



March 13, 2025

Congressman Pete Sessions
2157 Rayburn House Office Building
Washington, DC 20515

Congressman Kweisi Mfume
2263 Rayburn HOB
Washington, DC 20515

**RE: Hearing March 11, 2025
U.S. House of Representatives Committee on Oversight and Government Reform
Subcommittee on Government Operations
Shifting Gears: Moving from Recovery to Prevention of Improper Payments and Fraud**

Dear Congressmen:

The Blueprint 2025 ("BP2025") Initiative is a collaboration among infrastructure professionals, leading infrastructure development companies and public sector project managers which advances and supports plans and policies to restore the U.S.' position as the country with the world's best, most efficient and most productive infrastructure. For more than a decade, we have aggressively argued for extensive use of digital technologies, automation and Artificial Intelligence to expedite and improve the NEPA environmental review process and governmental processes in general. We were highly encouraged by the constructive dialog between the two of you which took place at the March 11, 2025, Subcommittee hearings on DOGE related issues.

The Executive Orders by which President Trump established the DOGE and clarified its mandate appear to be well considered, functional charters which clearly define DOGE'S objectives, the authorities and responsibilities of cabinet agencies, DOGE's role as technology consultant and software designer for the Cabinet Agencies and the way in which it will be integrated into the basic functions of Government. To be specific:

Objectives: The January 20th order (E.O. 14158) clearly states that DOGE's purpose is to implement the President's DOGE Agenda "*by modernizing Federal technology and software to maximize governmental efficiency and productivity.*" It does not give the DOGE any authority to directly carry out any management role with respect to any agency or, indeed, to take any action unrelated to the modernization of government software and technology. The February 11th order (E.O.14219) expands this purpose by giving DOGE a *consultative role* regarding the actions by Agency Heads to cut costs through the installation of systems to reduce or reallocate spending to promote efficiency and advance Administration policies. We need to be clear as to the scope of DOGE's authority and avoid misunderstandings about what it is doing.

Authorities and Responsibilities of Agency Heads: Both orders make clear that Agency Heads have primary responsibility for implementation. Each Agency Head must establish a “DOGE Team” of at least four employees, which may, or may not, include DOGE Special Employees. DOGE has a consultative role regarding team selection. Team Leads are to coordinate with DOGE and advise their Agency Heads regarding implementation of the President’s DOGE Agenda. Agency Heads are clearly in charge. The DOGE role is consultative and advisory – and presumably grounded in the DOGE prime function of modernizing software and technology. Agency Heads are free to accept or reject DOGE advice.

DOGE’s Role and Integration - The January 20th order positions DOGE as a technology advisor and software designer to be integrated into the agencies in order to help them implement a “Software Modernization Initiative to improve the quality and efficiency of government -wide software, network infrastructure, and information technology (IT) systems.” Presumably, directed toward the objective of *maximizing governmental efficiency and productivity*. The February 11th order (as built upon by an OMB Guidance Letter to Agency Heads dated February 26th) adds an additional consultative role for the DOGE Teams. Assistance in the development of data driven plans to reduce the size of the federal workforce and identify and prevent wasteful expenditures.

To summarize, the two executive orders address and resolve a number of contentious issues which are impeding progress towards the DOGE objectives.

- DOGE is to operate at the direction of Agency Heads as a technology advisor and software designer. It has no independent authority to downsize agencies, fire workers or make management decisions for the agencies it serves. So long as it acts within the scope of its Presidential assignment, these sorts of actions should not occur except at the Agency Heads’ direction.
- There seems to be a relatively broad consensus that Government is too large and not sufficiently efficient but perhaps an equally broad consensus that adjustments need to be “surgical”. Adherence to the EO’s premise that DOGE should focus on *modernization of Federal technology and software to maximize governmental efficiency and productivity* would enhance public confidence, and possibly judicial acceptance of the proposition that the DOGE effort is indeed “surgical”, data driven and appropriately directed and thus an appropriate exercise of executive authority.
- The January 20th Executive Order expects that DOGE’s activities will, from the outset, be focused on *modernization of Federal technology and software to maximize governmental efficiency and productivity*.

Unfortunately, the publicly available information suggests that, in actual practice, the Orders’ mandates are not being adhered to. For example:

- DOGE has departed from the Order’s “software and technology from the outset” mandate and, instead, implemented an aggressive, ad hoc management approach emphasizing large scale firings and radical reduction of agency functions. DOGE predecessor

functions in the General Services Administration appear to have been reduced or eliminated – apparently at DOGE direction, and a number of the technical experts in the US Digital Service have resigned.

- We have not seen official announcements of the Agency Heads’ appointment of DOGE teams, any indication that those teams are active or any clear confirmation of the Agency Heads’ primacy or the purely advisory and consultative role of the DOGE.

Whether these departures are a reaction to embedded opposition within the agencies or some other factor, they appear to have resulted in lack of transparency, public misunderstandings and mistrust and extensive litigation that may not have been necessary if the mandates had been scrupulously followed.

What all of this suggests is that, if the Trump mandates are properly interpreted and adhered to, the gap between your two parties’ positions may not be unbridgeable. We urge that you and your committee members work together in a continuing effort to identify shared objectives and approaches to achieving them.

The current widespread misunderstandings regarding the proper DOGE functions are creating unnecessary controversy and impeding the shared goal of improving government efficiency and productivity through the effective use of technology and digital systems. We hope that you and your Committee can help to resolve these misunderstandings and put this well-intended effort back on track towards a more efficient and productive government.

For your record, we are attaching recent statements of position on these issues which we hope will be helpful in charting a path forward. We are always available to respond to questions or provide additional information.

Blueprint 2025

2550 M Street NW

Washington, DC 20005

T: 202 775 2025

gordon@sinfpi.org

<https://www.sinfpi.org/>