Questions for the Record for Lori Chavez-DeRemer

Committee on Education and Workforce Hearing
"Examining the Policies and Priorities of the Department of Labor"
June 5, 2025

Chairman Tim Walberg (R-MI)

1. Beginning in 2011, pharmacy benefit managers (PBMs) began to implement formulary exclusions that require patients to pay completely out-of-pocket for a drug or undertake a lengthy appeals or exceptions process. Formulary exclusions have grown 961 percent—from109 drugs to 1,156 drugs—from 2014-2022. To what extent do formulary exclusions limit patient choice and drug access?

Response:

On April 15, President Donald Trump issued Executive Order (EO) 14273 titled, "Lowering Drug Prices by Once Again Putting Americans First," to provide access to prescription drugs at lower costs to American patients and taxpayers. The EO directed the Secretary of Labor to, within 180 days, propose regulations pursuant to the Employee Retirement Income Security Act (ERISA) of 1974 to improve employer health plan fiduciary transparency into the direct and indirect compensation received by pharmacy benefit managers (PBMs).

Congress and other Federal agencies have issued multiple reports regarding PBM's use of perverse formulary practices. In 2019, then-Chairman Chuck Grassley (R-IA) and then-Ranking Member Ron Wyden (D-OR) issued a first of its kind report following a two year investigation exposing, among other things, how rebates, discounts, and fees tied to list price and the increased use of formulary exclusion tactics by PBMs have had unintended consequences on the insulin therapeutic class: list price continued to increase, leading to higher prices at the pharmacy counter for patients.

Since 2019, there has been a concerted effort by Congress and other Federal agencies to examine PBM business practices including the use of formulary exclusion tactics. The Consolidated Appropriations Act of 2021 directed the Federal Trade Commission to initiate a 6(b) study into the use of rebate walls to block competition from new branded therapies, biosimilars, generics, and other innovative products. In May 2021, the FTC issued a report based solely on publicly available information and indicated that such practice could raise antitrust concerns. In June 2022, the FTC issued a policy statement explaining, that among other things, "rebates and fees may shift costs and misalign incentives in a way that ultimately increases patients' costs and stifles competition from lower-costs drugs, especially when generics and biosimilars are excluded or disfavored on formularies."

In July 2024, the FTC issued an interim staff report highlighting the use of formulary exclusion tactics, finding some rebate contracts explicitly excluded generics and biosimilars, favoring high-list, high-rebate branded alternatives. This tactic impacts patients in two ways. First, a patient's out-of-pocket cost obligations may be higher if the patient is required to take the branded drug product. Second, cash patients, including uninsured, lack meaningful access to affordable medicines. And third, exclusionary rebates may have negative spillover effects on the market as a whole, limiting generic drug companies' ability to get more patient uptake.

2. When PBMs' compensation is tied to the list price of a medicine, this can lead to PBMs disfavoring generic or lower-priced brand competitors. PBMs continuously say that lowering drug costs for patients is a top priority. Would you consider reviewing a reform idea that would break the link between PBM compensation and the list price of medicines to benefit patients in meaningful ways, such as through increased coverage of lower cost alternatives such as generics or biosimilars?

Response:

The Department would welcome any opportunity to collaborate with Congress on ways to lower prescription drug prices for the American worker.

3. On May 15, 2025, the Departments of Health and Human Services, Labor (DOL), and Treasury (Tri-Agencies) issued a statement announcing they will not enforce the 2024 *Mental Health Parity and Addiction Equity Act* Final Rule. The non-enforcement is in response to a legal challenge by the ERISA Industry Committee regarding the lawfulness of the 2024 rule and is expected to remain in place for at least 18 months after a final decision in the lawsuit. According to the non-enforcement policy, the Tri-Agencies are reexamining the broader parity enforcement approach.

   Aspects of mental health and substance use disorder law and regulations remain overly complex and technical. As a result, compliance has become a moving target through a patchwork of unclear and often conflicting guidance. The proliferation of differing compliance approaches, tools, and interpretations has led to confusion and strains on government, health plan, employer, and provider resources. Will you commit to working with health plans, employers, and other interested stakeholders to streamline the parity compliance process?

Response:

Yes. On September 9, 2024, the Departments of Labor, Health and Human Services (HHS), and the Treasury (the Departments) issued a final rule titled "Requirements Related to the Mental Health Parity and Addiction Equity Act," (2024 Final Rule). On January 17, 2025, the ERISA Industry Committee (ERIC) filed suit in the U.S. District Court of the District of Columbia challenging certain provisions of the 2024 Final Rule on multiple grounds, including on grounds that they are arbitrary and capricious and contrary to law. Additionally, Executive Order 14219, titled "Ensuring Lawful Governance and Implementing the President's 'Department of Government Efficiency' Deregulatory Initiative," directs federal agencies to review regulations to identify those that may undermine the national interest, including by imposing undue burdens on small businesses or significant costs upon private parties that are not outweighed by public benefits. In such cases, federal agencies must exercise enforcement discretion to ensure lawful governance. The lawsuit is in abeyance while the Departments reconsider the 2024 Final Rule, including whether to issue a notice of proposed rulemaking rescinding or modifying the regulation through notice and comment rulemaking.

MHPAEA provides critical protections for workers, individuals, and their families who need treatment for mental health conditions and substance use disorders. During this period of nonenforcement of the 2024 Final Rule as the Departments revisit the Rule, the Departments remain

committed to ensuring that individuals receive protection under the law in a way that is not unduly burdensome for plans and issuers.

4. The President has promised "radical price transparency," and I hope to see new regulations soon requiring group health plans that are subject to the *Employee Retirement Income Security Act* to finally let patients know what the price tag will be for their trip to the hospital or just a routine doctor's visit. This initial price for patients before they go to the doctor is called an "advance explanation of benefits" and has been the law since the end of 2020. Can you update us on where these new regulations stand at the Employee Benefits Security Administration?

Response:

The Department is committed to fulfilling the President's promise to deliver radical price transparency in healthcare. The spring regulatory agenda, published on September 4, 2025, indicates that a proposed rule will be issued by April 2026. Advanced Explanation of Benefits (AEOB) implementation is a priority for the Department, and we have been working with the Departments of Health and Human Services and the Treasury as well as interested industry stakeholders on the technical aspects of potential data transmission standards. This work informs the development of regulations that are operationally feasible for plans and providers and meet consumer expectations and needs.

5. The tree care industry continues to rank among the most hazardous in the country, with a fatality rate that far exceeds the national average. At the same time, it plays a vital role in protecting critical infrastructure—maintaining powerlines and roadways, supporting wildfire prevention, and responding to hurricanes, winter storms, and other disasters. Despite these responsibilities and risks, there is still no dedicated Occupational Safety and Health Administration (OSHA) standard tailored to the unique hazards of tree care operations. Instead, employers must navigate a patchwork of general industry standards that were not designed for arboricultural work. This fragmented regulatory approach creates confusion, results in inconsistent enforcement, and ultimately undermines safety for workers performing essential public-facing services. During the first Trump administration, OSHA completed the *Small Business Regulatory Enforcement Fairness Act* panel process for a tree care operations standard. That process produced strong recommendations and a clear path for advancing the rule. However, the Biden administration repeatedly delayed publication of a proposed rule, despite longstanding bipartisan calls for action. At a May 2025 hearing before the Subcommittee on Workforce Protections, Members of Congress again raised concerns about this delay and heard testimony emphasizing that a properly crafted standard would not impose new regulatory burdens. Rather, it would replace the current patchwork with clear, practical requirements—consolidating and improving existing regulations to better protect workers in this high-risk field.

    a. Does DOL consider completion of a tree care operations standard a priority?

Response:

OSHA first published an Advanced Notice of Proposed Rulemaking (ANPRM) in 2008. The standard remains an agency priority, and the Spring 2025 Regulatory Agenda projects that the agency will publish a Notice of Proposed Rulemaking (NPRM) in April 2026.

b. What steps are being taken to move this standard forward?

Response:

Internal OSHA experts and leadership are currently reviewing this issue and determining the best path forward.

6. OSHA's injury and illness recordkeeping system, including its recordability criteria, was established in 1971. Do you believe it would be prudent to evaluate the OSHA injury and illness recordkeeping to ensure they appropriately meet the needs of today's employers and workers?

Response:

Among other things, the Occupational Safety and Health Act of 1970 (the OSH Act) required OSHA to issue regulations requiring employers to "maintain accurate records of, and to make periodic reports on, work-related deaths, injuries and illnesses other than minor injuries requiring only first aid treatment and which do not involve medical treatment, loss of consciousness, restriction of work or motion, or transfer to another job." 29 U.S.C. § 657(c)(2). Soon after Congress passed the OSH Act, OSHA issued the required occupational injury and illness recording and reporting regulations as 29 CFR part 1904, and since 1971, OSHA and the Bureau of Labor Statistics (BLS) have operated the injury and illness recordkeeping system as a cooperative effort. However, OSHA has revisited the requirements contained in that regulation a number of times over the past fifty years, including comprehensively reviewing the recordkeeping criteria.

In addition, OSHA has updated its guidance to employers on recordkeeping throughout the years to account for changes in the modern online workplace. The timely recordkeeping of injury and illness information is required for collection and maintenance by most employers on the OSHA 300 logs, with partial exemptions for very small employers and those in low-hazard industries. It is beneficial to employers and workers alike, as it allows for the tracking of safety performance and identification of hazards, injury trends, and corrections that may need to be made to prevent further similar injuries and ensure a safe and healthy workplace.

7. Physical therapy treatment, when delivered for work-related injuries, is currently classified as medical treatment, triggering its recordability under OSHA reporting requirements. Despite physical therapy's advantages, the current system inadvertently discourages proactive injury prevention, ergonomic intervention, and rehabilitation by penalizing employers and employees for pursuing recovery or prevention through physical therapy. Would you be willing to evaluate rescinding physical therapy intervention as an OSHA recordable event to ensure U.S. workers are receiving low-cost, highly effective intervention for injury prevention and recovery while concurrently reducing the administrative burden of U.S. employers?

Response:

Physical therapy itself is not a recordable event. Rather, a work-related illness or injury is recordable if it results in death, days away from work, restricted work or transfer to another job, *medical treatment beyond first aid*, or loss of consciousness, and OSHA considers physical therapy to be "medical treatment beyond first aid." 29 CFR 1904.7(a); 29 CFR 1904.7(b)(5)(ii)(M). Thus, if a work-related illness or injury is treated with physical therapy, then that illness or injury meets OSHA's general recording criteria. See 29 CFR 1904.7. OSHA has reviewed and considered the request to rescind its classification of physical therapy treatment as "medical treatment beyond first aid" under OSHA's Recordkeeping regulation. However, as the agency has consistently explained, the exception for "first aid" treatment is intended to capture situations where treatment is applied to address "truly minor injuries and illnesses." 66 FR 5916, 5984. As the agency stated in the Recordkeeping final rule in 2001, physical therapy is often used to treat more serious injuries and therefore rises to the level of medical treatment beyond first aid. 66 FR at 5992. Physical therapy for purely precautionary purposes (*i.e.*, physical therapy which is purely preventative in the absence of a triggering illness or injury) is not considered medical treatment under OSHA's recordkeeping rule, which requires the recording of work-related illnesses and injuries.

8. Enacted in 1927, the *Federal Longshore and Harbor Workers' Compensation Act* (Longshore Act) provides for the payment of compensation, medical care, and vocational rehabilitation services to employees disabled from on-the-job injuries that occur on the navigable waters of the United States, or in adjoining areas customarily used in the loading, unloading, repairing, or building of a vessel. The Longshore Act (through the *Defense Base Act*) also applies to employees of companies performing Department of Defense contracts.

   Under current law, the Longshore Act holds employers that are subject to it responsible for hearing loss that occurred before and after employment, as well as loss caused by non-work-related employment or loss due to the natural aging process. However, OSHA and most state-level workers' compensation laws permit a reduction in claims value based on age-related hearing loss. Will DOL consider a review of its administration of the Longshore Act for the purposes of updating its processes and recommending to Congress any legislative changes it considers necessary?

Response:

Under the Longshore and Harbor Workers' Compensation Act (LHWCA), workers who suffer hearing loss due to occupational noise exposure in covered maritime employment are entitled to compensation. While there is no statutory provision for apportioning hearing loss between occupational and non-occupational causes (e.g., aging or prior non-covered employment), the LHWCA allows employers to seek partial reimbursement from the Special Fund if the worker has pre-existing hearing loss and certain conditions are met. Any shift toward an apportionment model found in some state-level workers' compensation laws would require a statutory change.

9. On April 23, the President signed an executive order affirming that his administration is committed to utilizing apprenticeships to expand the American workforce—including directing DOL to submit plans by this summer to facilitate enrolling at least 1 million new apprentices. One of the tools to support apprenticeship programs has been the use of "industry intermediaries" which allow sectors to tailor programs and outreach based on

practical knowledge and the specific needs of its employers. What role will intermediaries play in DOL's overall plans to support and expand apprenticeship programs?

