

Congress of the United States
Washington, DC 20515

August 14, 2020

Mr. Louis DeJoy
Postmaster General
United States Postal Service
475 L'Enfant Plaza, S.W., Room 10300
Washington, D.C. 20260-1000

Dear Postmaster General DeJoy:

On Thursday morning, President Donald Trump admitted publicly that he is opposing the Postal Service's urgent request for \$25 billion as part of the coronavirus legislation pending in Congress because of his baseless objection to expanding mail-in voting. He stated:

They want \$25 billion for the post office. Now, they need that money in order to have the post office work so it can take all of these millions and millions of ballots. Now, in the meantime, they aren't getting there. ... But if they don't get those two items, that means you can't have universal mail-in voting because they're not equipped to have it. ... If we don't make a deal, that means they don't get the money. That means they can't have universal mail-in voting. They just can't have it.¹

To be clear, the request for \$25 billion came from the Postal Service, which asked Congress for these funds not to implement "universal mail-in voting," but to continue meeting delivery standards during the unprecedented coronavirus pandemic. This request was supported unanimously and on a bipartisan basis by the Postal Board of Governors—all of whom were appointed by President Trump. The House of Representatives passed this request three months ago as part of the HEROES Act, but President Trump has refused to provide this crucial federal assistance to the Postal Service, agreeing only to increase its borrowing authority.

On Tuesday—two days before the President made his admissions—your General Counsel and Executive Vice President, Thomas J. Marshall, sent two letters to Congress.

The first admitted that the Postal Service now lacks the funding necessary to fulfill its core mission. His letter included this stark warning: "We are currently unable to balance our costs with available funding sources to fulfill both our universal service mission and other legal obligations." His letter went on to outline a number of drastic operational changes that you are attempting to implement in the name of cost-cutting.²

¹ *Trump Admits He Opposes Funding for Postal Service to Block More Voting by Mail*, National Public Radio (Aug. 13, 2020) (online at www.npr.org/2020/08/13/902109991/trump-admits-to-opposing-funding-for-postal-service-to-block-more-voting-by-mail).

² Letter from Thomas J. Marshall, General Counsel and Executive Vice President, U.S. Postal Service, to Chairwoman Carolyn B. Maloney, House Committee on Oversight and Reform (Aug. 11, 2020) (online at <https://oversight.house.gov/sites/democrats.oversight.house.gov/files/documents/USPS%20to%20COR%2008-11-20%20re%20Operational%20Changes.pdf>).

Also on Tuesday, your General Counsel sent a second letter to Congress asserting in rosy language that “the Postal Service remains fully committed to fulfilling our role in the electoral process by doing everything we can to handle and deliver Election Mail, including ballots, in a timely manner consistent with our operational standards.”³

These two letters raise significant questions. Rather than strongly advocating for the Postal Service’s request for emergency funding, it appears that you are now using funding shortfalls—which are being aggravated by the President himself—to justify sweeping operational changes that experts warn could degrade delivery standards, slow the mail, jeopardize crucial deliveries such as prescription medicines and essential goods, and potentially impair the rights of eligible Americans to cast their votes through the mail in the upcoming November elections.

We are writing today to request additional information and documents regarding your policies and practices, the specific changes you are proposing, the rationale for those changes, and the potential impacts of those changes. The Postal Service should not make changes that slow down the mail or in any way compromise service for veterans, small businesses, rural communities, seniors, and millions of Americans who rely on the mail—including significant numbers of people who will be relying on the Postal Service to exercise their right to vote.

First-Class vs. Marketing Mail

Your General Counsel’s letter on election mail reiterates the delivery standards for First-Class (2-5 days) and Marketing Mail (3-10 days) and asserts that it is Postal Service policy to process election mail in accordance with these standards. The letter also indicates that if states and jurisdictions want the First-Class delivery times they have been accustomed to, they will need to pay higher rates. The letter warns that “using Marketing Mail will result in slower delivery times and will increase the risk that voters will not receive their ballots in time to return them by mail.”⁴

However, it has been the practice of the Postal Service to prioritize the delivery of all election mail to meet the equivalent of First-Class delivery times no matter what class of mail was used to send it. A report from the Postal Service Office of Inspector General (OIG) on the 2018 elections found that 95.6 percent of election mail was delivered within a 1-3-day service standard, functionally equivalent to the faster service standard applied to First-Class mail. This finding and OIG’s audit work clearly indicate that the Postal Service has a practice of processing election mail as First-Class mail. The OIG also conducted interviews in which area and facility postal managers explicitly stated that they treat all election mail as First-Class mail.⁵

³ Letter from Thomas J. Marshall, General Counsel and Executive Vice President, U.S. Postal Service, to Chairwoman Carolyn B. Maloney, House Committee on Oversight and Reform (Aug. 11, 2020) (online at <https://oversight.house.gov/sites/democrats.oversight.house.gov/files/documents/USPS%20to%20COR%2008-11-20%20re%20Election%20Prep.pdf>).

