

# Understanding Recent Federal Actions | Transportation Funding & Programs

August 11, 2025

*This explainer is part of GCC's efforts to help state officials and stakeholders understand how recent federal actions may affect state policies and programs related to energy and climate change. Our goal is for this explainer to remain useful and accurate in a rapidly changing landscape, therefore we will be updating this article as needed. This reflects Georgetown Climate Center's understanding of the status of these policies as of August 11, 2025. To share feedback regarding this analysis or information that you think should be added, clarified or updated, please contact [James Bradbury](#).<sup>1</sup> [View other Understanding Recent Federal Actions explainers here.](#)*

## What You Need To Know

- On January 20, 2025, President Trump signed an executive order (EO), entitled "[Unleashing American Energy](#)," which in Section 7 (called "Terminating the Green New Deal") directs all federal agencies to "immediately pause the disbursement of funds appropriated through" the Inflation Reduction Act (IRA) and Infrastructure Investment and Jobs Act (IIJA). The EO potentially implicates an [estimated](#) \$125 billion dollars of IIJA funding that the U.S. DOT has not yet obligated to states or other eligible recipients.
- Multiple ongoing legal challenges to parts of the order and related agency actions are contributing to ongoing uncertainty around federal funding for climate-related low-carbon transportation initiatives as of this writing.
- As of June 2025, it appears that most transportation formula funds appropriated by the U.S. Congress through the IIJA are no longer subject to the "pause" in disbursements originally initiated by the Unleashing American Energy EO. However, for the formula-funded National Electric Vehicle Infrastructure (NEVI) program, while states can be reimbursed for projects funded with previously obligated funds, the outlook for unobligated funds and future funding remains uncertain. Only 16% of [NEVI program funds](#) currently available to states for FY2022-FY2025 have been obligated.<sup>2</sup>

petitive grant programs remain at risk, and the administration’s response to court decisions regarding these funding freezes will determine the extent to which states’ low-carbon transportation investments continue to be affected. In particular, whether the Administration prevails in overturning several preliminary injunctions that stop the White House Office of Management and Budget (OMB) from directing agencies to categorically freeze funds, and U.S. DOT from withholding certain transportation funds, will be critical. Notably, on June 5, the U.S. Court of Appeals for the Fourth Circuit **granted** the Government’s motion to stay a preliminary injunction that would have prohibited federal agencies from freezing or otherwise withholding access to federal funding for plaintiffs in Sustainability Institute v. Trump, so those funds remain frozen for the time being.

- On July 3, 2025, the U.S. Congress passed a budget reconciliation package (**H.R.1**, known as the “One Big Beautiful Bill Act”), which included provisions rescinding any unobligated funding from several federal transportation-related grant programs that were created by the IRA.
- This explainer describes executive actions taken by the Administration since January 20, 2025, following the “**Unleashing American Energy**” EO, that affect state transportation programs. It also addresses what those actions could mean for federal funding that states have been **planning to use** for investments in low-carbon transportation and climate resilience projects. Several State Departments of Transportation (DOTs) (**including Oregon’s**) have expressed concerns about federal funding for planned projects being at risk. A March 4 **letter** from the president of American Association of State Highway and Transportation Officials (AASHTO) to Secretary Sean Duffy of the U.S. DOT called attention to “detrimental project delivery impacts from a growing number of interruptions in federal approvals – including federal funding – that states are currently experiencing in USDOT-administered programs.”

## Context

### Uncertainty: The New Normal for Federal Transportation Funding

Since January 20, uncertainty has prevailed with regard to federal transportation grant funding that state and local DOTs rely on for infrastructure projects already being planned. This uncertainty arises in part from the Administration’s approach to implementing the Unleashing American Energy EO. That approach has been testing the limits of executive branch authorities, as indicated by judicial decisions in multiple jurisdictions. The uncertainty is driven primarily by federal agencies such as U.S. DOT pausing, suspending, or terminating the disbursement of Congressionally appropriated funds to states under awarded grants and, in some cases, failing to disburse previously obligated funds.

