0893, September 2013); Audit Report on Followup on the Geothermal Technologies Office (OAI-M-17-01, October 2016); Audit Report on The Hydrogen Energy California Project (OAS-RA-13-22, June 2013); Audit Report on The Department of Energy's Hydrogen and Fuel Cells Program (OAS-RA-13-31, September 2013).

[2] Special Report on Prospective Consideration for Clean Energy Demonstration Projects (DOE-OIG-22-39 August 2022).

Under the PRP, financial assistance awards are assessed against a number of criteria including whether a project has achieved the milestones set forth in the terms of the award; whether a project remains technically and economically feasible; and whether, pursuant to 2 CFR 200.340(a)(4), a project continues to effectuate the purpose of the program or the Department's priorities.

As outlined in 2 CFR 910.218, award recipients contesting a termination notice can avail themselves of informal dispute resolution, mediation, and a formal administrative appeal to the Senior Procurement Executive (SPE). Pursuant to the informal dispute resolution process, award recipients meet with program office leadership, a contracting officer, and program counsel to discuss the rationale for the termination. Alternatively, award recipients can submit to the contracting officer documentation challenging the termination. Program office leadership, working with program counsel, will provide a written response to the challenge. Award recipients can also avail themselves of non-binding mediation or an administrative appeal to the SPE. Administrative appeals are governed by 2 CFR 910.128(d) and Chapter 6.4.2(B) of the DOE Guide to Financial Assistance.

To date, program offices have reviewed more than 2,000 awards and the entire loan and loan guarantee portfolio against these criteria. The terminated awards mentioned in your correspondence were part of a much larger tranche of awards review by different offices, with the bulk of the proposed determinations being to proceed with awards either as written or subject to modifications. These terminated awards are subject to ongoing litigation, which was filed after the first set of termination notices were sent out but prior to final action being taken on the balance of the awards reviewed.

DOE has met with GAO and the Inspector General and provided them copies of the assessment summaries prepared by the program offices. DOE takes seriously its stewardship of taxpayer dollars and it welcomes your interest in this process as well as the steps DOE is taking to implement additional controls around financial assistance programs. If you need additional information, please contact me or Mr. Michael Inguanta, Deputy Assistant Secretary for House Affairs, Office of Congressional and Intergovernmental Affairs, (202) 586-5450.

Sincerely,

Jeffrey Novak
Principal Deputy General Counsel

Appendix B

United States House of Representatives Committee on Energy and Commerce
Subcommittee on Energy
January 13, 2026 Hearing: Protecting America's Energy Infrastructure in Today's Cyber and Physical Threat Landscape
Questions for Alex Fitzsimmons, Director
Office of Cybersecurity, Energy Security, and Emergency Response

QUESTIONS FROM REPRESENTATIVE FRANK PALLONE, JR.

Q1. During questioning, you asserted that political retribution – if an awardee is located in a state that voted for President Trump – has nothing to do with whether or not an award was canceled by the Department of Energy (DOE) last October. However, in a court filing dated December 23, 2025, that was signed by an Assistant Attorney General, the Department of Justice stipulated that, "A primary reason for the selection of which DOE grant termination decisions were included in the October 2025 notice tranche was whether the grantee was located in a 'Blue State.'" I entered this court filing into the hearing record during my questioning.

Q1A. In response to Representative Tonko's question about the Department of Justice's stipulation, you stated that "we do not agree with the court's filing." Is it DOE's stance that the Department of Justice stipulation quoted above is incorrect or misleading?

Q1B. Why did DOE consider if an awardee was in a "blue state" when deciding to cancel or announce the cancellation of an award?

Q1C. Who directed DOE to consider if an awardee was in a "blue state" when deciding to cancel or announce the cancellation of an award?

A1. As part of Department of Energy's (DOE) Portfolio Review Process (PRP), program offices that were involved in the process were tasked with assessing their financial assistance awards against a number of criteria including whether a project has achieved the milestones set forth in the terms of the award; whether a project remains technically and economically feasible; and whether, pursuant to 2 C.F.R. 200.340(a)(4), a project continues to effectuate the purpose of the program or the Department's priorities. These criteria do not include political geography or a financial assistance award recipient's location. Based on this assessment, program offices developed proposals to retain, modify, or terminate projects which were then presented to a cross-functional committee for feedback, with program offices then making (and implementing) the final decisions whether to retain, modify or terminate projects. To date, program offices have reviewed more than 2,000 awards against these criteria.

The May 2025 Office of Clean Energy Demonstrations termination notices and the October 2025 termination notices were part of a much larger tranche of awards reviewed by different offices, with the bulk of the proposed decisions being to proceed with awards either as written or subject to modifications.

At issue in the *City of St. Paul* litigation was whether DOE's termination of seven awards relevant to the plaintiffs was consistent with the First Amendment and Fifth Amendment. Defendants, DOE and Office of Management and Budget, explained that the initial tranche of termination notices sent in October 2025 was drawn from the broader list of termination decisions, as described above, which had nothing to do with political geography or a financial assistance award recipient's location. In a decision filed January 12, 2026, the court dismissed the First Amendment claim but ruled that termination of seven awards was inconsistent with the Fifth Amendment. Although DOE disagrees with the court's decision on the Fifth Amendment claim, DOE has complied with the court's Order and reinstated the awards at issue in the case.

As noted, the decision in *City of St. Paul* vacated seven termination notices but did not address the overwhelming majority of awards for which DOE has sent termination notices. In accordance with 2 C.F.R. 910.128, DOE offices continue to engage in informal dispute resolution with award recipients that have disputed a termination notice they received.

Q2. Beyond the awards illegally canceled by DOE throughout 2025, we have received countless anecdotes of other awards where DOE has simply refused, without cause, to definitize a final award or move from one gate stage to the next. In other cases, DOE has simply ignored outreach from an award recipient, refusing to answer questions from the award recipient.

Q2A. Why has DOE ceased engaging with recipients of awards it has not canceled?

A2A. As indicated above, the October notice tranche was part of a subset of a much larger set of awards—more than 2,200—that DOE program offices reviewed as part of the PRP. Litigation was filed before DOE took final action on the balance of the reviewed awards. DOE has since taken final action to retain or modify 75% of the reviewed awards. DOE has also taken steps to ensure that program offices are continuing to fund projects on which final action has not been taken.

Q2B. Has Secretary Wright or anyone from the Executive Office of the President directed any DOE employee to cease engaging with certain award recipients?

A2B. No. DOE has continued to engage in informal dispute resolution with terminated award recipients. It has taken final action to retain or modify 75% of the more than 2,200 awards that have been reviewed to date. And, it has taken steps to ensure that program offices are continuing to fund projects on which final action has not been taken. It is also meeting with recipients of conditional awards that the prior Administration never definitized to explore whether project proposals can be modified to effectuate program goals or to further DOE priorities.

Q2C. Has Secretary Wright or anyone from the Executive Office of the President directed any DOE employee to refuse to advance projects through their milestone phases?

A2C. No. As part of the PRP process, program offices assess whether—if applicable under the terms of an award—a project has met agreed-to milestones. This assessment is conducted by program offices working with technical staff and program counsel.