⁴ *Id.*

⁵ U.S. Postal Service, Office of Inspector General, *Audit Report: Service Performance of Election and Political Mail During the 2018 Midterm and Special Elections* (Nov. 4, 2019) (online at www.uspsoig.gov/sites/default/files/document-library-files/2019/19XG010NO000.pdf).

This longstanding practice should not change now, especially in light of the extreme financial challenges faced by states and localities as a result of the coronavirus crisis. Although some jurisdictions may be able to send their election mail at the First-Class rate, the majority of jurisdictions simply do not have sufficient resources to do so. If election mail sent at the Marketing Mail rate faces slower delivery times than it has historically, voters will be disenfranchised.

If any changes are made to the longstanding election mail practice just months ahead of the 2020 general election, it will cause further delays that will lead to voters being disenfranchised and put significant additional financial pressures on states and election jurisdictions that are already struggling to pay for elections held during the pandemic.

Prior to 2020, it was the practice of the Postal Service to prioritize the delivery of all election mail, including voter registration materials, absentee ballot request, and ballots, to meet the equivalent of First-Class delivery times no matter what class of mail was used to send it. It is unacceptable to change or propose changes to this practice fewer than three months before a general election. Will the Postal Service commit to continuing this practice?

Dates for Sending and Receiving Mail-In Ballots

The apparent conflicts between election deadlines in state law and delivery timelines for election mail are also a significant focus of your General Counsel's letter on election mail. States must weigh several factors when setting election deadlines, including the risk that unnecessarily early deadlines for voters to request absentee ballots could disenfranchise voters who are unaware of the deadlines or do not anticipate their need for absentee ballots until closer to Election Day.

Much of the letter's analysis seems to assume that the actual ballot will be making the round trip from election officials to the voter and back to election officials entirely by mail. However, many states offer alternatives for returning a ballot by mail, such as drop boxes and in-person delivery to election offices. When these options are available, there is a significant likelihood that a voter could request an absentee ballot closer to the election than the Postal Service's 15-day recommendation and still have time to receive the ballot and cast it.

Notwithstanding this consideration, the tight timelines outlined in this letter for transmitting election mail underscore the importance of not making any changes that will slow the delivery of election mail before the election. During an unprecedented pandemic, the Postal Service should be doing everything possible to make it easier for election officials to administer elections and Americans to vote. We urge you not to increase costs for election officials and to direct all Postal Service employees to continue to prioritize delivery of election mail so that voters and election workers have ample time to request and send election mail.

What measures will the Postal Service take to ensure timely delivery of absentee applications and absentee ballots, including for those ballots that are requested within 15 days of the election and those ballots mailed within one week of the state deadline? Will this include authorizing overtime if necessary?

Efforts to Curtail Overtime

Overtime is a critical tool used by the Postal Service to maintain surge capacity in times of greatest need. With the coronavirus pandemic raging across our nation at record levels, the number of mail-in ballots for the November election is expected to reach historic highs. In addition, overtime allows postal managers to pay employees who work extra hours when other employees are out sick or at home quarantining in order to protect their coworkers and the American people.

On July 14, 2020, several internal Postal Service documents were made public indicating that you had conveyed information to Postal Service managers regarding upcoming operational changes, including the elimination of overtime. One document, entitled “PMG Expectations and Plan,” stated: “Overtime will be eliminated. Again we are paying too much in OT and it is not cost effective and will soon be taken off the table. More to come on this.”⁶

On July 17 and 20, 2020, the Senate Committee on Homeland Security and Governmental Reform⁷ and the House Committee on Oversight and Reform, respectively, wrote to you to request an explanation for this document.⁸

On July 22, 2020, your General Counsel responded in a letter conceding that this document “was prepared by a mid-level manager” at the Postal Service, but claiming that it did not originate from Postal Service Headquarters and that its contents “should not be treated as official statements of Postal Service policy.” The letter also stated:

To address our financial challenges, management is developing a business plan to ensure that we will be financially stable and able to continue to provide reliable, affordable, safe and secure delivery of mail and packages to all Americans. This plan will be presented to and considered by the Board of Governors. . . . Once the Board has agreed to the plan, we would be happy to brief you or your staffs on the details.⁹

⁶ U.S. Postal Service, *PMGs Expectations and Plan* (undated) (online at www.nonprofitmailers.org/leaked-usps-powerpoint-indicates-pmg-dejoy-focus-on-getting-operating-costs-under-control/).

⁷ Letter from Ranking Member Gary C. Peters, Senate Committee on Homeland Security and Governmental Affairs, to Postmaster General Louis DeJoy (July 17, 2020) (online at www.hsgac.senate.gov/imo/media/doc/200717_Letter_USPSServiceChanges.pdf).

⁸ Letter from Chairwoman Carolyn B. Maloney, House Committee on Oversight and Reform, Chairman Gerald E. Connolly, Subcommittee on Government Operations, Chairman Stephen F. Lynch, Subcommittee on National Security, and Rep. Brenda L. Lawrence to Postmaster General Louis DeJoy (July 20, 2020) (online at <https://oversight.house.gov/sites/democrats.oversight.house.gov/files/2020-07-20.CBM%20GEC%20to%20DeJoy%20-PMG%20re%20Postal%20Service%20Changes.pdf>).

⁹ Letter from Thomas J. Marshall, General Counsel and Executive Vice President, U.S. Postal Service, to Chairwoman Carolyn B. Maloney, House Committee on Oversight and Reform, Chairman Gerald E. Connolly, Subcommittee on Government Operations, Chairman Stephen F. Lynch, Subcommittee on National Security, and Rep. Brenda L. Lawrence (July 22, 2020) (online at https://oversight.house.gov/sites/democrats.oversight.house.gov/files/Marshall%20Response%20to%20Maloney%20et%20al%20re%20USPS%20Operational%20Changes_07-22-2020_0.pdf); Letter from Thomas J. Marshall, General Counsel and Executive Vice President, U.S. Postal Service, to Ranking Member Gary C. Peters, Senate

However, during a meeting with House Speaker Nancy Pelosi and Senate Minority Leader Chuck Schumer on August 5, 2020, you seemed to admit that, in fact, you had personally approved certain limitations on the use of overtime, but you failed to explain what those limitations are.

In letters sent after the meeting, Postal Service officials provided this update:

[T]here have been no edicts to delay the mail or eliminate overtime, although we are reemphasizing that operational managers must ensure that overtime is earned as the result of unexpected volume or other factors, pursuant to our normal overtime analysis, before it is approved.¹⁰

Based on this chronology of reversals, it is unclear—even among your own employees—what changes, if any, the Postal Service is proposing to its overtime policy. If your intention is to simply continue “normal overtime,” as the most recent letter suggested, then we call on you to make clear to all postal managers and employees that they should continue utilizing overtime as they have in the past to handle surges in mail—including mail-in ballots—and to pay employees for time they work when there are insufficient numbers of employees available to fulfill the Postal Service’s mission.

We also request copies of all documents sent to any Postal Service managers or employees relating to overtime policy changes since June 15, 2020.

Efforts to Restrict Deliveries

As with the overtime issue, internal Postal Service documents became public in mid-July indicating that you had conveyed information to postal managers about restricting the number of deliveries that employees are permitted to make—even if mail is left behind at postal facilities.

One document, entitled “Mandatory Stand-Up Talk: All Employees,” stated that the Postal Service was making “immediate” changes, including “transportation changes being implemented immediately.” According to this document, both “late trips” and “extra trips” to meet delivery standards “are no longer authorized or accepted.” The document also included this warning:

Committee on Homeland Security and Governmental Affairs, (July 22, 2020) (online at www.hsgac.senate.gov/imo/media/doc/20200722_USPS%20Response%20to%20Peters%20Jul%2017%20Ltr.pdf).