Noteworthy actions that contribute to the uncertainty around federal transportation funding include the following examples.

- In State of New York v. Trump, a coalition of states has presented to **the U.S. District Court for the District of Rhode Island** over 100 **declarations** describing harms resulting from continued funding freezes and evidence of federal agencies continuing to “improperly freeze federal funds

ment of appropriated federal funds.” These funding freezes and ongoing litigation have created uncertainty around critical transportation infrastructure funding, such as \$60 million in emergency federal highway funds to reimburse Maryland for the removal and salvage of debris from the Francis Scott Key Bridge.

- U.S. DOT rescinded approvals of state NEVI plans without providing any evidence of deficiencies in the plans and announced their intention to delay obligating any further funding under the program until after they provide new guidance. Seventeen state attorneys general filed a lawsuit to challenge DOT’s actions and, on June 24, a district court ordered US DOT to reinstate NEVI funding for 14 of those states, by July 2. On February 7, U.S. DOT Secretary Sean Duffy suggested in a televised interview that Congress could “claw the [NEVI] money back in reconciliation or some other means.”
- According to a leaked internal memo, U.S. DOT is in the process of reviewing unobligated portions of all competitively awarded grants, with the intention to divert funding away from bike, pedestrian, electric vehicle and other clean transportation projects and toward infrastructure that more directly aligns with the Trump administration’s policies.
- On April 8, 2025, President Trump signed another EO, entitled "Protecting American Energy from State Overreach," which directs the Department of Justice to identify and take “all appropriate action” to stop the enforcement of state laws related to climate, the environment or social justice. Secretary Duffy has indicated that New York State’s federal transportation funding may be affected by developments in the context of the U.S. DOT’s legal efforts to end New York’s congestion price program, which illustrates one way this EO could be used to restrict other funding for states.

To date, the prevailing uncertainty around transportation funding has been partially addressed by the courts, though significant uncertainty remains. In particular, federal district courts in DC and Rhode Island have temporarily enjoined (i.e., prevented) OMB from directing federal agencies to freeze certain federal funds. The Rhode Island district court has specifically enjoined DOT from freezing certain IRA and IIJA related funds to 22 state<sup>3</sup> plaintiffs and DC. The U.S. Court of Appeals for the First Circuit has rejected the Trump Administration's bid to pause that order while it litigates its appeal. Those cases are described in greater detail below. For now, IRA- and IIJA-related transportation funds should continue flowing (at least to those plaintiffs, if not more broadly), but that could change if the Trump Administration is successful in its First Circuit appeal or seeks review of the U.S. Supreme Court. State DOTs may also continue to raise concerns, as they did in the March 4 letter from AASHTO highlighting the negative effects for state DOTs that have resulted from federal funding uncertainties.

The reconciliation package (H.R.1, known as the “One Big Beautiful Bill Act”) passed by the U.S. Congress on July 3 and signed into law by the President on July 4 includes several provisions that codify funding rollbacks that the Trump Administration has been attempting to achieve by Executive Order. In particular, the package rescinds unobligated funding from several transportation-related IRA programs (discussed further below, under “Competitive Discretionary Grant Programs”).

## How Might Formula-Funded Transportation Programs Be Affected?

As of June, 2025, it appears that *most* transportation *formula* funds appropriated by the federal government through the IIJA are no longer subject to the “pause” in disbursements originally initiated by the Unleashing American Energy EO. In most cases, the IIJA directs FHWA to apportion funding for its formula-funded programs as lump sums to each state. This includes funding for the Surface Transportation Block Grant Program and the National Highway Performance Program, as well as the **Carbon Reduction Program** and the **PROTECT Formula Program**. The text of the statute appears to be clear on its face that FHWA “shall distribute” among states the amounts of funding that Congress has made available for these programs.<sup>4</sup> This suggests that most formula-funded transportation programs should not be affected by how the U.S. DOT operating administrations (aka “modes,” such as FHWA, Federal Transit Administration and Federal Rail Administration) and OMB ultimately interpret the meaning of Section 2 of the **Unleashing American Energy** EO (which defines a broad set of new policy goals).