Response:

The Department is committed to expanding Registered Apprenticeship programs and believes that our key partnerships with industry are crucial to this expansion. The Department currently partners with 15 industry intermediaries to expand the use of Registered Apprenticeship in a wide variety of sectors, including supply chain automation, nanotechnology and semiconductors, information technology (IT), cybersecurity, healthcare, advanced manufacturing, logistics, hospitality, and the energy sector.

These intermediaries support Registered Apprenticeships in these industries, including, but not limited to, the following activities:

- Assisting employers in developing high quality Registered Apprenticeship standards for new programs.
- Providing subject matter expertise on apprentice recruitment strategies, including leveraging partnerships and other resources that help bring employers together to build a talent pipeline that helps growing sectors stay competitive in today's global economy.
- Providing incentive funding to employers and their related training partners to offset the costs of developing, launching, and sustaining Registered Apprenticeship programs.
- Conducting outreach to employers, unions, educators and others to promote Registered Apprenticeship and increase awareness of the value and strong Return on Investment of Registered Apprenticeships.
- Implementing industry-driven strategies to expand Registered Apprenticeship opportunities across growing sectors.
- Providing technical assistance on strategies and promising practices that lead to successful placement and retention in Registered Apprenticeship opportunities.

The Department is continuing to work with these industry intermediaries and is exploring new fields, including artificial intelligence (AI), where industry intermediaries could be considered to help meet the 1 million apprentice goal and align with President Trump's recent Executive Order on Advancing Artificial Intelligence Education for American Youth.

In July, President Trump also released his AI policy strategy, "Winning the Race: America's AI Action Plan", which illustrates how American workers will be central to the Trump Administration's AI policy and outlines the Department's integral role in creating a future-ready workforce. The plan prioritizes AI skills development as a core objective of workforce funding streams, including apprenticeships, partners with education and workforce system stakeholders to expand early career exposure programs and pre-apprenticeship opportunities for middle and high school students in AI infrastructure occupations, and expand Registered Apprenticeships for occupations critical to AI infrastructure. We appreciate your interest and continued support of Registered Apprenticeship Programs.

Rep. Glenn "GT" Thompson (R-PA)

1. Madam Secretary, can you explain how you see career and technical education (CTE) playing a role in achieving the President's Executive Order on Preparing Americans for High-Paying, Skilled Trade Jobs of the Future, including increasing pre-apprenticeships and registered apprenticeships through CTE programs?

Response:

In August, the Department, in coordination with the Departments of Commerce and Education, released a comprehensive worker investment and development strategy, "America's Talent Strategy: Building the Workforce for the Golden Age", to implement the Executive Order. The Department also recently announced the implementation of an Interagency Agreement with the Department of Education to create an integrated federal education and workforce system, with the Department of Labor taking on a greater role in administering CTE programs. The Department looks forward to sharing progress with Congress on efforts to align CTE with workforce development programs to advance career awareness, modern work-based learning models, employer-validated credentials, and CTE alignment with the skills needed to enter Registered Apprenticeships.

Rep. Glenn Grothman (R-WI)

1. Secretary Chavez-DeRemer, OSHA's proposed rule adopts a one- size-fits-all approach to heat illness and injury prevention, applying identical requirements across indoor and outdoor environments and across all sectors, including agriculture, construction, and manufacturing, without differentiation. This broad application fails to consider critical distinctions in worksite conditions, tasks performed, or industry-specific risks. How does OSHA justify imposing identical obligations on such a broad and diverse range of workplaces, regardless of differences in work tasks, physical environments, industry risks, or business size? Shouldn't the final rule recognize and account for the distinct operational realities of sectors where heat is a controlled byproduct of indoor production rather than an ambient environmental exposure?

Response:

OSHA is currently in the middle of the rulemaking process with respect to the Heat Injury and Illness Prevention in Outdoor and Indoor Work Settings proposed rule. OSHA received over 40,000 comments in response to the proposal and heard from nearly 300 participants during an informal hearing on the proposal, which was held from June 16 through July 2. Individuals who submitted a Notice of Intention to Appear before the hearing can participate in the post-hearing comment period, which is open until September 30, 2025. These individuals can file additional evidence and data relevant to the proceeding, including written responses to questions asked during hearing proceedings, as well as final written briefs at regulations.gov. At the close of this comment period, OSHA will consider all of the comments and testimony that have been provided through the heat rulemaking process and will determine the best path forward.

2. Secretary Chavez-DeRemer, the proposed rule's rigid acclimatization requirements are another example of its inflexible, one-size-fits-all approach. Mandating a specific phase-in schedule for all new or returning workers, regardless of industry, workforce

composition, or existing safety practices, fails to recognize how acclimatization is already effectively managed in controlled indoor environments like manufacturing. For example, many manufacturing facilities already use tailored onboarding, cross- training, and seasonal protocols to manage exposure. OSHA needs to address the operational and financial burdens this inflexible framework imposes on manufacturing sectors, where staffing challenges and continuous operations leave little room for a rigid acclimatization schedule. Shouldn't OSHA consider allowing employer-determined acclimatization protocols that still meet the rule's safety objectives but offer greater flexibility based on industry context?

Response:

OSHA is currently in the middle of the rulemaking process with respect to the Heat Injury and Illness Prevention in Outdoor and Indoor Work Settings proposed rule. OSHA received over 40,000 comments in response to the proposal and heard from nearly 300 participants during an informal hearing on the proposal, which was held from June 16 through July 2. Individuals who submitted a Notice of Intention to Appear before the hearing can participate in the post-hearing comment period, which is open until September 30, 2025. These individuals can file additional evidence and data relevant to the proceeding, including written responses to questions asked during hearing proceedings, as well as final written briefs at regulations.gov. At the close of this comment period, OSHA will consider all of the comments and testimony that have been provided through the heat rulemaking process and will determine the best path forward.

3. The Federal government has an obligation to effectively manage taxpayer dollars and ensure all Federal programs are efficient and mission driven. The Job Corps Program is no exception. As part of the *A Stronger Workforce for America Act* (ASWA), Congress and Job Corps stakeholders have proposed several reforms to the Job Corps program estimated to save the taxpayer tens of millions of dollars per year and unlock key partnerships with our nation's top employers. Reforms would also address concerns identified by the Department of Labor's Job Corps transparency report.

Response:

The Department appreciates Congress's focus on strengthening workforce outcomes for young people and acknowledges the reform principles reflected in the *A Stronger Workforce for America Act*. The Department remains committed to working with Congress to ensure that any path forward for Job Corps prioritizes accountability, transparency, and ensuring the best possible outcomes for students.

4. Secretary Chavez-DeRemer, does the Department of Labor support the reforms to the Job Corps Program proposed as part of the *A Stronger Workforce for America Act* (ASWA) in the 118th Congress?

Response:

The Department appreciates Congress's focus on strengthening workforce outcomes for young people and acknowledges the reform principles reflected in the *A Stronger Workforce for America Act*. The Department remains committed to working with Congress to ensure that any path forward for Job Corps prioritizes accountability, transparency, cost effectiveness, and ensuring the best

possible outcomes for students.

5. Secretary Chavez-DeRemer, would the Department of Labor support an extension of the Job Corps Program to allow for meaningful reforms to take effect?

Response:

If Congress reauthorizes the Job Corps program, the Department will implement meaningful reforms that improve the effectiveness, efficiency, and fiscal integrity of the Job Corps program. The Department will welcome the opportunity to provide technical assistance and to inform any transition or reform efforts and to ensure that any changes prioritize outcomes for students and responsible stewardship of taxpayer funds.

6. Secretary Chavez-DeRemer, Obama-Biden policies required Job Corps students who have a high school diploma to participate in remedial classes until they test on the Test of Adult Basic Education that they are effectively "college-ready." But most of these students enrolled to get a trade education and become an electrician or a welder, not go to college. How much has Job Corps student attrition increased and graduation rates decreased because of these misguided Obama-Biden policies?

Response:

Under the *Workforce Innovation and Opportunity Act (WIOA)*, a "graduate" is defined as a student who, as a result of participation in Job Corps, either receives a secondary school diploma or equivalent, or completes the requirements of a career and technical education program that prepares them for employment or postsecondary education (see WIOA Section 142(5)). This statutory definition reinforces the importance of both academic and technical achievement as valid pathways to success.

While the Department does not collect data focused narrowly on the impact of specific past academic policies on attrition or graduation rates, the Department continues to evaluate the balance between academic instruction and career training to ensure students are not unnecessarily delayed from entering the workforce. Our focus remains on equipping students with the credentials, skills, and opportunities needed to achieve economic self-sufficiency.

Rep. Elise Stefanik (R-NY)

1. Upstate New York and North Country farmers that utilize the H-2A program in my district consistently express the devastating impact the Biden Administration inflicted on family farms across America due to the March 2023 DOL Adverse Effect Wage Rate methodology final rule. This new methodology has resulted in skyrocketing wages and has created a massive administrative burden for farmers who use the program. Secretary Chavez-DeRemer, what steps is your department taking to ensure that wage determinations under the H-2A program are not placing an unsustainable burden on farmers who are already operating on razor-thin margins?

Response:

The Department understands that agricultural employers play a vital role in our nation's economy, and their ability to obtain a reliable workforce is critical to producing the U.S. food supply. The Department is committed to the effective administration of the H-2A temporary agricultural visa program and the protection of American workers. The Department's H-2A program regulations currently require an H-2A employer to offer, advertise in its recruitment, and pay a wage that is at least the highest of the Adverse Effect Wage Rate (AEWR), the prevailing wage, the collectively bargained wage rate, the Federal minimum wage, or the State minimum wage. The Department is aware of concerns raised by many agricultural producers and associations that the Biden Administration's 2023 AEWR Final Rule contains provisions which can lead to higher AEWR rates being assigned for certain job duties, such as driving tractor trailer trucks, irrespective of how often such duties are performed. The Department is sensitive to those concerns and understands the importance of AEWR rates to American farmers and ranchers seeking a reliable and legal workforce.

As the Department has announced, https://www.dol.gov/agencies/eta/foreign-labor/news, in response to litigation challenging the 2023AEWR final rule, on August 25, 2025, the U.S. District Court for the Western District of Louisiana issued an order vacating the rule. As a result of this vacatur, until the Department develops a new AEWR methodology, it will set AEWR rates under the methodology set forth in the 2010 H-2A rule. As is noted in the recently released Spring Regulatory Agenda, DOL intends to issue a Notice of Proposed Rulemaking to revise the AEWR methodology for H-2A workers.

More broadly, the Department is actively collaborating with other federal agency partners, including the Department of Agriculture, to examine possible reforms that can improve the H-2A program in a manner that better balances the competing goals of providing U.S. employers with a needed workforce while preventing adverse effect on workers in the United States similarly employed. The Department has already made several recent policy and programmatic changes to facilitate use of the program. For example, the Department has temporarily suspended the fee it collects for certified H-2A labor certification applications, https://www.govinfo.gov/content/pkg/FR-2025-07-31/pdf/2025-14510.pdf; is changing policy to account for an H-2A employer's staggered dates of need, https://www.govinfo.gov/content/pkg/FR-2025-08-25/pdf/2025-15653.pdf; and is collaborating with other federal partners on technology-based solutions to make use of the program simpler and less burdensome.

2. Do I have your commitment to address a long-term solution regarding the Adverse Effect Wage Rate and reverse the methodology that took effect in March 2023?

Response:

Yes, the Department is committed to continuing to work with Congress and our federal agency partners to address concerns raised by stakeholders concerning the rising Adverse Effect Wage Rate (AEWR) and its impact on the agricultural sector, especially for employers in labor-intensive specialty crop operations.

As the Department has announced, https://www.dol.gov/agencies/eta/foreign-labor/news, in response to litigation challenging the 2023AEWR final rule, on August 25, 2025, the U.S. District

Court for the Western District of Louisiana issued an order vacating the rule. As a result of this vacatur, until the Department develops a new AEWR methodology, it will set AEWR rates under the methodology set forth in the 2010 H-2A rule. As is noted in the recently released Spring Regulatory Agenda, DOL intends to issue a Notice of Proposed Rulemaking to revise the AEWR methodology for H-2A workers. The Department remains cognizant of employers' need for longer-term certainty with respect to H-2A wages. Therefore, itis actively exploring new AEWR methodologies that carefully balance the workforce needs of agricultural employers with the Department's statutory mandate to protect the wages and working conditions of agricultural workers in the United States.

3. Many farmers in my district have expressed concern that the soaring Adverse Effect Wage Rate increases are not only hurting their ability to hire employees but are also making it nearly impossible to compete globally. Has your department conducted a cost-benefit analysis on the long-term consequences of these wildly elevated wage hikes for U.S. agricultural competitiveness?

Response:

The Department is aware of concerns raised by many agricultural producers and associations that the AEWRs have substantially increased in recent years and that the Biden Administration's 2023 AEWR Final Rule contains provisions which can lead to even higher minimum wages for certain job duties, such as driving tractor trailer trucks, irrespective of how often such duties are performed. The Department is sensitive to those concerns and understands the importance of AEWR rates to American farmers and ranchers seeking a reliable and legal workforce. The Department is committed to addressing the concern of increasing year-over-year AEWR rates within the authority granted to the Department by Congress. To that end, in addition to implementing the recent vacatur of the 2023 AEWR rule—a rule that raised strong concerns among many farmers and growers—the Department is actively collaborating with other federal agencies, including the Department of Agriculture, to examine possible reforms that can improve the broader H-2A program in a manner that balances workforce needs of agricultural employers with the Department's statutory mandate to protect the wages and working conditions of agricultural workers in the United States.