¹⁰ Letter from David E. Williams, Chief Operating Officer and Executive Vice President, U.S. Postal Service, to Ranking Member Gary C. Peters, Senator Thomas R. Carper, Senate Committee on Homeland Security and Governmental Affairs, and Senators Charles E. Schumer and Amy Klobuchar (Aug. 6, 2020) (online at www.hsgac.senate.gov/imo/media/doc/20200806_USPS%20Response%20to%20Peters%20et%20al%20Jul%2030%20Ltr.pdf); Letter from Thomas J. Marshall, General Counsel and Executive Vice President, U.S. Postal Service, to Chairwoman Carolyn B. Maloney, House Committee on Oversight and Reform (Aug. 11, 2020) (online at <https://oversight.house.gov/sites/democrats.oversight.house.gov/files/documents/USPS%20to%20COR%2008-11-20%20re%20Operational%20Changes.pdf>).

One aspect of these changes that may be difficult for employees is that—temporarily—we may see mail left behind or mail on the workroom floor or docks (in P&DCs), which is not typical.¹¹

On July 17 and 20, 2020, the Senate and House oversight committees wrote to you to request an explanation for this document.¹²

On July 22, 2020, your General Counsel responded in letters conceding that this document “was prepared by Southern Area leadership and was distributed in the Southern Area,” but, as with the overtime restrictions, that its contents were not “official statements of Postal Service policy.” He also suggested that no significant, nationwide changes to delivery schedules were being implemented, writing:

Please be assured that we are aware of our legal obligations to request an advisory opinion before implementing a “change in the nature of postal services which will generally affect service on a nationwide or substantially nationwide basis” under 39 U.S.C. Subsection 3661(b). None of the operational efforts discussed here constitute such a change. To the extent that Postal Service management develops proposals to make any such service changes within the scope of Section 3661(b), and our Board approves such proposals, we will make the appropriate requests to the Postal Regulatory Commission.¹³

However, during that same week, reports became public about changes the Postal Service was implementing to test restricted delivery methods as part of a new initiative known as Expedited Street/Afternoon Sortation (ESAS). The Postal Service apparently has already implemented this program at hundreds of postal facilities across the country. As one employee

¹¹ U.S. Postal Service, *Mandatory Stand-Up Talk: All Employees—Pivoting for Our Future* (July 10, 2020) (online at <https://federalnewsnetwork.com/wp-content/uploads/2020/07/071020-stand-up-talk.pdf>).

¹² Letter from Ranking Member Gary C. Peters, Senate Committee on Homeland Security and Governmental Affairs, to Postmaster General Louis DeJoy (July 17, 2020) (online at www.hsgac.senate.gov/imo/media/doc/200717_Letter_USPSServiceChanges.pdf); Letter from Chairwoman Carolyn B. Maloney, House Committee on Oversight and Reform, Chairman Gerald E. Connolly, Subcommittee on Government Operations, Chairman Stephen F. Lynch, Subcommittee on National Security, and Rep. Brenda L. Lawrence to Postmaster General Louis DeJoy (July 20, 2020) (online at <https://oversight.house.gov/sites/democrats.oversight.house.gov/files/2020-07-20.CBM%20GEC%20to%20DeJoy%20-PMG%20re%20Postal%20Service%20Changes.pdf>).

¹³ Letter from Thomas J. Marshall, General Counsel and Executive Vice President, U.S. Postal Service, to Chairwoman Carolyn B. Maloney, House Committee on Oversight and Reform, Chairman Gerald E. Connolly, Subcommittee on Government Operations, Chairman Stephen F. Lynch, Subcommittee on National Security, and Rep. Brenda L. Lawrence (July 22, 2020) (online at https://oversight.house.gov/sites/democrats.oversight.house.gov/files/Marshall%20Response%20to%20Maloney%20et%20al%20re%20USPS%20Operational%20Changes_07-22-2020_0.pdf); and Letter from Thomas J. Marshall, General Counsel and Executive Vice President, U.S. Postal Service, to Ranking Member Gary C. Peters, Senate Committee on Homeland Security and Governmental Affairs (July 22, 2020) (online at www.hsgac.senate.gov/imo/media/doc/20200722_USPS%20Response%20to%20Peters%20Jul%2017%20Ltr.pdf).

union reported, “The test is scheduled to begin on July 25, 2020, and anticipated to continue for approximately thirty to sixty days in 384 selected sites.”¹⁴

On August 6, 2020, Chairwoman Maloney and more than 80 other Members of Congress sent you a letter expressing concerns about the possibility that this new ESAS initiative could “further delay mail delivery times, a concern shared by stakeholders.”¹⁵