## What about the National Electric Vehicle Infrastructure (NEVI) Program?

The NEVI Program is also an FHWA formula-funded program, through which each state is apportioned a share of total program dollars and funding is **available until expended**. However, unlike most formula funds, under the IIJA, **FHWA approval of state EV infrastructure plans** is first required before NEVI funds may be obligated to the states. The Biden Administration previously approved state plans for all states for **FY2022 through FY2025**.<sup>5</sup>

Importantly, the funding “pause” called for in the **Unleashing American Energy** EO explicitly singles out “funds for electric vehicle charging stations made available through the National Electric Vehicle Infrastructure Formula Program and the Charging and Fueling Infrastructure Discretionary Grant Program.”

On February 6, U.S. DOT **sent a letter** to all directors of state DOTs informing them that FHWA is “[i]mmediately suspending the approval of all State Electric Vehicle Infrastructure Deployment plans for all fiscal years.” Since state plans are tied to National Electric Vehicle Infrastructure (NEVI) program funding, the letter goes on to direct that:

GEORGETOWN CLIMATE CENTER *new obligations may occur under the NEVI Formula Program until the updated final NEVI Formula Program Guidance is issued and new State plans are submitted and approved. Instructions for the submission of new State plans for all fiscal years will be included in the updated final NEVI Formula Program Guidance. Since FHWA is suspending the existing State plans, States will be held harmless for not implementing their existing plans. Until new guidance is issued, reimbursement of existing obligations will be allowed in order to not disrupt current financial commitments.”*

Meanwhile, **reimbursements** for active projects – i.e., those for which funding has already been obligated – initiated during the first four years of the NEVI program should continue. The ultimate effect of the Trump Administration actions on unobligated NEVI funds is not yet clear, particularly for FY2022 through FY2025 funds. For FY2026 NEVI funds, the Trump Administration has more discretion to update NEVI program guidance and this process could substantially delay the approval of plans and state use of NEVI funds for that fiscal year.

Meanwhile, on May 7, 17 state attorneys general **filed a lawsuit** challenging the U.S. DOT’s NEVI-related actions, including their suspension of previously approved state NEVI plans, the withholding of NEVI funds, and refusing to review and process state requests for authorization to obligate NEVI funds. Additionally, on May 22, the Government Accountability Office published **a report** finding that the U.S. DOT violated the Impoundment Control Act and concluded that “DOT is not authorized to withhold [FY 2022 through 2025 NEVI] funds from expenditure and DOT must continue to carry out the statutory requirements of the program.” (See more on this below, under “Legal Challenges.”)

## What about Competitive Discretionary Grant Programs?

Competitive grant programs represent a particular concern for state agencies that invest valuable resources in planning projects and submitting bids for federal grant awards.

For example, the Charging and Fueling Infrastructure (CFI) Discretionary Grant Program was specifically identified in the **Unleashing American Energy** EO (as noted above). While \$1.7 billion of the \$2.5 billion in this program had been **awarded** as of March 7, these funds are likely at risk, particularly in cases where grant agreements were not already in place prior to the EO.

Additionally, a **leaked internal DOT memo**, which directed agency staff to identify programs and projects that are inconsistent with recent EOs, initiated a new process of federal review regarding the unobligated portions of all competitively-awarded grants. The memo directs all U.S. DOT operating administrations to review all competitively awarded grants with funding that has not been fully obligated and take steps to eliminate or re-program portions of the funding. Project

**GEORGETOWN CLIMATE CENTER** potential removal or reprogramming include all "activities that are necessary to advance climate, equity, and other priorities counter to the Administration's Executive Orders." Examples cited in the memo include all "equity activities, Diversity, Equity, and Inclusion (DEI) activities, climate change activities, environmental justice (EJ) activities, gender-specific activities, when the primary purpose is bicycle infrastructure (i.e., recreational trails, shared-use paths, etc.), electric vehicles (EV), and EV charging infrastructure."