The Department has already made several recent policy and programmatic changes to facilitate use of the program. For example, the Department has temporarily suspended the fee it collects for certified H-2A labor certification applications, https://www.govinfo.gov/content/pkg/FR-2025-07-31/pdf/2025-14510.pdf; is changing policy to account for an H-2A employer's staggered dates of need, https://www.govinfo.gov/content/pkg/FR-2025-08-25/pdf/2025-15653.pdf; and is collaborating with other federal partners on technology-based solutions to make use of the program simpler and less burdensome.

4. During my over decade-long career in Congress, I have continuously advocated for our hardworking New York dairy farmers to have access to the H-2A program. Secretary Chavez-DeRemer, are you willing to work with Congress on tweaking our agricultural worker visa program to allow for year-round visas?

Response:

Under the Immigration and Nationality Act (INA), an employer must establish a need for agricultural services or labor to be performed in the United States on a seasonal or temporary basis.

The Department has heard from many agricultural employers, especially in the dairy and meat processing industries, that this statutory requirement, which is regulated by the Department of Homeland Security (DHS), does not address the persistent shortage of U.S. workers in their industries. The Department is sensitive to these concerns and actively collaborating with other federal agencies, including DHS and the Department of Agriculture, to examine possible reforms that can improve the H-2A program for employers and is prepared to work with Congress to explore potential revisions to the INA that governs eligibility for the H-2A program.

Rep. Rick Allen (R-GA)

1. Experts recognize that misaligned incentives in the drug payment system encourage PBMs to favor medicines with high list prices and larger manufacturer rebates or discounts. However, when PBMs faced criticism over this dynamic, they shifted their compensation models to focus on administrative or other fees, which are still tied to list prices. Isn't this just reshuffling the same flawed incentives? Would delinking PBM compensation from the list price of drugs—so they're paid a flat service fee rather than a percentage of rebates or list prices—help eliminate the incentive to prioritize higher-cost drugs?

Response:

The Department would welcome any opportunity to collaborate with Congress on ways to lower prescription drug prices for the American worker.

2. Alternative funding programs (AFPs) are programs that employers use that involve contracting with vendor to target commercially insured patients taking targeted drugs to shift the cost of covering prescription drugs to third-parties such as patient support and assistance programs. Do you believe that AFPs often lead to lapses in care for individuals with chronic and/or high-cost conditions? Do you believe that employers are aware of the danger AFPs can cause their employees, whether through delayed access to prescription drugs or downright denials?

Response:

Alternative funding programs (AFPs), also known as specialty carve-out programs, aim to reduce employer costs by utilizing pharmaceutical manufacturer's patient assistance programs for high-cost specialty drugs. While AFPs pose significant issues, like delayed access to prescription drugs, it is the Department's view that AFPs are a symptom of broader problems in healthcare—the high costs of specialty drugs. Specialty drugs typically address chronic illnesses, like cancer and arthritis, and represent a significant percentage of an employer's overall pharmacy costs. The Department is committed to lowering drug costs for the American worker and would welcome an opportunity to engage with Congress on policy solutions.

3. President Trump's Executive Order issued on May 12 directed the Department of Labor (DOL) to issue regulations on prohibited transactions, which would require PBMs to disclose information regarding how they are compensated? How can DOL leverage those regulations to protect employers and employees from non-transparent fees that PBMs extract?

Response:

On April 15, President Donald Trump issued Executive Order (EO) 14273 titled, "Lowering Drug Prices by Once Again Putting Americans First," to provide access to prescription drugs at lower costs to American patients and taxpayers– putting Americans first and making America healthy again. The EO directed the Secretary of Labor, via the Employee Benefits Security Administration (EBSA) to, within 180 days, propose regulations pursuant to the Employee Retirement Income Security Act (ERISA) to improve employer health plan fiduciary transparency into the direct and indirect compensation received by pharmacy benefit managers (PBMs). EBSA is fully engaged and committed to carrying out this directive as expeditiously as possible.

Rep. Burgess Owens (R-UT)

1. Research from Credential Engine has identified more than one million credentials—from degrees and certificates to badges and licenses—currently available in the U.S. labor market. Yet employers, educators, students, and workers still lack a clear, standardized way to understand what these credentials actually mean—what skills they represent, how they align with workforce demands, or whether they translate into better jobs and earnings.

   At the same time, there is growing interest in modernizing our approach to workforce data through tools like Learning and Employment Records, which can help individuals more easily verify and communicate their competencies throughout their careers. But without consistent, transparent credential data, these innovations won't fulfill their promise.

   Can you speak to how improving credential transparency—particularly the use of structured, comparable, and open data about the content and value of credentials—can support skills-based hiring, empower workers to better signal their skills, and enhance the impact of tools like LERs in the workforce development system?

Response:

Increased transparency includes providing data not only on credential attainment but also on various credentials' labor market value. These elements are important to help inform workers' choices and improve learning and employment records. The Department publishes open data on all eligible training providers, including the credential offered, currently at trainingproviderresults.gov. The Department is working to improve the quality of the eligible training provider data submitted by states to enhance transparency around participant outcomes and credentials offered by all training providers that receive funding through the public workforce system. The Department will also strengthen oversight and guidance to States to ensure state Eligible Training Provider Lists (ETPLs) reflect training programs that demonstrate real economic value to workers, while making it easier for these effective programs to establish eligibility across state lines. The Department also makes open data on occupational information, and associated credentials, available through www.onetonline.org. Lastly, the Department requires grantees that develop credentials, such as Strengthening Community Colleges grantees, to make information about their credentials available through open, linked, and interoperable data formats.

The Department, in partnership with the Departments of Commerce and Education, will also develop a public Credentials of Value scorecard that enables employers, job seekers, career coaches, and other workforce stakeholders to compare education and training programs based on quality assurance criteria including labor market outcomes, cost, duration, and credential type. The Department will review ongoing state and private sector initiatives to inform the creation of the scorecard and believes it could integrate wage record data and credential transparency efforts to support informed decision-making by workforce stakeholders.

2. In its 2021 FLSA worker classification rule, the Department of Labor included an example specific to the trucking industry. With this example, the Department clarified that a motor carrier requiring an independent contractor to use a device that limits their truck's speed would not affect the trucker's classification, and would not indicate control by the motor carrier, because this requirement is "implemented in order to comply with specific legal obligations and to enhance safety."

   This example seems to conflict with the Department of Transportation's approach to speed limiting technology on trucks. Over the past 15 years, DOT has been considering a mandate requiring speed limiting devices in trucks, but has never issued a specific requirement or regulation to do so. Right now, there is no specific legal obligation to use a speed limiting device on a truck. In fact, it seems unlikely that DOT under President Trump would move forward on a speed limiter mandate due to safety concerns expressed by America's truckers.

   As you and the Department are considering revisions to FLSA worker classification regulations, would you defer to the Department of Transportation's determinations on what is safe and required for the operation of heavy-duty trucks, specifically with regard to the use of speed limiters?

Response:

The Department replaced the 2021 rule with a different rule in 2024. In ongoing litigation challenging the 2024 rule, the Department has informed courts that it is reconsidering the 2024 rule, including whether to rescind it. If the Department decides to engage in further rulemaking related to FLSA independent contractor classification status, the Department will seek technical assistance from other interested Departments where appropriate.

3. On April 23, 2025, President Trump issued an Executive Order directing the Departments of Labor, Education, and Commerce to identify alternatives to four-year degrees that align with employers' skill needs. With over 400,000 open construction jobs and 40% of the workforce expected to retire within a decade, expanding access to skilled trades is more urgent than ever.

   How is the Department of Labor advancing this Executive Order to help more Americans enter these high-demand, well-paying careers?

Response:

The Department of Labor is collaborating with the Departments of Education and Commerce to

implement the Executive Order to help ensure more workers enter high-demand, well-paying careers including by enhancing Registered Apprenticeships in skilled trades to meet and surpass 1 million active apprentices across industries, including construction. As of Q2 FY 2025, there are 451,650 apprentices in construction-related programs, a 38 percent increase since FY 2020, demonstrating their critical role in addressing workforce needs. Additionally, since the start of the current Administration, the Department has invested nearly $120 million in grants and cooperative agreements to expand Registered Apprenticeships, with nearly $84 million awarded to states in June 2025 to increase program capacity and support skilled trades, including construction.

Ranking Member Robert C. "Bobby" Scott (D-VA)

1) The Department of Labor has the statutory requirement under Section 503 of the *Rehabilitation Act* (Section 503) and the *Vietnam Era Veterans' Readjustment Assistance Act* (VEVRAA) to enforce anti-discrimination requirements with regards to federal contract workers who have disabilities and/or veteran status. Under the first Trump Administration, OFCCP successfully initiated focused reviews under Section 503 and VEVRAA to ensure that federal contractors were providing equal employment opportunities and complying with requirements of these statutes.[1]
    a. What is OFCCP currently doing to ensure that it is meeting its statutory requirements to ensure that federal contract workers are not being discriminated against on the basis of disability and/or veteran status?

Response:

The Department of Labor is committed to carrying out the statutory functions which Congress has currently assigned to the Department to investigate and enforce Section 503 and VEVRAA. OFCCP is currently carrying out the statutorily required functions under those laws, including investigating complaints filed under these laws. OFCCP will continue to provide information and assistance to federal contractors so that they can better understand their obligations under these laws.

    b. Is OFCCP currently conducting any compliance evaluations or other enforcement activity to ensure federal contractors are meeting their responsibilities under Section 503 and VEVRAA?

Response:

OFCCP is currently carrying out the statutorily required functions delegated to it under Section 503 and VEVRAA, including investigating complaints filed under the laws.

        i. If so, please provide a description of enforcement activities OFCCP is currently conducting with regards to enforcing Section 503 and VEVRAA.

Response:

As of January 31, 2025, any components of reviews or investigations of claims based on Executive Order 11246 were closed, and any and all reviews or investigations of claims based on Section 503 of the Rehabilitation Act of 1973, as amended, 29 U.S.C. § 793 (Section 503), and/or the Vietnam

[1] https://edworkforce.house.gov/uploadedfiles/craig_leen_-_testimony.pdf; https://www.dol.gov/newsroom/releases/ofccp/ofccp20201019-0

Era Veterans' Readjustment Assistance Act of 1974, as amended, 38 U.S.C. § 4212 (VEVRAA), were held in abeyance pending further guidance. On July 1, 2025, pursuant to Secretary's Order 08-2025, the abeyance on Section 503 and VEVRAA activities was lifted. Any VEVRAA and Section 503 complaints held in abeyance, as well as new complaints under those statutes, are being processed by OFCCP. Because OFCCP's compliance review format significantly entangled E.O. 11246 reviews with reviews of Section 503 and/or VEVRAA compliance, OFCCP exercised its discretion to administratively close all pending compliance reviews and will take no further action related to the scheduling list released in November 2024.

ii. If not, please provide an explanation as to why these enforcement activities are not occurring.

Response:

See above.

c. How many complaints alleging discrimination under Section 503 or VEVRAA have been filed with OFCCP since January 20, 2025?

Response:

As of July 18, 2025, there are 224 complaints alleging discrimination under Section 503 or VEVRAA that have been filed with OFCCP since January 20, 2025.

d. How many active cases related to claims under Section 503 and VEVRAA are currently being investigated by OFCCP?

Response:

As of July 18, 2025, OFCCP has begun the process to restart investigations following Secretary's Order 08-2025 issued on July 1, 2025, which lifted the abeyance on all activities related to Section 503 and VEVRAA. As part of that process, OFCCP is ascertaining which of the complaints held in abeyance with Section 503 and VEVRAA allegations satisfy the criteria to proceed to an investigation.

e. Are workers receiving timely responses and updates regarding the status of their filed claims? What information has been shared with workers who have filed claims about the processing of their claims?

Response:

Yes, all complainants who have filed complaints containing Section 503 and VEVRAA allegations have been notified that OFCCP has begun processing these complaints. Each complainant received a letter with OFCCP contact information which informed them that:

On January 21, 2025, President Donald J. Trump issued Executive Order 14173, entitled "Ending Illegal Discrimination and Restoring Merit-Based Opportunity," which revoked Executive Order 11246. On January 24, 2025, U.S. Department of Labor Acting Secretary Vince Micone, through

Secretary's Order 03-2025, directed the Office of Federal Contract Compliance Programs (OFCCP) to cease and desist all investigative and enforcement activity under Executive Order 11246 and to notify all impacted regulated parties that complaint investigations and compliance reviews under Section 503 of the Rehabilitation Act of 1973 (Section 503), as amended, and the Vietnam Era Veterans' Readjustment Assistance Act of 1974 (VEVRAA), as amended, are being held in abeyance pending further guidance. OFCCP's records indicate that you either had a complaint containing allegations under Section 503 and/or VEVRAA pending at that time or that you subsequently filed one. This letter serves as notice that the abeyance has been lifted and that OFCCP is processing your complaint.