On August 11, 2020, your General Counsel responded by conceding that he “did not specifically mention the new Expedited to Street/Afternoon Sortation (ESAS) initiative” in his previous letter on July 22, 2020, but he argued that ESAS is merely a “pilot initiative,” despite the fact that it is already in place at hundreds of facilities. His letter also admitted—but downplayed—delays in mail delivery resulting from this new nationwide initiative, writing:

[W]e acknowledge that temporary service impacts can occur as we redouble our efforts to conform to the current operating plans, but any such impacts will be monitored and temporary as the root causes of any issues are addressed and corrected.¹⁶

Your failure to consult with Congress or stakeholders before implementing major changes at hundreds of processing facilities and post offices across the country is highly irresponsible and reckless—particularly in the midst of a global pandemic and less than three months before the general election. It is also extremely troubling that you appear to recognize the likelihood of significant delivery delays as a result of your actions, but you are dismissing their significance.

For all of these reasons, we request copies of all documents referring or relating to the planning, implementation, and monitoring of the ESAS initiative, including but not limited to all communications, evaluations, assessments, or reports from any postal facility participating in this initiative regarding mail left behind or delayed as a result of these policies.

Warnings About Negative Impact of Operational Changes

Numerous experts, former Postal Service officials, state officials, and others have warned that your drastic moves could have a profoundly negative impact on mail delivery and the upcoming general election.

¹⁴ National Association of Letter Carriers, *USPS Announces New ESAS Delivery Initiative Test* (July 21, 2020) (online at www.nalc.org/news/nalc-updates/usps-announces-new-esas-delivery-initiative-test).

¹⁵ Letter from Chairwoman Carolyn B. Maloney, House Committee on Oversight and Reform, et al., to Postmaster General Louis DeJoy (Aug. 6, 2020) (online at <https://oversight.house.gov/sites/democrats.oversight.house.gov/files/2020-08-06.CBM%20et%20al.%20to%20DeJoy-%20PMG%20re%20Postal%20Standards%20Changes.pdf>).

¹⁶ Letter from Thomas J. Marshall, General Counsel and Executive Vice President, U.S. Postal Service, to Chairwoman Carolyn B. Maloney, House Committee on Oversight and Reform (Aug. 11, 2020) (online at <https://oversight.house.gov/sites/democrats.oversight.house.gov/files/documents/USPS%20to%20COR%2008-11-20%20re%20Operational%20Changes.pdf>).

Former Deputy Postmaster General Ronald Stroman, who served as the second highest ranking official at the Postal Service before his departure this summer, said:

The concern is not only that you're doing this in a pandemic, but a couple of months before an election with enormous consequences. If you can't right the ship, if you can't correct these fast enough, the consequence is not just, OK, people don't get their mail, it's that you disenfranchise people. Making these changes this close to an election is a high-risk proposition.¹⁷

Secretary of State Kim Wyman (R-Washington) noted that your reported departure from traditionally treating ballots as First-Class mail in the state "is very concerning" and will "force" counties to pay significantly more in postage—approximately six times the usual per-envelope cost—to ensure voters receive their ballots in time for them to count.¹⁸ She described how "election officials are very concerned, if the post office is reducing service, that we will be able to get ballots to people in time."¹⁹

A chief election official in Ingham County, Michigan said that delayed mail as a result of operational changes "is extraordinarily concerning because Michigan law requires that the ballot be in the possession of the local clerk by the time polls close on Election Day," and rural portions of her county already face extra time to receive mail.²⁰

Tammy Patrick, former federal compliance officer for the Maricopa County Elections Department in Arizona and former member of the bipartisan Presidential Commission on Election Administration, said that the impact on election mail "could be severe, and unless addressed, may cause an increased number of ballots rejected for being late at various points in the pipeline."²¹ For example, "for states that a ballot has to be postmarked by Election Day or by whatever the deadline, it's quite possible under this new regime that a ballot wouldn't get its postmark until the next day, and that could in fact disenfranchise a voter."²²

Mark Jamison, a former postmaster from North Carolina, said that the "rule has always been you clear every piece of first-class mail out of a plant every day, period. There has never

¹⁷ *Postal Service Changes Pose Threat to Voting, Says Former USPS Deputy*, The Guardian (Aug. 13, 2020) (online at www.theguardian.com/us-news/2020/aug/13/united-states-postal-service-trump-republicans).