Transportation Secretary Sean Duffy, when asked about the leaked memo during his April 2 **testimony** before the Senate Committee on Environment and Public Works, defended this new practice by arguing that the result would bring projects more in line with the original intent of Congress. However, according to **the memo**, the programs are required to go through project-by-project review, include those where the original "[s]tatutory language includes equity requirements, climate considerations or bicycle infrastructure." Elements of such projects may be subject to revision or removal, to be "replace[d] ... with relevant elements that align with the program statute, the original scope of the application submission, and current Administration EOs." This creates uncertainty and raises questions regarding the future prospects of any competitively-awarded low-carbon transportation or climate resilience project that is still underway and not yet fully constructed.

While many of the federal funding programs that states are using for transportation and climate-related investments were established or reauthorized by the IIJA, several other programs, established by the IRA, have been defunded by the U.S. Congress. In particular, the budget reconciliation package (**H.R.1**) that was signed into law by the President on July 4, 2025, includes:

**Provisions that rescind all unobligated funding for the following U.S. DOT programs:**

- Fueling Aviation's Sustainable Transition Grant Program (Sec. 40010),
- Low-Carbon Transportation Materials Grants Program (Sec. 60021),
- Neighborhood Access and Equity Grant Program (Sec. 60019), and
- Environmental Review Implementation Funds (Sec. 60023).<sup>6</sup>

**Provisions that rescind all unobligated funding for the following U.S. Environmental Protection Agency programs:**

- Clean Heavy-Duty Vehicles Program (Sec. 60001),
- Greenhouse Gas Reduction Fund (Sec. 60002),
- Diesel Emissions Reduction Act Program (Sec. 60003),
- Environmental Product Declaration Assistance (Sec. 60011), and
- Climate Pollution Reduction Grant Program (Sec. 60013).

**GEORGETOWN CLIMATE CENTER** less uncertainty related to previously awarded competitive grant programs if grant agreements are already in place and other steps have been taken to obligate funds. Furthermore, grantees will need to remain in compliance with the terms and conditions of their awards to help ensure that the funding remains secure. For recently awarded grants, as noted already, U.S. DOT has issued orders initiating review processes that could slow the pace of completing new grant agreements for certain programs. This is likely to be particularly true for grant awards funded through programs that may be interpreted as falling under the broadly worded policy section (Section 2) of the Unleashing American Energy EO, including any sources of funding that may be implicated by the EO's references to an "electric vehicle mandate" or "Green New Deal."

However, the various legal challenges, court orders and pending appeals detailed below – and how the administration responds to these court orders – introduce a significant source of further uncertainty regarding DOT implementation of any funding-related EO directives.

## Summary of Executive and Judicial Actions

This section provides a chronology and additional details about the executive actions and court proceedings referred to in previous sections.

### White House Executive Orders and OMB Memos

Initially, the wording of the Unleashing American Energy EO was interpreted by many as applying to reimbursements by the federal government to state DOTs for *all* federal highway improvement projects, including formula-funded and discretionary grant programs funded by the IIJA. Accordingly, disbursements for highway projects were briefly stopped by the Federal Highway Administration (FHWA) on Tuesday, January 21.

That same day, the Office of Management and Budget (OMB) published a guidance memo (M-25-11), stating that the immediate "pause" in federal funding referenced in the EO "only applies to funds supporting programs, projects, or activities that may be implicated by the policy established in Section 2 of the [Executive Order]." Section 2 of the EO enumerates various Administration policy preferences, including opposition to incentives for electric vehicles. The memo concludes by saying that "[a]gency heads may disburse funds as they deem necessary after consulting with the Office of Management and Budget."

While funding disbursements for most U.S. DOT transportation programs resumed quickly after the M-25-11 memo was posted, a number of disruptions to the routine flow of federal funding reportedly continued for some federally awarded grants. For example, on January 30 the National Highway Safety Administration issued a Stop Work Order to the National Safety Council's Road to Zero Coalition.