If your complaint contains allegations based on Executive Order 11246, please note that pursuant to Executive Order 14173, OFCCP no longer has any authority to investigate these allegations and any aspect of the complaint or open investigation pertaining to Executive Order 11246 will be closed with no further action taken.

2) The President's FY 2026 budget proposes to eliminate OFCCP and move the responsibility for the enforcement of Section 503 and VEVRAA to other agencies. Under this proposal, what is the plan for the remaining OFCCP staff after any transfer?

Response:

Should Congress enact the President's FY 2026 budget proposal for OFCCP, the Department will engage in deliberative discussions on this issue.

3) Please provide the following information regarding staffing numbers for OFCCP:
    a. Number of current staff, broken down by office location, who are not on administrative leave;

Response:

LOCATION	DESCR	CITY	STATE	Count
CO0054	CESAR E. CHAVEZ MEMORIAL BLDG	DENVER	CO	4
DC0116	FRANCES PERKINS BLDG	WASHINGTON	DC	15
GA0500	SAM NUNN - ALABAMA ST SW	ATLANTA	GA	1
GAV052	SAM NUNN - FORSYTH ST	ATLANTA	GA	1
IL0236	JOHN C KLUCZYNSKI FEDERAL BLDG	CHICAGO	IL	1
KY0086	ROMANO MAZZOLI FB	LOUISVILLE	KY	1
LA0034	FE HERBERT FEDERAL BLDG	NEW ORLEANS	LA	5
MI0800	985 MICHIGAN AVE FED BUILDING	DETROIT	MI	1
MO1965	TWO PERSHING SQUARE	KANSAS CITY	MO	1
MS0083	DR A H MCCOY FB - CAPITOL ST	JACKSON	MS	1
NJ4360	DIAMOND HEAD BLD	MOUNTAINSIDE	NJ	2
NY7340	NIAGARA CENTER - ELMWOOD AVE	BUFFALO	NY	1
PA0930	1835 MARKET ST	PHILADELPHIA	PA	2
PR3998	MILLENNIUM PLAZA BLDG	GUAYNABO	PR	1
TN0076	JOHN J DUNCAN FB	KNOXVILLE	TN	1

TX0164	HIPOLITO F GARCIA FOB/US CTHS	SAN ANTONIO	TX	7
TX0292	A MACEO SMITH FEDERAL BLDG	DALLAS	TX	8
TX0701	LABRANCH FEDERAL BUILDING	HOUSTON	TX	5
VA0088	400 N 8TH ST	RICHMOND	VA	1
VA0328	2300 CLARENDON BLVD	ARLINGTON	VA	1
Remote	Home Location			16
		Total		**76**

b. Number of staff who have taken the Deferred Resignation Program; and

Response:

OFCCP had 239 staff take the Deferred Resignation Program.

c. Number of staff who were placed on administrative leave and served a Reduction in Force notice.

Response:

OFCCP has 165 staff who were placed on administrative leave and received a Reduction in Force notice. Of the 165, 157 are still on administrative leave under the RIF notice. Two employees' retirements had been processed; five employees were accepted into the DRP; and one employee has passed away since the date the notices were issued. The Department has since issued a notice to the employees on administrative leave advising that the RIF is being held in abeyance and that the Department is actively working to identify a suitable position for reassignment elsewhere within the Department of Labor.

4) Section 159 of the *Workforce Innovation and Opportunity Act* (WIOA) includes clear requirements and processes for the closure of Job Corps Centers that were not followed in the "pause" announced on May 29, 2025.

a. How does the Department define a "pause" and how is it different than a "termination"?

Response:

The Department is committed to complying with all statutory requirements under the Workforce Innovation and Opportunity Act (WIOA), including those outlined in Section 161 (29 U.S.C. § 3209(j)) regarding the closure of Job Corps centers. In this instance, no decision to permanently close any Job Corps center was made or implemented. As such, the closure procedures outlined in WIOA—such as the public comment period and Congressional notification—were not triggered.

b. What authority is the Department using to "pause" operations? Please provide a citation for the law or regulation.

Response:

The Department is committed to complying with all statutory requirements under the Workforce Innovation and Opportunity Act (WIOA), including those outlined in Section 161 (29 U.S.C. § 3209(j)) regarding the closure of Job Corps centers. In this instance, no decision to permanently close any Job Corps center was made or implemented. As such, the closure procedures outlined in WIOA—such as the public comment period and Congressional notification—were not triggered. Further, the Department resumed program operations that were paused on May 29, 2025, in compliance with court orders in *NJCA v. DOL and Cabrera v. DOL.*

The Department has, however, temporarily paused operations at select centers to meet fiscal and operational responsibilities or to address health and safety concerns. Most recently on December 19, 2024, the Department announced via press release the temporary pause of operations at the Whitney M. Young Jr. Job Corps Center in Simpsonville, Kentucky, and the Woodstock Job Corps Center in Woodstock, Maryland in order to address budget constraints and ensure the continued viability of the program.

5) With Job Corps operations on pause, how does the Department plan to fulfill its obligations to implement the *Full-Year Continuing Appropriations and Extensions Act, 2025*, which includes $1,760,155,000 for Job Corps? Does the Department of Labor intend to begin a new bidding process for contracts in order to operate the "paused" centers for FY 2025?

Response:

The Department has resumed center operations at the contractor-operated centers that were subject to the May 29, 2025 pause, in compliance with court orders in *NJCA v. DOL* and *Cabrera v. DOL*, including taking any contract actions necessary to maintain center operations.

6) Please provide a list of every Job Corps center operator contract that has been terminated or modified since January 20, 2025, including the total amount of funds originally awarded to each operator, the amount of funds that each operator has spent up to the date of the contract's termination or modification, and the amount of remaining unspent funds for each contract.

Response:

There are no center operations contract terminations dating from on or after January 20, 2025 that are in effect today. On May 29, 2025, the Department did issue notices of terminations for the operations contracts that were set to expire after June 30, 2025. However, on June 4th, DOL effectively rescinded those termination notices, as required by the orders of the Court in *NJCA v. DOL* (1:25-cv-04641) (S.D.N.Y.). In compliance with the Court's orders in *NJCA v. DOL*, beginning on July 1, 2025, the Department has modified a number of Job Corps operations contracts to extend performance through at least September 30, 2025, and to fund current work. The Department continues to take any necessary contract actions to operate centers in compliance with court orders in *NJCA v. DOL* and *Cabrera v. DOL*. The amount of unspent funds remaining on each contract is a dynamic number that contractors are tasked with monitoring under their contracts.

7) On April 25, 2025, the Department's Employment and Training Administration (ETA) released a "Job Corps Transparency Report", which is cited throughout the DOL press release announcing the pause of operations at centers. However, the report provides cost per enrollee based on enrollment from program year 2023. Please provide an updated cost per enrollee with the enrollments on campuses as of May 28, 2025, incorporating onboard strength at each campus.

Response:

The full cost and program data required for this calculation will not be available until after September 30, 2025.

8) Since the Trump Administration began on January 20, 2025, it's my understanding that DOL has not completed any background checks, which has led to a complete halt in new enrollments at Job Corps centers.
    a. Please provide the number of new enrollments on hold due to the cessation of background checks since January 20, 2025.

Response:

While background checks were paused in March 2025, between January 20 and June 5, 2025, Job Corps centers continued to process eligible applicant files beyond the background check step and collectively enrolled 11,375 new students. As of August 7, 2025, Job Corps had 18,235 applicants awaiting a background check. The Department has resumed background checks as of August 25, 2025.

    b. Please provide a list of onboard strength (enrollment) at each Job Corps center before January 20, 2025, as well as immediately before the operations pause on May 29, 2025.

Response:

Please see the table that follows.

Center-by-Center OBS on 1/15/2025 and 5/28/2025					
State	**Region**	**Center**	**PY 2024 Planned OBS**	**OBS as of 01/15/2025**	**OBS as of 05/28/2025**
Alaska	San Francisco	Alaska	226	196	156
New Mexico	Dallas	Albuquerque	327	229	203
Montana	Dallas	Anaconda	170	124	159
Oregon	San Francisco	Angell	160	125	138
Puerto Rico	Boston	Arecibo	201	186	154
Georgia	Atlanta	Atlanta	250	0	0
Indiana	Chicago	Atterbury	410	251	267
Tennessee	Atlanta	BL Hooks-Memphis	287	148	142
South Carolina	Atlanta	Bamberg	203	206	173
Wisconsin	Chicago	Blackwell	162	81	88
Virginia	Philadelphia	Blue Ridge	192	66	91
South Dakota	Dallas	Boxelder	124	91	84
New York	Boston	Brooklyn	145	114	118
Georgia	Atlanta	Brunswick	315	207	211
Kentucky	Philadelphia	Carl D. Perkins	235	96	121
Louisiana	Dallas	Carville	153	0	0
Arkansas	Dallas	Cass	119	99	85
New York	Boston	Cassadaga	245	159	157
Washington	San Francisco	Cascades	300	239	250
Idaho	San Francisco	Centennial	120	82	71
West Virginia	Philadelphia	Charleston	307	117	104
Ohio	Chicago	Cincinnati	202	196	195
Utah	Dallas	Clearfield	1002	801	744
Ohio	Chicago	Cleveland	346	184	163
Colorado	Dallas	Collbran	220	104	101
Washington	San Francisco	Columbia Basin	236	157	164
Washington	San Francisco	Curlew	172	120	117
Texas	Dallas	David Carrasco	379	358	299
Ohio	Chicago	Dayton	170	138	114
New York	Boston	Delaware Valley	208	164	161
Iowa	Chicago	Denison	282	220	204
Michigan	Chicago	Detroit	298	183	223
Kentucky	Philadelphia	Earle C Clements	1022	555	563
New Jersey	Boston	Edison	417	392	317
Missouri	Chicago	Excelsior Springs	436	285	271
Rhode Island	Boston	Exeter	185	162	150
Mississippi	Atlanta	Finch-Henry	226	116	97
Virginia	Philadelphia	Flatwoods	105	75	67
Kansas	Chicago	Flint Hills	217	181	169

Michigan	Chicago	Flint-Genesee	307	181	147
Washington	San Francisco	Fort Simcoe	112	89	99
Arizona	San Francisco	Fred G. Acosta	267	254	255
Kentucky	Philadelphia	Frenchburg	100	71	81
Alabama	Atlanta	Gadsden	260	177	175
Texas	Dallas	Gary	1471	785	852
Michigan	Chicago	Gerald R. Ford	212	193	129
New York	Boston	Glenmont	266	243	252
Massachusetts	Boston	Grafton	237	234	201
Kentucky	Philadelphia	Great Onyx	151	123	103
Mississippi	Atlanta	Gulfport	107	109	116
Oklahoma	Dallas	Guthrie	532	376	321
West Virginia	Philadelphia	Harpers Ferry	109	124	118
Connecticut	Boston	Hartford	181	183	184
Hawaii	San Francisco	Hawaii	211	190	152
Minnesota	Chicago	Hubert Humphrey	264	165	164
Indiana	Chicago	IndyPendence	100	54	39
California	San Francisco	Inland Empire	340	281	281
New York	Boston	Iroquois	225	163	106
Florida	Atlanta	Jacksonville	300	284	256
Tennessee	Atlanta	Jacobs Creek	111	90	88
Illinois	Chicago	Joliet	255	128	158
Pennsylvania	Philadelphia	Keystone	431	304	327
Montana	Dallas	Kicking Horse	0	0	0
North Carolina	Atlanta	Kittrell	350	241	234
Texas	Dallas	Laredo	220	222	194
Arkansas	Dallas	Little Rock	237	197	168
California	San Francisco	Long Beach	300	283	257
Maine	Boston	Loring	301	198	194
California	San Francisco	Los Angeles	614	524	513
North Carolina	Atlanta	Lyndon Johnson	120	116	101
Hawaii	San Francisco	Maui	128	66	57
Florida	Atlanta	Miami	300	292	248
Wisconsin	Chicago	Milwaukee	237	108	129
Missouri	Chicago	Mingo	144	119	100
Mississippi	Atlanta	Mississippi	292	204	167
Alabama	Atlanta	Montgomery	254	155	153
Kentucky	Philadelphia	Muhlenberg	343	170	187
New Hampshire	Boston	New Hampshire	300	239	238
Connecticut	Boston	New Haven	157	157	146
Louisiana	Dallas	New Orleans	186	156	105
Texas	Dallas	North Texas	562	435	390
Vermont	Boston	Northlands	220	147	143
North Carolina	Atlanta	Oconaluftee	114	119	109

Virginia	Philadelphia	Old Dominion	318	71	78
New York	Boston	Oneonta	291	238	241
Iowa	Chicago	Ottumwa	237	195	205
Oregon	San Francisco	PIVOT	60	22	22
Illinois	Chicago	Paul Simon	338	159	180
Maine	Boston	Penobscot	273	220	191
Pennsylvania	Philadelphia	Philadelphia	319	147	167
Arizona	San Francisco	Phoenix	353	295	259
Kentucky	Philadelphia	Pine Knot	160	155	145
Nebraska	Chicago	Pine Ridge	171	78	110
Florida	Atlanta	Pinellas	300	271	260
Pennsylvania	Philadelphia	Pittsburgh	699	443	438
District of Columbia	Philadelphia	Potomac	378	264	267
North Dakota	Dallas	Quentin Burdick	197	120	105
Puerto Rico	Boston	Ramey	470	356	320
Pennsylvania	Philadelphia	Red Rock	264	196	159
New Mexico	Dallas	Roswell	178	121	113
California	San Francisco	Sacramento	414	380	326
California	San Francisco	San Diego	555	394	399
California	San Francisco	San Jose	396	240	242
North Carolina	Atlanta	Schenck	192	47	98
Louisiana	Dallas	Shreveport	285	253	214
Massachusetts	Boston	Shriver	300	256	244
Nevada	San Francisco	Sierra Nevada	509	297	291
New York	Boston	South Bronx	250	222	227
Oregon	San Francisco	Springdale	139	76	75
Missouri	Chicago	St. Louis	520	251	218
Oklahoma	Dallas	Talking Leaves	197	159	141
Oregon	San Francisco	Timber Lake	165	124	133
Oregon	San Francisco	Tongue Point	473	353	314
Montana	Dallas	Trapper Creek	215	150	158
California	San Francisco	Treasure Island	532	385	390
Oklahoma	Dallas	Tulsa	235	165	155
Georgia	Atlanta	Turner	732	531	510
Utah	Dallas	Weber Basin	210	168	201
Massachusetts	Boston	Westover	437	376	353
Kentucky	Philadelphia	Whitney M. Young	0	157	0
Delaware	Philadelphia	Wilmington	153	113	69
Wyoming	Dallas	Wind River	300	179	191
Oregon	San Francisco	Wolf Creek	221	161	151
Maryland	Philadelphia	Woodland	300	243	285
Maryland	Philadelphia	Woodstock	0	248	1
		Total	35438	25435	23974

c. Will you commit to conducting background checks to begin new enrollments in the program?