¹⁸ *Washington's Top Elections Official Warns of 'Very Concerning' Changes at Postal Service That Could Impact Voting*, Spokesman-Review (Aug. 10, 2020) (online at www.spokesman.com/stories/2020/aug/09/washingtons-top-elections-official-warns-of-very-c/).

¹⁹ *Mail Delays Fuel Concern Trump Is Undercutting Postal System Ahead of Voting*, New York Times (July 31, 2020) (online at www.nytimes.com/2020/07/31/us/politics/trump-usps-mail-delays.html).

²⁰ *Election Officials Worry Postal Changes Could Affect Voting By Mail*, National Public Radio (July 29, 2020), (online at www.npr.org/2020/07/29/896588223/election-officials-worry-postal-changes-could-affect-voting-by-mail).

²¹ *How US Postal Service Changes Could Complicate Mail-in Voting*, ABC News (Aug. 5, 2020) (online at <https://abcnews.go.com/Politics/us-postal-service-complicate-mail-voting/story?id=72170452>).

²² *Election Officials Worry Postal Changes Could Affect Voting By Mail*, National Public Radio (July 29, 2020) (online at www.npr.org/2020/07/29/896588223/election-officials-worry-postal-changes-could-affect-voting-by-mail).

been, never, in the 30 years I worked for the post office, there has never been a time when you curtail first-class mail.”²³

Based on a report this morning, postal facilities in New York are experiencing significant delays as a result of your recent changes. According to Jonathan Smith, the President of the New York Metro Area Postal Union, delays are becoming common, with some facilities lagging five to six days behind on mail delivery. He said that if the Postal Service were allowed to operate “under the exact same conditions Mr. DeJoy found it, using the overtime, using the staff we do have, we would have absolutely no problem delivering on our mission to make sure every ballot is getting back to the election committee on time.”²⁴

As one current postal employee in Pennsylvania told a reporter: “By the time political season rolls around, I shudder to think what it’s going to look like.”²⁵

Conclusion

Given the urgency of this issue, we request that you respond to these questions and produce the requested documents no later than August 21, 2010. If you have any questions about this request, please contact Senate Committee on Rules and Administration staff at (202) 224-6352, Committee on House Administration staff at (202) 225-2061, Senate Committee on Homeland Security and Governmental Affairs staff at (202) 224-1187, or House Committee on Oversight and Reform staff at (202) 225-5051.

Sincerely,



Nancy Pelosi
Speaker
U.S. House of Representatives



Charles E. Schumer
Democratic Leader
U.S. Senate



Zoe Lofgren
Chairperson
Committee on House Administration



Amy Klobuchar
Ranking Member
Senate Committee on Rules and
Administration

²³ *Postal Service Changes Pose Threat to Voting, Says Former USPS Deputy*, The Guardian (Aug. 13, 2020) (online at www.theguardian.com/us-news/2020/aug/13/united-states-postal-service-trump-republicans).

²⁴ *Some Mail Is Delayed Five to Six Days in NYC, Postal Workers' Union Says*, NY1 (Aug. 14, 2020) (online at www.ny1.com/nyc/all-boroughs/politics/2020/08/13/nyc-elections-2020-nyc-vote-by-mail-mail-is-delayed-by-days-union-says?mc_cid=a6b2e2c8b9&mc_eid=02df88b174).

²⁵ *Postal Service Backlog Sparks Worries That Ballot Delivery Could Be Delayed in November*, Washington Post (July 30, 2020) (online at www.washingtonpost.com/politics/postal-service-backlog-sparks-worries-that-ballot-delivery-could-be-delayed-in-november/2020/07/30/cb19f1f4-d1d0-11ea-8d32-1ebf4e9d8e0d_story.html).



Carolyn B. Maloney
Chairwoman
House Committee on Oversight and Reform



Gary C. Peters
Ranking Member
Senate Committee on Homeland
Security and Governmental Affairs

cc: The Honorable Kevin McCarthy, Minority Leader
U.S. House of Representatives

The Honorable Mitch McConnell, Majority Leader
U.S. Senate

The Honorable Rodney Davis, Ranking Member
Committee on House Administration

The Honorable Ron Johnson, Chairman
Senate Committee on Homeland Security and Governmental Affairs

The Honorable James Comer, Ranking Member
House Committee on Oversight and Reform

The Honorable Roy Blunt, Chairman
Senate Committee on Rules and Administration