GEORGETOWN CLIMATE CENTER government-wide memo (**M-25-13**) that directed federal agencies to temporarily pause all activities related to obligation or disbursement of all Federal financial assistance...including, but not limited to, financial assistance for foreign aid, nongovernmental organizations, DEI, woke gender ideology, and the green new deal."

Although the Trump Administration subsequently **rescinded** the M-25-13 memo on January 29 after a **federal judge** temporarily blocked the Administration from acting on it, the same afternoon White House press secretary Karoline Leavitt **posted on X**: "The Executive Orders issued by the President on funding reviews remain in full force and effect and will be rigorously implemented by all agencies and departments."

## Legal Challenges

It is not yet clear what each agency's implementation of the EOs identified above will look like in practice, particularly given ongoing legal challenges. The following five lawsuits have a direct bearing on how – and to what extent – U.S. DOT provides grant funding for state-led transportation projects:

### 1. *State of New York v. Trump*

- On January 31, 23 state-level Attorneys General filed a **lawsuit** in the U.S. District Court for Rhode Island, challenging OMB directive **M-25-13**, seeking legal relief from documented harms caused by widespread funding freezes.
- On March 6, the district court issued a **preliminary injunction**, finding that the Trump Administration had "imposed a categorical mandate on the spending of congressionally appropriated and obligated funds without regard to Congress's authority to control spending." The decision ordered that federal agencies are "enjoined from pausing, freezing, blocking, canceling, suspending, terminating, or otherwise impeding the disbursement of appropriated federal funds to" the 22 state plaintiffs and DC "under awarded grants, executed contracts, or other executed financial obligations based on the OMB Directive" or any other similar directive that "imposes or applies a categorical pause or freeze of funding appropriated by Congress."
- Defendants appealed the district court's preliminary injunction ruling. On March 26, the defendant's request for a stay pending appeal of the district court's preliminary injunction was **denied** by the U.S. Court of Appeals for the First Circuit.

*On hold, pending appeal: For now, unless their appeal is successful, defendants in this case are required to comply with the terms of the preliminary injunction, which essentially nullifies OMB directive **M-25-13**, as requested by the plaintiffs in this case.*

### 2. *Woonasquatucket River Watershed Council v. the U.S. Department of Agriculture*

profit organizations sued OMB, Kevin Hassett in his capacity as Director of the National Economic Council, and other federal Defendants (not including U.S. DOT) regarding the so-called funding freezes. This case was also filed in federal court in Rhode Island.

- On April 15, the district court issued a **preliminary injunction** ordering Federal Defendants to resume disbursement of “already-awarded funding appropriated under the [IIJA and IRA].” Although U.S. DOT was not a named defendant, U.S. DOT may be implicated because the order required OMB to provide written notice of the court’s decision to “all agencies to which Memorandum M-25-11 was addressed,” including U.S. DOT, and

*“...instruct those agencies that they may not take any steps to implement, give effect to, or reinstate under a different name the unilateral, non-individualized directives in Memorandum M-25-11 with respect to the disbursement of all open awards under the [IRA] or the [IIJA].”*

- On May 30, the district court granted the defendants’ motion to stay proceedings pending the resolution of ongoing appeals in the First Circuit, including *State of New York v. Trump* and the Administration’s appeal of the preliminary injunction in this case.

*On hold, pending action on other cases: Any court decisions in the State of New York v. Trump case will be central to the outcome of the Woonasquatucket River Watershed Council case.*