Response:

The Department has resumed background checks as of August 25, 2025.

9) The WANTO grants were funded at FY 2024 levels through the *Full-Year Continuing Appropriations and Extensions Act, 2025*. How does the Department plan to fulfill its obligations to award those funds? Does the Department intend to release a new FOA for the FY 2025 WANTO grants?

Response:

On July 9, 2025, the Department published the Women in Apprenticeship and Nontraditional Occupations (WANTO) Funding Opportunity Announcement for FY 2025 for purposes of awarding a new set of grants to community-based organizations seeking to recruit, train, and retain more women in pre-apprenticeship and Registered Apprenticeship programs. This announcement follows a thorough evaluation and realignment of the program, which will ensure WANTO grants help the department achieve President Trump's goal of reaching one million new active apprentices.

10) It's been widely reported (including by WIRED[2]) that DOGE staffers, including Miles Collins, Aram Moghaddassi, and Marko Elez have gotten access to systems within the Department that contain U.S. citizens' Social Security numbers. Protecting Americans' privacy is an incredibly important responsibility, which should not be taken lightly.
    a. In any instance where the Department has shared data with DOGE, where has the data been stored?

Response:

Department of Labor staff is hyper-aware of potential privacy concerns when accessing sensitive data and operates with care. These individuals are, or were, Department of Labor employees, which means they are, or were, subject to the same oversight, rules, and accountability as any other federal employee within the Department. Like all DOL employees, they are, or were, required to undergo cybersecurity and data privacy trainings and to adhere to those practices.

b. What processes are in place to ensure U.S. citizens' and legal residents' data from DOL is not being copied by Elon Musk and his affiliates?

Response:

See the response to 10 a. above.

c. Has DOL staff and/or DOGE shared National Farmworker Jobs Program data with other agencies during the Trump Administration?

[2] https://www.wired.com/story/doge-access-immigration-data-department-of-labor/

Response:

The Department's Employment and Training Administration (ETA) has not shared individualized records for the National Farmworker Jobs Program (NFJP) with any other federal agency.

i. If so, who approved sharing the National Farmworker Jobs Program data?

Response:

ETA has not shared individualized records for the NFJP with any other federal agency.

ii. If so, for what purposes has data from the National Farmworker Jobs Program been shared with other agencies?

Response:

ETA has not shared individualized records for the NFJP with any other federal agency.

11) A recent report from the Department of Labor's Inspector General shows the vast majority of employers and anti-union consultants failing to report persuader activities under the *Labor-Management Reporting and Disclosure Act* (LMRDA). Widespread non-compliance with the LMRDA's reporting requirements for employers and persuaders denies workers critical pre-representation election information—such as who is being paid and how much they are being paid to persuade workers on the question of union representation—and undermines their right to free and fair elections. What concrete steps is the Department taking to increase compliance by employers and their consultants with regard to persuader activities?

Response:

The Department is committed to the evenhanded administration and enforcement of the LMRDA, including all requirements related to persuader activity reporting. The Office of Labor-Management Standards (OLMS) remains focused on upholding the law and ensuring that employers and workers have access to information required by the LMRDA. OLMS will continue to administer all statutory requirements as directed by Congress and in accordance with its mission to promote transparency and protect the American worker.

a. Will the Department implement all six of the Inspector General's recommendations in its May 2024 report entitled, *OLMS Can Do More to Protect Workers' Rights to Unionize Through Persuader Activity Disclosure* (May 2024 Report)?

Response:

In response to the Department's Office of Inspector General May 2024 report concerning the Office of Labor-Management Standards (OLMS) persuader reporting program, OLMS has already implemented a number of the report's recommendations. Specifically, as of January 2025, OLMS

added the Employer Identification Number (EIN) on the Forms LM-10, LM-20, and LM-21, and last year completed the recommendation for written tip line procedures and the recommendation for interagency training with staff of the National Labor Relations Board. OLMS seeks to complete the remaining recommendations, as soon as feasible. Additionally, OLMS continues to process its persuader reporting tip line and engage in cross-match efforts involving the three persuader reports to obtain more reports. As a result of these efforts, OLMS has seen a continued increase in persuader reports in recent years and anticipates that trend to continue this year.

i. If the Department declines to implement one or more of the recommendations, please provide a specific explanation for each, stating why the Department will not implement it and whether the Department has an alternative proposal and an explanation of the alternative proposal.

Response:

See above.

b. Will the Department implement all six of the Inspector General's recommendations in its May 2024 Report by the end of Calendar Year 2025?

Response:

The Department is committed to addressing the Inspector General's recommendations from the May 2024 Report. We are taking these recommendations seriously and will continue to make progress toward their completion.

OLMS has already implemented a number of the report's recommendations. Specifically, as of January 2025, OLMS added the Employer Identification Number (EIN) on the Forms LM-10, LM-20, and LM-21, and last year completed the recommendation for written tip line procedures and the recommendation for interagency training with staff of the National Labor Relations Board. OLMS seeks to complete the remaining recommendations, as soon as feasible. Additionally, OLMS continues to process its persuader reporting tip line and engage in cross-match efforts involving the three persuader reports to obtain more reports. As a result of these efforts, OLMS has seen a continued increase in persuader reports in recent years and anticipates that trend to continue this year.

i. If the Department will not implement one or more of the recommendations by the end of Calendar Year 2025, please provide a specific explanation of why the Department cannot do so, including resource constraints or the time required for implementation.

Response:

See above.

12) For more than five decades, the ERISA Advisory Council has served as a valuable resource for the Department of Labor. As you know, Ranking Member DeSaulnier and I wrote to you recently asking for information regarding the status of the Council, which

has yet to hold a meeting this year. The Council is established by section 512 of ERISA and is required to meet at least four times per year. The Department is required to support the Council's operations, including by providing an Executive Secretary to the Council. As we await your full response to this letter, I request answers to the following questions:

a. Will you confirm that you are not considering abolishing the Council or purging its membership?

Response:

Thank you for your June 2, 2025, letter regarding the Department of Labor's Advisory Council on Employee Welfare and Pension Benefit Plans (Council). Your letter raises concerns about transparency related to the Council's activities, specifically the removal of records from our website and the potential elimination of the Council by the current Administration. As you know, the Department published the Council's reports, along with the written statements by invited witnesses and issue statements, online at https://www.dol.gov/agencies/ebsa/about-ebsa/about-us/erisa-advisory-council. These postings do not reflect any endorsement of the views expressed by the Council and witnesses and are consistent with our historical practices.

b. Will you commit to convening the minimum of four statutorily required meetings of the Council this year? When will the first meeting be held?

Response:

See the response to 12. a above.

c. According to the Department's website, the position of Executive Secretary is vacant. When do you intend to fill this position, as required by law?

Response:

See above.

13) The Employee Benefits Security Administration (EBSA) has the vast mission of protecting the health, retirement, and other employee benefits of more than 156 million American workers, retirees, and their families covered by millions of plans holding $14 trillion in assets. However, EBSA has for decades been severely underfunded, with about one investigator for every 17,500 plans within its jurisdiction. According to recent reports, more than 20 percent of EBSA's workforce has been lost during the first few months of the Trump Administration, yet the Budget proposes to further cut EBSA and neglects to extend the bipartisan *No Surprises Act* implementation funding. This would leave EBSA with just 640 FTEs, a decline of more than 35 percent since 2012 when the agency's mission was much smaller.

a. How can you vigorously enforce the law—including shared bipartisan priorities such as health care price transparency, surprise medical billing, and improving retirement security—while slashing EBSA's workforce?

Response:

EBSA is currently working on a strategic plan to refocus its activities to facilitate the distribution of resources from lower priority strategies/programs to higher priorities strategies/programs. The restructuring will create a more responsive organization that facilitates results-based management and outcomes, all of which are aimed at protecting the security of employee benefits.

14) In 2020, President Trump signed into law the *Consolidated Appropriations Act, 2021*, which included important reforms that have improved enforcement of the *Mental Health Parity and Addiction Equity Act* (MHPAEA) by EBSA. Despite the high recoveries EBSA has achieved on behalf of plan participants thanks to this law, the Department has announced nonenforcement of the 2024 MHPAEA final rule while also shrinking the agency's workforce.

    a. Does the Administration intend to further roll back this bipartisan progress on parity by issuing regulations or guidance that would weaken MHPAEA?

Response:

On September 9, 2024, the Departments of Labor, Health and Human Services (HHS), and the Treasury (the Departments) issued a formal rule titled "Requirements Related to the Mental Health Parity and Addiction Equity Act," (2024 Final Rule). On January 17, 2025, the ERISA Industry Committee (ERIC) filed suit in the U.S. District Court of the District of Columbia challenging certain provisions of the 2024 Final Rule on multiple grounds, including on grounds that they are arbitrary and capricious and contrary to law. Additionally, Executive Order 14219, titled "Ensuring Lawful Governance and Implementing the President's 'Department of Government Efficiency' Deregulatory Initiative," directs federal agencies to review regulations to identify those that may undermine the national interest, including by imposing undue burdens on small businesses or significant costs upon private parties that are not outweighed by public benefits. In such cases, federal agencies must exercise enforcement discretion to ensure lawful governance. This lawsuit is in abeyance while the Departments reconsider the 2024 Final Rule, including whether to issue a notice of proposed rulemaking rescinding or modifying the regulation through notice and comment rulemaking.

MHPAEA provides critical protections for workers, individuals, and their families who need treatment for mental health conditions and substance use disorders. During this period of nonenforcement of the 2024 Final Rule as the Departments revisit the Rule, the Departments remain committed to ensuring that individuals receive protections under the law in a way that is not unduly burdensome for plans and issuers.

    b. Have you analyzed the projected impact of nonenforcement of the law on benefit recoveries for people with behavioral health needs? If so, please provide this information to the Committee.

Response:

See above.

15) Rep. Ilhan Omar asked you during the hearing, "[C]an you assure this Committee that you will not propose any rollbacks of child labor rules that prevent children from being employed in hazardous occupations?" You did not answer that question; instead, your response reiterated your commitment "to fighting against all child exploitation" and then addressed a separate matter regarding funds for the Bureau of International Labor Affairs. Please address the specific question whether you will commit not to roll back hazardous occupation orders.

Response:

The Wage and Hour Division investigates all actionable claims of illegal child labor brought to its attention and will continue to protect children from exploitation and harm from illegal child labor, including those children who are forced or asked to perform hazardous jobs.

Representative Haley Stevens (D-MI)

1. There has been a lot of talk from you and this Administration about supporting American workers, including union workers. It's been less than five months but I think we can safely say that a lot of that talk has proved empty. So far, the Trump Administration has stripped one million federal workers of their right to form a union and has undermined the independence of the National Labor Relations Board by firing one of its board members. I don't see why Michiganders should trust an Administration to protect private sector workers when they treat their own workforce with such disrespect.

   I am from Michigan where union membership really means something. We recognize that unions are a path to safe, high-paying, middle-class jobs for working people. I hope that the Administration you're a part of quits talking a big game and actually starts acting on behalf of American workers.

   So Secretary Chavez-DeRemer, my first question focuses on the Office of Labor-Management Standards, or OLMS. This office is charged with collecting financial disclosures from employers when they hire anti-union "persuaders" or consultants. Transparency on how much companies are spending on these activities is vital. President Trump has tapped, Elisabeth Messenger, who has a history of supporting anti-union causes to lead OLMS.

   a. In light of this, will you commit that OLMS under your leadership will ensure employer compliance with financial disclosure requirements when it comes to anti-union consultants?

