

Cynthia A. Tschampl

Comment to OMB proposed rule,

https://www.federalregister.gov/documents/2026/05/29/2026-10817/regulation-for-federal-financial-assistance?utm_source=substack&utm_medium=email

My name is Cynthia Tschampl, and as a Senior Research Scientist, native Iowan, and active citizen of the United States, I am writing to request OMB not implement the proposed rule titled Regulation for Federal Financial Assistance [OMB-2026-0034-0001](#).

There are many reasons, both specific and general to oppose this rule. Growing up in Iowa, surrounded by the farm life, I am particularly sensitive to harms proposed to farmers and rural areas. The current Administration has implemented so many policies harmful to farmers (e.g., ending the farm-to-school program, ending the farm-to-food bank program, tariffs that collapsed markets for our farmers, tariffs that increased input costs for farmers, the war in Iran that increased gas and fertilizer prices, etc.) that I fear one more blow to farmers will be the end of the last family farms. I am particularly thinking of the ability for a political appointee to unilaterally end or disallow agricultural research (e.g., sections §200.218, §200.202, §200.340, §200.206, §200.300, §200.205), particularly if it uses disallowed words like “disparity” in figuring out which cows produce the most milk or which corn species are underutilized. Also, so many of the pests that impact our crops are spread internationally (e.g. the screwworm return, and the beetles killing our lumber trees), that it makes no sense to implement §200.220.

As a citizen, I value my freedom above all things, and this proposed rule reads as prohibition on all words in proposals and all proposals in general that are perceived in any way opposed to very few political persons. The preamble to the rule seems to say that far left or Marxist ideas getting into research at around 10% of grants is a bad thing, but it seems fitting if 10% of our population hold those beliefs. The broad powers embedded in so many of the provisions seem to shut down free exchange of ideas (we don’t know from which “ideological” slant the next break-through drug will come) and privilege far right fascism over all other beliefs (e.g., sections §200.218, §200.202, §200.340, §200.206, §200.300, §200.205, §200.450, §200.204, §200.220, §200.1, §200.454, §200.461, §200.432). These sections also create a suppression of research results, indicating a loss of transparency, which is against what the rule summary says is an original purpose of the rule.

As a Senior Research Scientist at the only Jewish university in the country, my daily work is directly affected by this rule in so many ways: reduced chances of winning grants (without which, I will lose my job), reduced chances of publishing my work (suppressed speech, loss of promotion options), losing grants in midstream (which is wasteful), and loss of exchanging ideas with other scholars (e.g., sections §200.218, §200.202, §200.340, §200.206, §200.300, §200.205, §200.450, §200.204, §200.220, §200.1, §200.454, §200.461, §200.432).

In summary, please do not implement any portion of this rule. I am sure the OMB has enough work already to do without becoming lords over every federal agency and every individual grant. Let Freedom ring!