### 3. Sustainability Institute v. Trump

- On March 26, 13 nonprofits and six local governments **sought a preliminary injunction** in federal court in South Carolina against President Trump, U.S. DOT, Secretary Duffy, and other federal defendants to prevent the administration from freezing or terminating grants under various programs funded by IRA and IIJA, including two transportation-related programs: the Charging and Fueling Infrastructure Program Grants, discussed above, and the Active Transportation Infrastructure Investment Grant Program.
- On May 20, the district court **granted** the plaintiffs motion for a preliminary injunction with respect to 32 of the 38 grants at issue in the case, including the two grants under the two U.S. DOT programs.
- Defendants appealed the preliminary injunction decision. On June 5, 2025, the U.S. Court of Appeals for the Fourth Circuit **granted** the Government’s motion for a stay of the injunction, pending appeal of the case, finding that “the Government is ‘likely to succeed’ in showing that the district court lacked subject matter jurisdiction over Plaintiffs’ claims” and that “the

GEORGETOWN CLIMATE CENTER ted irreparable harm because it is being forced to disburse funds from a finite appropriation and will not be able to recoup those funds once expended.”

*In force, pending appeals:* As a result of the Fourth Circuit's stay order, Secretary Duffy and other defendants in this case are not currently required to disperse funding to the **38 grants** at issue in the case.

#### 4. State of Washington v. U.S. Department of Transportation

- On May 7, 17 state attorneys general filed a **lawsuit** in the U.S. District Court for the Western District of Washington challenging the U.S. DOT's (1) suspension of previously approved state NEVI plans, (2) withholding of NEVI funds, and (3) refusal to review and process state requests for authorization to obligate NEVI funds.
- On June 24, the federal district court in the Western District of Washington temporarily **enjoined** the Trump administration's NEVI funding freeze for 14 of the 17 states and reinstated their EV infrastructure funding (finding three of the states – Minnesota, DC, and Vermont – had not provided enough facts to show eminent harm warranting an injunction). The order went into effect on July 2.
- On July 23, the court **granted** a request to intervene by dozens of environmental groups seeking broader relief on behalf of members who expected to benefit from a “robust, reliable nationwide” EV charging network funded by NEVI.

*Funding restored, in part:* US DOT is required to reinstate NEVI funding for 14 of the 17 states that filed suit. States covered by the injunction report that their access to NEVI funding has been restored, and at least one state (Washington) has **fully obligated its remaining funding**. Meanwhile, the remaining 36 states are not able to obligate any new funding through the NEVI program (see details in the NEVI Program section, above), although the environmental group intervenors may seek and obtain broader injunctive relief.

#### 5. State of California v. the U.S. Department of Transportation

- On May 13, 2025, 20 state attorneys general **sued, again in federal court in Rhode Island**, to block the Trump administration's effort to **condition transportation funding** on compliance with federal immigration enforcement policy.
- On June 19, the district court issued a broad **preliminary injunction, applying to all states**, and denied the defendants' motion for a stay. The preliminary injunction ordered that: “Defendants are prohibited from taking adverse action against any state entity or local jurisdiction, including barring it from receiving or making it ineligible for federal funding, based on the Immigration Enforcement Condition, absent specific statutory authorization.”

**GEORGETOWN CLIMATE CENTER**: Pending an appeal from the Trump Administration, which has not yet been filed, the Trump Administration is now prohibited from imposing immigration enforcement conditions on grant recipients in any jurisdiction. This will help to remove a barrier to negotiating final grant agreements with federal agencies.

## U.S. DOT Policy Statements and Directives

On January 29, U.S. DOT Secretary Sean Duffy issued a **policy statement** along with a related Secretarial Memo and an Order to update agency policies, programs and activities to align with President Trump's recent EOs, which included **rescinding dozens of** former President Biden's executive orders. Secretary Duffy's January 29 directives are summarized below.