Response:

The Department administers and enforces all statutory requirements under the Labor-Management Reporting and Disclosure Act of 1959 (LMRDA), including those related to employer financial disclosure reports involving consultants. The agency delegated authority to carry out these responsibilities, OLMS, approaches these responsibilities impartially and in accordance with the law. The Department continues to offer compliance assistance and outreach to help ensure employers and consultants are aware of and understand their obligations under the LMRDA. Promoting

transparency and protecting union members' rights remain central to the Department's work.

b. In fact the Department's Inspector General found in a May 2024 report that employers significantly underreported and delayed their financial disclosures on "persuader" activity. Will you commit to improving OLMS enforcement on employers' financial disclosures in line with the Inspector General's recommendation?

Response:

OLMS administers the financial disclosure requirements of the LMRDA in accordance with the law and strives to achieve transparency in labor-management relations. The agency reviews relevant recommendations, including those from the Department of Labor's Office of Inspector General, and continues to provide compliance assistance and outreach so that employers understand their disclosure obligations. The Department plans to complete all recommendations from the Department's Inspector General, where feasible.

2. I'd like to move on to another issue that often faces workers who decide to join a union: difficulty reaching a first contract with employers. Oftentimes, workers who decide to organize can face significant delays in reaching a first contract with their employer. This only hurts workers and saps employers of valuable resources.
    a. As a former cosponsor of the Protecting the Right to Organize Act during your time in the House, do you recognize the right of a legally formed union to reach a timely first contract with their employer?

Response:

Overseeing the collective bargaining process is primarily the jurisdiction of agencies independent from the Department of Labor (DOL), like the National Labor Relations Board (NLRB). However, DOL's Office of Labor-Management Standards (OLMS) is diligently working to ensure transparency and democratic processes within unions, helping ensure unions remain responsive to the interests of their members. The Department is committed to promoting a safe workplace and supporting worker rights, including enforcing the laws within the Department's jurisdiction.

b. Do you think the Department of Labor has a role to play in making sure workers who have organized are can reach a first contract with their employers?

Response:

See above.

c. I am concerned that current and future budget cuts under this Administration will undermine worker protections, including their right to organize. Will you commit to working with Congress to ensure budget cuts do not negatively impact these rights?

Response:

The Department is committed to promoting a safe workplace and supporting worker rights, including enforcing the laws within the Department's jurisdiction.

Rep. Ilhan Omar (D-MN)

Impacts on the Bureau of International Labor Affairs (ILAB)

1. Please provide a list of all ILAB programs terminated by the Department in March 2025, including:
    a) Project Title
    b) Country of implementation
    c) Original duration and funding level
    d) Congressional authorization

Response:

Please see the attached spreadsheet containing the requested information.

2. What specific criteria or policy rationale was used to evaluate and terminate these grants?

Response:

Please see the attached spreadsheet containing the requested information.

    a) Are you aware that multiple stakeholders, from Members of Congress to labor/advocates to industry groups have spoken in defense of ILAB?

Response:

We are aware that multiple stakeholders support the work of ILAB, and while some stakeholders have differing views about what its posture should be on particular global issues and questions of grant policy, we all agree that ILAB plays a critical role as the voice of the American worker in international trade. ILAB will continue to conduct its important mission, in alignment with President Trump's America First, pro-worker agenda.

    b) Were any of these stakeholders consulted or notified before the decision, and if not, please explain how you will prevent a race to the bottom for labor and business practices without these international and on-the-ground partnerships?

Response:

The Department of Labor remains committed to combating child labor, forced labor and other exploitative labor practices around the world. This is essential to protecting U.S. workers and companies from being undercut by unfair competition. ILAB leads our efforts in this area by

producing three congressionally-mandated reports identifying child and forced labor in over 150 countries, by engaging directly with U.S. trading partners to prevent and remediate labor abuses, and by working with other U.S. government agencies for a government-wide approach to ensure labor rights are considered at the most relevant and impactful points in U.S. policymaking and actions. ILAB also focuses on supply chains with a direct nexus to the United States and priority U.S. trading partners. Through these methods, ILAB continues to sharpen its focus and enhance its effectiveness in advancing the Administration's America First Trade Policy.

c) Without these ILAB grants, how will you ensure that U.S. workers and businesses do not face unfair competition from being undercut by exploitative corporations and regimes?

Response:

The Department of Labor is committed to addressing unfair labor practices around the world that put American workers and businesses at a competitive disadvantage. ILAB leads efforts in this area through its production of three congressionally mandated reports identifying child and forced labor in over 150 countries around the world, engaging directly with U.S. trading partners to prevent and remediate labor abuses, and working with other U.S. government agencies for a government-wide approach to ensure labor rights are considered at the most relevant and impactful points in U.S. policymaking and actions. ILAB also focuses on supply chains with a direct nexus to the United States and priority U.S. trading partners. Through these methods, ILAB continues to sharpen its focus and enhance its effectiveness in advancing the Administration's America First Trade Policy.

In alignment with America First Trade Policy, and in close coordination with the Office of the U.S. Trade Representative, ILAB is ensuring that American workers and businesses benefit from the Administration's trade agenda by combating unfair labor practices overseas that undermine the ability of American workers and business to compete in international markets. Importantly, ILAB utilizes its technical expertise to support vigorous enforcement of labor provisions in trade agreements. For instance, ILAB continues to prioritize the enforcement of labor provisions in the USMCA, including by administering the Rapid Response Labor Mechanism, which allows the United States to take enforcement actions against factories in Mexico that deny workers the rights of free association and collective bargaining under Mexican law, undermining U.S. workers' and business' ability to compete fairly in trade.

ILAB will also continue to utilize its critical role in the Forced Labor Enforcement Task Force (FLETF), and the Uyghur Forced Labor Prevention Act (UFLPA), to ensure that foreign manufacturers producing products with forced labor are banned from importing those goods into the United States. Similarly, ILAB will continue to develop and share its research on supply chains tainted with forced labor, so that U.S. companies can undertake robust due diligence to avoid sourcing goods from unscrupulous foreign suppliers utilizing unfair labor practices.

3. Please detail any legal review that was conducted prior to termination. Was grant termination evaluated for consistency with appropriations language or statutory mandates under:
    a) US-Mexico-Canada Agreement (USMCA) implementing legislation, P.L.

116- 113?

Response:

The Department cannot provide a response at this time due to ongoing litigation.

i. This bill provided $210 million for ILAB: $180 million over four years for USMCA-related technical assistance projects and $30 million over eight years for the capacity of ILAB to monitor USMCA compliance, including the necessary expenses of additional full-time ILAB employees for the Interagency Committee and labor attachés in Mexico. Can you confirm whether those appropriated funds are currently being disbursed on schedule, and if not, why not?

Response:

The period of availability for the $180 million provided to ILAB to administer technical assistance grants related to the USMCA ended on December 31, 2023. ILAB fully obligated all its USMCA technical assistance funding by that deadline. For any future allocation of FY 2025 technical assistance funding, ILAB will evaluate how such assistance can address labor law enforcement in countries and sectors where American workers face unfair competition, particularly where it is caused by unfair labor practices or lax enforcement.

b) Trafficking Victims Protection Reauthorization Act of 2005 and the Frederick Douglass Trafficking Victims Prevention and Protection Reauthorization Act of 2018?

Response:

The Department cannot provide a response at this time due to ongoing litigation.

c) Section 307 of the Tariff Act of 1930 and the Trade Facilitation and Trade Enforcement Act of 2015?

Response:

The Department cannot provide a response at this time due to ongoing litigation.

d) Executive Order 13126, "Prohibition of Acquisition of Products Produced by Forced or Indentured Child Labor"?

Response:

The Department cannot provide a response at this time due to ongoing litigation.

4. Did the Department of Labor consult with the following agencies before the decision to terminate ILAB grants, if so, please provide written or summarized meeting notes or correspondence from the following:
    a) Office of the U.S. Trade Representative (USTR)

Response:

The Department cannot provide a response at this time due to ongoing litigation.

    b) Customs and Border Protection (CBP)

Response:

The Department cannot provide a response at this time due to ongoing litigation.

    c) Department of State (including the Office to Monitor and Combat Trafficking in Persons or other relevant offices & attachés).

Response:

The Department cannot provide a response at this time due to ongoing litigation.

5. How will the Department fulfill its labor enforcement obligations under trade agreements such as USMCA and CAFTA-DR in the absence of ILAB's grantmaking, technical assistance/research, and on-the-ground partnerships? How will these same obligations be met with a reduced workforce?

Response:

ILAB monitors and enforces Mexico's compliance with USMCA labor commitments through our staff located in Washington, D.C. and through labor attachés based in Mexico City, Monterrey, and Tijuana, Mexico. These staff also work to ensure companies in Mexico are abiding by USMCA labor provisions, including by working with the Office of the U.S. Trade Representative to administer the USMCA Rapid Response Labor Mechanism, which allows the United States to take enforcement actions against facilities in Mexico that fail to comply with Mexico's obligations to guarantee free association and the right to collectively bargain. Dedicated funding for ILAB's USMCA staff, which was appropriated in the USMCA Implementation Act, is available through September 30, 2027. Our Mexico-based staff have strong on-the-ground partnerships with representatives from the Mexican government, business, and labor communities. Similarly, ILAB monitors and enforces CAFTA-DR labor commitments through our Washington, DC-based staff and a regional labor attaché based in Guatemala.

6. What alternative plans does DOL have in place to support U.S. businesses and suppliers seeking compliance with laws like the Uyghur Forced Labor Prevention Act?

Response:

Consistent with the Administration's commitment to strengthening labor standards in global supply chains and supporting fair trade practices that put American workers and businesses first, the Department of Labor plays a leading role in implementing the Uyghur Forced Labor Prevention Act (UFLPA) and advancing a whole-of-government response to combat forced labor.

Through the Forced Labor Enforcement Task Force, ILAB has been instrumental in developing and updating the UFLPA Strategy. This includes:

- Assessing the risk of importing goods mined, produced, or manufactured with forced labor in China
- Evaluating forced labor schemes and maintaining the UFLPA Entity List
- Issuing importer guidance that strengthens due diligence expectations
- Collaborating with NGOs and industry on best practices

Through robust private sector engagement, ILAB also raises awareness about child and forced labor throughout supply chains, and urges industry to exercise due diligence in combating these practices. Tools like *Comply Chain* and ILAB's research provide American companies with useful resources to identify, assess, and mitigate labor risks in the production of goods intended for the U.S. market, supporting compliance with the UFLPA and reinforcing a level playing field. These efforts help counter exploitative practices by foreign adversaries, safeguard strategic industries, and uphold the goal of an America first trade policy.

7. Please confirm the number of ILAB staff who have resigned, retired, been reassigned, or been fired since January 2025.

Response:

On January 19, 2025, the Department's Bureau of International Affairs (ILAB) had 149 employees. On May 15, 2025, ILAB had 146 employees, which includes 58 employees who accepted the Deferred Resignation Program.

8. How many full-time staff currently remain at ILAB, responsible for:
    a) Trade agreement labor enforcement with USTR

Response:

ILAB's Office of Trade and Labor Affairs currently has 23 full time staff who are wholly responsible for trade agreement labor enforcement with USTR and another ten support trade enforcement efforts through technical assistance, research, program and policy monitoring and evaluation, and data analysis.

In addition, ILAB's Office of Child Labor, Forced Labor, and Human Trafficking has four staff members who support trade enforcement efforts through their work on the Forced Labor Enforcement Task Force and implementation of the UFLPA and USMCA.

b) Country-specific monitoring and reporting

Response:

ILAB's Office of Child Labor, Forced Labor, and Human Trafficking currently has 14 full-time staff responsible for conducting country-specific monitoring and reporting under Congressional mandates and Presidential directives to combat child labor and forced labor globally.

In addition, ILAB's Office of Trade and Labor Affairs has 23 staff responsible for monitoring compliance with country-specific labor obligations under U.S. trade agreements and preference programs.

c) Forced labor risk mapping and coordination with CBP

Response:

ILAB's Office of Child Labor, Forced Labor, and Human Trafficking has five full-time staff to support forced labor risk mapping and coordination with U.S. Customs and Border Protection's Forced Labor Division.

9. What is the current operational budget for ILAB for FY25? Has any unobligated funding been repurposed or rescinded? If so, please identify the amounts and new funding designations.

Response:

The Department's FY 2025 Operating Plan submitted to Congress on April 29, 2025, outlined a funding level of $113.125 million for ILAB. Most of this funding is available for obligation through December 31, 2025, and the Department is in the process of determining the exact programmatic needs in line with Administration priorities. We will continue to review allocations throughout the fiscal year.

10. Does the Department intend to revisit the decision to cancel these programs and contracts soon or in future budget cycles?

Response:

In alignment with the President's America First Trade Policy, the Department plans to obligate ILAB's FY 2025 technical assistance funds for projects that address unfair labor practices that undermine fair competition. By doing so, ILAB will be able to better serve national interests and ensure American workers and businesses get opportunities to compete in global markets. ILAB's renewed technical assistance program will strengthen labor law enforcement in priority trade partner countries, refocusing on strategic sectors where systemic labor abuses and lax enforcement artificially suppress wages and labor costs, placing American workers at a competitive disadvantage.