- The Secretarial Memo on "**Implementation of Executive Orders Addressing Energy, Climate Change, Diversity, and Gender**" interprets a list of new executive orders, including the Unleashing American Energy EO, as directing "Federal agencies, where [sic] as consistent with the law, to identify and eliminate all orders, directives, rules, regulations, notices, guidance documents, funding agreements, programs and policy statements, or portions thereof, which were authorized, adopted or approved [by President Biden] and which reference or relate in any way to climate change, "greenhouse gas" emissions, racial equity, gender identity, "diversity, equity, and inclusion," goals, environmental justice, or the Justice 40 Initiative." The **memo** tasks all DOT operating administrations and the Office of the Secretary (OST) with identifying a list of all such programs, policies, etc., in a written report, within 10 days, and the order then describes agency plans to "rescind, cancel, revoke and terminate" all such activities.
- The order on "**Ensuring Reliance Upon Sound Economic Analysis in Department of Transportation Policies Programs and Activities**" articulates new priorities for federal transportation funding. This order directs all DOT-funded grants, loans and contracts to "prioritize projects and goals that" 1) apply user-pay models, 2) direct funding to local opportunity zones, 3) provide transportation benefits to families and communities with higher than average marriage and birth rates, 4) prohibit recipients of U.S. DOT assistance from imposing vaccine or mask mandates and, 5) require local compliance or cooperation with Federal immigration enforcement and other executive goals. **This order** also directs each of DOT's operating administrations to integrate the principles outlined in the order.<sup>7</sup> The legal challenges noted above are an important source of uncertainty regarding DOT implementation of this order, particularly the extent to which it applies to grants, loans, and contracts that have already been awarded.

Additional policy developments at U.S. DOT that affect climate initiatives, funding and project delivery by state agencies have been reported in the press and public letters. A few notable examples include:

- In late February, the U.S. DOT established an extra layer of federal review for revisions to federally-funded project plans, **then reversed course** a week later.

GEORGETOWN CLIMATE CENTER tion-related research has **been cut**, particularly for climate and equity programs. The cuts include funding for already-awarded grants to states and universities that are not aligned with the new administration's priorities.

- On April 24, 2025, Secretary Duffy **issued a letter** to all recipients of U.S. DOT funding announcing a new policy that requires immigration enforcement as a condition to receiving U.S. DOT funding. The letter states that all U.S. DOT funding recipients have "legal obligations" to cooperate with federal authorities, "including cooperating with and not impeding U.S. Immigration and Customs Enforcement (ICE) and other Federal offices... in the enforcement of Federal immigration law." It further warns that policies, programs, or activities designed to achieve equity could represent a "violation of Federal law and the terms of grant agreements."
- On June 4, the Transportation Research Board (TRB) of the National Academy of Sciences announced the elimination of all standing committees and introduced an entirely new set of committees. Various specialized and multidisciplinary committees that had, until June 4, focused on sustainability, environment, climate, emissions, equity and environmental justice have not been reintroduced. **Responding to questions** about this decision, TRB noted that "more than 90% of TRB funding comes from federal sources. As a federal contractor, TRB is required to comply with conditions placed on federal funding."

#### Endnotes:

1. *This explainer was prepared by James Bradbury, with contributions from Ryan Levandowski, Amanda Lineberry, Matthew Goetz, and Melissa Birchard.*
2. *As of February 6, 2025, when the U.S. Federal Highway Administration suspended approval of state NEVI Plans and stopped new obligations of funding under the NEVI Program, \$526 million in NEVI program funds have been obligated.*
3. *Those 22 states include New York, California, Illinois, Rhode Island, New Jersey, Massachusetts, Arizona, Colorado, Connecticut, Delaware, Hawai'i, Maine, Maryland, Michigan, Minnesota, Nevada, North Carolina, New Mexico, Oregon, Vermont, Washington, and Wisconsin.*
4. *23 U.S.C. § 104(b).*
5. *While the Joint Office only posted approved state plans through FY 2024, 47 NEVI state plans for FY2025 were reportedly approved by FHWA, as of December 16, 2024. [View Source](#) |*
6. *The reconciliation bill would also rescind all unobligated funding for related General Services Administration (GSA) programs, including GSA Assistance for Federal Buildings, Low-Carbon Materials for Federal Building Assistance, and the Emerging Technologies program. These are noteworthy because they are companions to the FHWA's Low-Carbon Transportation Materials grant program.*
7. *U.S. DOT has incorporated these priorities into its FY 2025 Safe Streets for All Notice of Funding Opportunity: [View Source](#). |*