Impacts on Child Labor Enforcement

1. How many Wage and Hour Division (WHD) field offices have been closed, downsized, or had staffing reductions since January 2025?

Response:

Of over ninety (90) offices, WHD has closed two (2) offices, each housing a single investigator, in Harlingen, TX and Fayetteville, AR, since January, 2025. WHD has not mandated staffing reductions since January 2025, although some WHD personnel have voluntarily left WHD since then.

2. What is the current number of active child labor investigations being pursued by the Department as of June 2025?

Response:

As of the date of this response, WHD has over 950 open child labor investigations.

3. What percentage of current WHD investigations involve migrant or undocumented children? Please provide available disaggregated data by industry and state.

Response:

WHD does not track the requested information.

4. How many investigators and staff currently specialize in child labor enforcement? Has the number increased or decreased since FY2023 and FY2024?

Response:

All WHD investigators are trained to professionally handle investigations into all laws under WHD's jurisdiction, including child labor laws.

5. What is the current average caseload per WHD investigator working on child labor violations? How does this compare to previous fiscal years?

Response:

WHD investigators are responsible for conducting investigations under all applicable Acts—including checking for child labor in every FLSA investigation—and are not limited to conducting enforcement under specific statutes or provisions. Investigator workloads vary based on several factors, including the scope, severity, and nature of violations involved in a case. Investigations of egregious child labor violations can involve more than one investigator, such as coordinated team investigations. Complex investigations can also overlap fiscal years. For these reasons, investigator caseloads are dynamic and are not tracked through national averages tied to investigators handling a

single issue.

6. What is the status of the DOL-HHS interagency taskforce on child labor?

Response:

In 2023, DOL and the HHS Administration for Children and Families formalized a collaborative partnership, referred to in some instances as a "taskforce", to enhance and maximize the wellbeing of children and enforcement of federal child labor laws via a Memorandum of Agreement regarding Inter-agency Data Sharing (the "MOA"). The MOA, including its provisions pertaining to the exchange of information, remains in effect.

a) If it's still active, which offices are involved, and what are its current goals and deliverables?

Response:

The MOA between DOL and HHS involves WHD and HHS's Administration for Children and Families. The agreement provides that it will help identify geographies and employers where children are likely being exploited, aid investigations by providing information to help identify circumstances where children are unlawfully employed, and facilitate coordination to ensure that victims or potential victims of child labor trafficking have access to critical services.

b) If not, what was the reason to dissolve the taskforce, and what are you doing instead to improve interagency coordination and efficacy?

Response:

The task force has not been dissolved.

7. Has the Department formally supported any enhancements or modifications to civil or criminal penalty structures under the Fair Labor Standards Act to address child labor violations. Why or why not? What specific statutory changes would the Department recommend to improve deterrence and accountability of unscrupulous employers?

Response:

The Department does not offer support or opposition for legislation. The Department provides technical assistance as requested, and continues to stand ready to provide additional assistance if requested to do so.

8. What kind of outreach, technical assistance, or enforcement support has DOL provided to local agencies, particularly in states that have experienced substantial increases in child labor violations and/or have rolled back child labor laws?

Response:

WHD regularly provides technical assistance to state and local agencies. WHD does not, however, enforce state and local wage and hour laws. If a state or locality has laws that provide weaker protections than federal law provides, WHD continues to enforce its laws to provide the greatest amount of protection to workers under the law.

9. Will the next Solicitor of Labor be directed to prioritize litigation and enforcement of egregious child labor and labor trafficking violations? What directives will be issued to ensure consistent and strong enforcement under the Solicitor's purview?

Response:

Enforcement of child labor and labor trafficking laws are a high priority for the Trump Administration, the Secretary of Labor and all Department of Labor employees. The Solicitor will prioritize litigation and other mechanisms to ensure that such violations are stopped, punished and ultimately prevented.

Rep. Donald Norcross (D-NJ)

1. As the daughter of a Teamster, you know that the right of workers to form a union and collectively bargain is central to improving wages, hours, working conditions, and more. You also know that when workers vote to form a union, they don't immediately reap the benefits of collective bargaining. Instead, they first need to obtain first contract with management who, because the law currently doesn't impose a negotiation deadline, often stall, delay, and drag out negotiations. In fact, according to Bloomberg Law, it takes an average of 458 days for unions and employers to agree on a first contract. This hurts workers who, despite exercising their right to bargain collectively, are prevented from doing so by employers who enjoy the benefits of the status quo. Do you support the idea of a guaranteed first contract?

Response:

Overseeing the collective bargaining process is primarily the jurisdiction of agencies independent from the Department of Labor (DOL), like the National Labor Relations Board (NLRB). However, DOL's Office of Labor-Management Standards (OLMS) is diligently working to ensure transparency and democratic processes within unions, helping ensure unions remain responsive to the interests of their members. The Department is committed to promoting a safe workplace and supporting worker rights, including enforcing the laws within the Department's jurisdiction.

2. On March 14, 2025, President Trump ordered the dismantling of the Federal Mediation and Conciliation Service (FMCS), including firing mediators and staff, and closing field offices across the country. FMCS is a small but vital federal agency responsible for helping to resolve contract negotiations between workers and employers. Do you support reversing the staffing cuts to FMCS, which would enable the agency to continue to provide necessary services including mediation for collective bargaining, grievances, and employment disputes?

Response:

The Federal Mediation and Conciliation Service (FMCS) is a federal agency independent from the Department of Labor (DOL). DOL does not have jurisdiction over this agency. Following the passage of the Labor Management Relations Act of 1947, FMCS took over from DOL the responsibility for engaging in mediation during labor disputes. While FMCS is not in DOL's jurisdiction, I respect the authority the President has to oversee the executive branch.

Rep. Alma S Adams, PhD (D-NC)

1. Madam Secretary, I have heard you say over and over again that you support workforce development while your administration is cutting critical agencies like the DOL Women's Bureau. In May, you cut a Women in Apprenticeship and Nontraditional Occupations (WANTO) grant just up the road from my district. Hope Renovations in Chapel Hill trained women and nonbinary people for construction jobs, which we need more of in North Carolina. After receiving the grant in 2023, Hope Renovations had the rug pulled from under them by your agency. 35 apprentices and 80 interns will not be able to participate in this program because your agency is more focused on fighting "DEI" than it is on strengthening the American workforce and helping North Carolinians get good-paying jobs.

    a. Please explain to me, Madam Secretary, how eliminating the Women's Bureau and WANTO grants is going to help the American worker.

Response:

The Department of Labor continues to ensure the Women's Bureau fulfills the mandate of its authorizing statute. Consistent with the President's Executive Order 14222, the Department has been reviewing all taxpayer-funded grants to ensure they fulfill their intended purpose.

On July 9th, the Department announced $5 million in available funding opportunities for 14 WANTO grants to attract and retain more American workers in Registered Apprenticeship programs, including in high-growth industries like construction, manufacturing, and cybersecurity.

However, the current structure of DOL's workforce development programs, including WANTO, makes it administratively burdensome for States to respond to their workforce needs. In addition to eliminating the Women's Bureau, the Budget proposes to create a new Make America Skilled Again (MASA) grant program to reduce the administrative burden on States by creating one workforce development program that will allow States and localities to determine how best to serve workers and employers in their areas, ensuring high performance by holding grantees accountable for the employment outcomes of the people they serve. The MASA grant maintains support for evidence-based programs by requiring that a minimum of 10 percent of MASA grantee expenditures are on Registered Apprenticeship activities, ensuring dedicated funding for this highly effective training model.

2. Federal contractors receive hundreds of billions of taxpayer dollars and employ 20 percent of the nation's workers. This Administration has dismantled the civil rights framework that protected these workers by rescinding President Lyndon Johnson's historic Executive Order 11246 (EO 11246). The proposed budget eliminates the Office of Federal Contract Compliance Programs (OFCCP) and moves responsibility for enforcing the Vietnam Era Veterans Readjustment Assistance Act and Section 503 of the Rehabilitation Act, which protect veterans and people with disabilities from discrimination, out of OFCCP to other agencies. I understand that worker complaints related to disability and veteran status discrimination are not actively being worked on and have been paused since OFCCP was ordered to pause enforcement on January 24, 2025— that is over 4 months.
    a. Are claims being processed? Are investigations going forward?

Response:

Yes, OFCCP is currently carrying out the statutorily required functions delegated to it under Section 503 and VEVRAA. On July 1, 2025, pursuant to Secretary's Order 08-2025, the abeyance on Section 503 and VEVRAA activities was lifted. Any VEVRAA and Section 503 complaints held in abeyance, as well as new complaints under those statutes, will be processed.

    b. When does OFCCP expect to begin working on these cases?

Response:

OFCCP is currently working on Section 503 and VEVRAA matters following the issuance of Secretary's Order 08-2025 on July 1, 2025.

    c. The FY 2026 budget proposes to eliminate OFCCP and transfer those responsibilities elsewhere, do you plan to indefinitely suspend processing claims related to disability and veteran status until they have been transferred out of OFCCP?

Response:

No. On July 1, 2025, pursuant to Secretary's Order 08-2025, the abeyance on Section 503 and VEVRAA activities was lifted. Any VEVRAA and Section 503 complaints held in abeyance, as well as new complaints under those statutes, will be processed by OFCCP.

    d. How is this fair for workers? By stopping enforcement, you are **encouraging** contractors to violate their workers' rights!

Response:

The Department of Labor is committed to carrying out the statutory functions which Congress has currently assigned to this Department to investigate and enforce Section 503 and VEVRAA. OFCCP has always faithfully executed on the statutorily required functions under those laws. On

January 21, 2025, President Donald Trump issued Executive Order (E.O.) 14173, "Ending Illegal Discrimination and Restoring Merit-Based Opportunity," which revoked E.O. 11246, which was previously enforced by OFCCP. OFCCP's previous structure entwined the three program areas of E.O. 11246, Section 503, and VEVRAA. A brief abeyance in Section 503 and VEVRAA activity was necessary to unwind OFCCP's E.O. 11246 program areas from the Section 503 and VEVRAA program areas and ensure OFCCP did not undertake any activity for which it was not authorized by law.

3. Because OSHA does not have a heat stress standard, the only way the Department can protect workers from extreme heat is to use the General Duty Clause of the OSH Act. But General Duty Clause cases take more time and resources to prove, and your budget appears to be taking resources *away* from OSHA and the Solicitor of Labor.

    a. Your budget request would reduce the FTEs in OSHA's federal enforcement program by 168 people, is that correct?

Response:

OSHA's FY 2026 President's Budget Request reduces FTEs in the Federal Enforcement budget activity by 168 FTE below the FY 2025 Enacted level.

    b. Is it correct that dozens of employees in the Solicitor's Office took the "Fork in the Road" offer to leave the Department?

Response:

Every year employees retire or resign from the Department of Labor to pursue various life and career goals. In recent months, approximately 120 employees in the Solicitor's Office voluntarily opted to accept the Administration's offer to take part in the Deferred Resignation Program.

The Office of Solicitor continues to execute its enforcement duties vigorously. It is expected to be able to fully perform at the same level throughout the Trump Administration. The Solicitor's Office closely monitors its human resource capabilities.

    c. And your budget projects that the Solicitor's Office will lose 40 additional FTEs, is that correct?

Response:

The FY 2026 President's Request for SOL funds 515 FTE, which is a 40 FTE decrease from the FY 2025 estimated FTE usage. The Office of Solicitor continues to execute its enforcement duties vigorously. It is expected to be able to fully perform at the same level throughout the Trump Administration. The Solicitor's Office closely monitors its human resource capabilities.

    d. Madam Secretary, you are reducing the capacity of the Department to protect workers from heat stress at a time when workers need DOL more than ever.

Response:

Setting standards that protect American workers and support the safety and health of the American workforce is a critical overarching goal for the Department of Labor. One of the many ways that the Department is working to fulfill this mission is through a thorough examination of hazards and their mitigation by components of the Department such as the Occupational Safety and Health Administration (OSHA). OSHA held a public hearing that concluded on July 2, 2025, specifically on the subject of heat injury and illness prevention in outdoor and indoor work settings. The post-hearing comment period is now open and closes on September 30, 2025.

Enforcement via the General Duty clause is only one way that the Department can protect workers from heat illness. Our Compliance Safety and Health Officers (CSHOs) continue to respond to heat-related hazards. In addition to enforcement, we are also utilizing our resources for the greatest and most wide-reaching impact through compliance assistance and employer and worker education regarding heat illness and other workplace hazards.

Rep. Suzanne Bonamici (D-OR)

1. **Job Corps:** On May 29th, the Department announced a "phased pause in operations at contractor-operated Job Corps centers nationwide."
    a. Does the Department of Labor intend to re-open these campuses? If so, when?

Response:

Following the June 4, 2025 issuance of the Temporary Restraining Order (TRO) in *NJCA v. DOL*, the Department instructed its impacted center operators to stop all activities related to the notices of termination and/or stop work orders that were issued on or around May 29, 2025. Job Corps-initiated student separations under the instructions provided on or around May 29, 2025 were also ordered to immediately stop. The Department also instructed operators to keep all necessary staff to maintain operations. The Department is continuing program operations in compliance with court orders in *NJCA v. DOL* and *Cabrera v. DOL*.

    b. Does the Department intend to revoke the original May 29th directive to pause Job Corps operations? Will you commit to renew these contracts and to continue Job Corps for FY 2025?

Response:

Following the June 4, 2025 issuance of the Temporary Restraining Order (TRO) in *NJCA v. DOL*, the Department instructed its impacted center operators to stop all activities related to the notices of termination and/or stop work orders that were issued on or around May 29, 2025. Job Corps-initiated student separations under the instructions provided on or around May 29, 2025 were also ordered to immediately stop. The Department also instructed operators to keep all necessary staff to maintain operations. The Department is continuing program operations in compliance with court orders in *NJCA v. DOL* and *Cabrera v. DOL*.

    c. Will the Department of Labor commit to resuming background checks and new

student enrollment for the Job Corps program while Job Corps centers remain open? If so, please provide information on the Department's timeline for resuming background checks.

Response:

The Department has resumed background checks as of August 25, 2025.

d. How will the Department follow the proper procedure to give the public an opportunity to voice concerns about closing Job Corps centers?

Response:

The Department is committed to complying with all statutory requirements under the Workforce Innovation and Opportunity Act (WIOA), including those outlined in Section 161 (29 U.S.C. § 3209(j)) regarding the closure of Job Corps centers.

e. There are approximately 4,481 homeless students in Job Corps, some as young as 16 years old. The Department has said they will provide transportation to get students to their home of record, but these 4,481 students do not have a home to return to. How will the Department support these students if the TRO is lifted and the "phased pause" moves forward? Where will the Department send these students?

Response:

Following the issuance of the termination notices on or around May 29, 2025, the Department coordinated with Employment and Training Administration (ETA) Regional Offices to deploy Rapid Response teams and refer affected students and contractor staff to American Job Centers (AJCs) and other workforce system partners for continued access to workforce services including training programs or employment. Additionally, all students provided at least an address and at least one contact person at the time of enrollment, which assisted the Department in supporting their return to their home of record and connecting to the workforce system. The Department has not made any final decisions about future action should the preliminary injunctions be lifted. The Department is committed to ensuring all participants are supported through the transition and connected with the resources they need to succeed as we evaluate the program's possibilities.

f. Did the Department factor in additional costs and lost potential if these students remain homeless, need to rely on more government services, or enter the criminal justice system?

Response:

The Department's analysis focused strictly on the Program Year 2023 performance data and operating costs.

g. What is the Department doing to support the thousands of Job Corps staff who are now out of a job because of the "pause"?

Response:

Following the issuance of the termination notices on or around May 29, 2025, the Department coordinated with Employment and Training Administration (ETA) Regional Offices to deploy Rapid Response teams and refer affected students and contractor staff to American Job Centers (AJCs) and other workforce system partners for continued access to workforce services including training programs or employment.

Following the June 4, 2025, issuance of the Temporary Restraining Order (TRO) in *NJCA v. DOL*, the Department instructed its impacted center operators to stop all activities related to the notices of termination and/or stop work orders that were issued on or around May 29, 2025. The Department also instructed operators to keep all necessary staff to maintain operations. The Department is continuing program operations in compliance with court orders in *NJCA v. DOL* and *Cabrera v. DOL*.

h. What is the Department of Labor doing to connect state and local governments with resources for communities affected by Job Corps closures?

Response:

Following the issuance of the termination notices on or around May 29, 2025, the Department coordinated with Employment and Training Administration (ETA) Regional Offices to deploy Rapid Response teams and refer affected students and contractor staff to American Job Centers (AJCs) and other workforce system partners for continued access to workforce services including training programs or employment.

Following the June 4, 2025, issuance of the Temporary Restraining Order (TRO) in *NJCA v. DOL*, the Department instructed its impacted center operators to stop all activities related to the notices of termination and/or stop work orders that were issued on or around May 29, 2025. The Department also instructed operators to keep all necessary staff to maintain operations. The Department is continuing program operations in compliance with court orders in *NJCA v. DOL* and *Cabrera v. DOL*.

i. In announcing the "pause," the Department of Labor relied on a report that contains disputed facts and conclusions and relied heavily on data from when the program was still recovering from the COVID-19 pandemic. Who were the authors of this report? Please be specific and include whether each person who contributed to the report was assigned to the Department of Labor by DOGE.

Response:

All officials who have been involved in assessing the Department's commitment to ensuring federal workforce investments deliver meaningful results for both students and taxpayers are DOL employees.

i. The report states that the cost per graduate at Job Corps is $155,600, but a report during the first Trump administration, prior to COVID-19, reported the average cost per graduate was $57,312. Please explain the dramatic

discrepancy between these two figures.

Response:

The Job Corps Transparency Report integrates multiple data sources to provide a data-centric examination of program expenditures and efficiency metrics, aggregating unmanipulated financial data and performance evaluations that are produced by the Department's Office of Job Corps. This report specifically analyzes the most recently available metrics from Program Year 2023, including cost per enrollee and per graduate.

ii. The report states that Job Corps students are largely hired in minimum wage positions, earning an average of $16,695 in annualized wages; however, during Program Year (PY) 2023, Job Corps students were placed in jobs earning an average wage of $17.13 (more than twice the federal minimum wage) and earned annualized wages of more than $31,000 on average. Please explain the dramatic discrepancy between these two figures.

Response:

The discrepancy is explained by the two different sources used for this information. The average annualized wages of $16,695 comes from PY 2023 WIOA Performance Data, specifically the Median 2nd Quarter Earnings measure, which includes "participants" enrolled for 60 or more days, to include those who completed the Career Preparation Period (CPP) but were enrolled in Job Corps for 60 or more days. By contrast, $17.13 is the Graduate and Former Enrollee Placement Average Wage (national) as seen on the PY 2023 Career Transition Services Report Card from JC's Outcome Measurement System. The measure is made up of the sum of hourly wages of graduates and former enrollees placed in a job or the military divided by the number of graduates and former enrollees placed in a job or the military.

Q2 earnings measures include all students who received any pay during that quarter, whereas hourly wage at placement reflects reported earnings at the time of job placement. These differing definitions naturally lead to differences in annualized estimates. Neither is intended for annualization purposes, and Job Corps is not required to collect or calculate annual income after exit.

Possible causes of the difference and the issues with trying to annualize hourly wage or quarterly earnings data:

1. **Partial Quarter Employment:** Some students begin their jobs partway through Q2. In these cases, their Q2 earnings reflect only a portion of the quarter, while their average hourly wage—when annualized (i.e., multiplied by 4)—may overstate their actual earnings for the period. Therefore, neither measure reflects the students' actual annual earnings.
2. **Students in School:** Some individuals captured in UI data are not counted as job placements by Job Corps because their primary activity is postsecondary education. These students may work part-time jobs or participate in work-study programs. Since Job Corps does not include educational placements in hourly wage calculations, their Q2 earnings are typically lower, as their jobs are supplemental and not career focused.

3. **Short Job Tenure:** Some students do not remain in their initial placements for the full quarter. In such cases, the reported $17.13 hourly wage may overestimate their actual earnings when annualized.
4. **Overtime Inclusion:** Hourly wages reported by Job Corps may include documented overtime, which can increase the reported average wage above the student's standard base pay and when annualized overestimate their annual earnings.
5. **Part-Time Hours:** Some students may earn the reported hourly wage but not work full-time hours. Annualizing their wages based on a full-time schedule would therefore overestimate their actual earnings.

iii. The report states that the Job Corps graduation rate is 38.7%; however, the National Job Corps Association asserts that the current graduation rate is higher, and historically graduation rates have been above 60%. What is the current graduation rate at Job Corps programs?

Response:

Based on Job Corps' preliminary data as of July 14, 2025, the graduation rate for PY 2024 (July 1, 2024 – June 30, 2025) is 47.7 percent.

The definition for "graduation" used here is as follows:

- Number of separated students in the reporting period without a Level 1 ZT violation, that were enrolled for 60 or more days, and completed an HSD/HSE and/or a CTT
- Number of separated students in the reporting period including students with a separation due to a Level 1 ZT violation

The program's graduation rate had not been 60 percent or greater since Program Year 2015 when it was 60 percent.

iv. The Department claims that the report shows that Job Corps is no longer achieving its intended outcomes; however, Job Corps graduates exceeded the wage goals set by the Department in PY 2023. Please clarify the outcomes that Job Corps is failing to meet, as well as evidence from accurate and current data.

Response:

The Department acknowledges that Job Corps graduates exceeded the median earnings goal in Program Year (PY) 2023, and we commend the students and staff who contributed to that outcome. However, wage outcomes represent just one of several WIOA primary indicators of performance.

v. Does the Department plan on doing an updated transparency report with more recent and accurate program data that is reflective of the current Job Corps population?

Response:

The Department will continue to evaluate the program's efficacy.

2. **Make America Skilled Again Block Grant:** Last week, the Trump Administration released its plans to cut nearly every workforce development program administered by the Department of Labor and replace these programs with the undefined "Make America Skilled Again" block grant program. These cuts eliminate funding for both the WIOA Youth Formula program and YouthBuild, a program that would logically be a landing spot for displaced Job Corps students.

    a. What workforce development and pre-apprenticeship alternatives will be available to the displaced Job Corps and YouthBuild students?

Response:

The Department believes that MASA grants will serve all workers more efficiently while providing states the flexibility to target resources to the skill needs of their populations. With streamlined administration, a higher percentage of funds can be spent on services for American workers to reach more participants, including low-income youth interested in pre-apprenticeship opportunities.

    b. What specific pre-apprenticeship and registered apprenticeship opportunities will the Department provide to meet the stated goal of one million new apprenticeships per year?

Response:

The President set a goal to reach and surpass 1 million apprentices in the Executive Order on *Preparing Americans for High-Paying Skilled Trades jobs of the Future*. This will be achieved through a multi-year strategy to strengthen and expand registered apprenticeship opportunities.

The Department believes that MASA grants would lead to reduced silos and increased efficiencies in pre-apprenticeship and registered apprenticeship. With streamlined administration, a higher percentage of funds can be spent on services for American workers to reach more participants to meet the administration's goal of one million new apprentices. MASA also will require that a minimum of 10 percent of MASA grant funds are spent on Registered Apprenticeship activities.

Additionally, the Department just awarded nearly $84 million in grants to 50 states and territories to increase the capacity of Registered Apprenticeship programs, representing an important step toward meeting the Administration's goal of expanding the program to one million active apprentices. The funding advances the expansion of Registered Apprenticeships and pre-apprenticeships in both traditional and emerging industries, including technology, artificial intelligence, advanced manufacturing, supply chain, transportation, building trades, and construction.

    c. The Make America Skilled Again block grant reduces overall funding for the consolidated workforce development programs by $4.64 billion. What is the justification for these cuts? How will these funds be distributed to states? Which states will lose the most federal funding under the new grant program?

Response:

The Department believes that MASA grants would lead to reduced silos and increased efficiencies in workforce development. With streamlined administration, a higher percentage of funds can be spent on services for American workers to reach more participants. The Department would distribute MASA funds to states and localities through a formula. The Department is ready to work with Congress to implement the MASA proposal through the appropriations process or incorporate it into reauthorization of the Workforce Innovation and Opportunity Act.

3. **Women's Bureau:** The president's FY26 budget eliminates the Women's Bureau, calling it an "ineffective policy office that is a relic of the past." This includes repealing the Women in Apprenticeship and Nontraditional Occupations (WANTO) grant program.
    a. How has the Department determined that the Women's Bureau and its programs are "ineffective"?

Response:

The FY 2026 Budget eliminates the Women's Bureau, an ineffective policy office that is no longer necessary. The Department of Labor's mission is to foster, promote, and develop the welfare of wage earners, job seekers, and retirees of the United States; improve working conditions; advance opportunities for profitable employment; and assure work-related benefits and rights. Recognizing the influx of women in the workforce during World War I, Congress created the Women's Bureau in 1920 to formulate standards and policies to promote the welfare of wage-earning women, improve their working conditions, increase their efficiency, and advance their opportunities for profitable employment, a mission that mirrors that of the Department. Pub. L. 66-259; *see also* Cong. Rec. H5217 (daily ed. Apr. 5, 1920). The landscape of the United States workforce, however, looks very different today than it did 105 years ago. In 1920, the female share of the labor workforce accounted for 20.2% compared to 79.8% for men; in 2023, women were 47.4% of the workforce and men were 52.6%. More women are participating in the workforce and are earning real wages. The Bureau has fulfilled the purpose for which it was established, and other agencies within the Department remain committed to accomplishing the Department's mission with respect to all wage earners, job seekers, and retirees of the United States.

    b. Without the Women's Bureau, how does the Department plan to provide research and support for women in the workforce and address the problems they face, including workplace discrimination, equal pay, paid leave, and child care?

Response:

The President's proposal to Make America Skilled Again will allow the Department to work directly with states to empower them to make determinations about what is best for their workforce – both men and women. We will continue working on commonsense, America First policies that help prepare everyone in our workforce for challenges they may face.

        i. What is the Department's plan to continue operating the National Database of Childcare Prices, the most comprehensive federal source of child care prices?

Response:

See the response to 3. b.