**[Your Name]**  
**[Your Affiliation/Organization, if applicable]**  
**[Your City/State]**  
**[Date]**

[**DOE-HQ-2025-0015**](https://www.federalregister.gov/documents/2025/05/16/2025-08535/rescinding-new-construction-requirements-related-to-nondiscrimination-in-federally-assisted-programs) **New Construction Requirements**

Department of Energy

Office of Civil Rights and EEO

1000 Independence Avenue SW, Room 5B-168

Washington, DC 20585

[**DOE-HQ-2025-0024**](https://www.federalregister.gov/documents/2025/05/16/2025-08593/rescinding-regulations-related-to-nondiscrimination-in-federally-assisted-programs-or-activities) **Nondiscrimination**

Department of Energy

Office of Minority Economic Impact

1000 Independence Avenue SW

Washington DC 20585

Re: Significant Adverse Comment Opposing the Direct Final Rules at Docket Numbers DOE-HQ-2025-0015 and DOE-HQ-2025-0024

To whom it may concern,

I write as a **[describe self, for example, as a disabled person, or as an advocate, on behalf of an org or as an individual]. [Share why you care about Section 504 regulations and accessible built environment].**

I write to express my strong opposition to proposed direct final rules—**DOE-HQ-2025-0015** and **DOE-HQ-2025-0024**—because they would take away key disability rights protections. I care about Section 504 and accessibility because they protect the rights of people with disabilities to access public spaces and live independently.

The first rule, **2025-0015**, would eliminate a requirement that federally funded buildings be fully accessible when they are built or renovated. The second rule, **2025-0024**, would remove rules that help ensure access to existing buildings. It would also take away the requirement that agencies create a plan to fix barriers in buildings that aren’t currently accessible.

These rules aren’t just helpful—they’re essential to making sure buildings are accessible and inclusive for everyone. This proposed rule goes against more than 40 years of progress in accessibility. Since 1980, Section 504 and UFAS have helped make sure buildings are accessible, without imposing undue burdens on builders. The Department of Energy (DOE) may not have fully considered the significant consequences this change could have on disabled Americans across the country.

Access to built environments, whether new constructions or renovated buildings, is safeguarded under the Americans with Disabilities Act (ADA), which clearly states that no individual should face exclusion from participation in public entity programs, services, or activities based on their disabilities.

Furthermore, clear and consistent guidance from the DOE is necessary to ensure that construction projects include essential accessibility features for people using mobility devices or those who are blind or have low vision or have other disabilities that require accommodation.

Requirements like elevators, ramps, and accessible bathrooms are essential to make sure everyone can safely and comfortably use public spaces. These features are part of universal design, which means designing buildings that work for all people. Whether someone uses a wheelchair, has a stroller, or just needs extra space, universal design benefits everyone in shared spaces. That’s why it’s so important that federally funded buildings include these features.

The Uniform Federal Accessibility Standards, or UFAS, are important because they give clear rules for how to build spaces that everyone can use—including people with disabilities. These standards help make sure public buildings are safe, welcoming, and accessible to all.

If the DOE decides to eliminate the requirement to follow UFAS standards, it will mean that builders who receive federal funding may no longer be obligated to comply with these needed accessibility measures. That could mean fewer ramps, elevators, or other important design elements—and more barriers for disabled people. Not to mention, this would push disabled people out of spaces their tax dollars help pay for. We should be moving forward on inclusion, not backward. Access matters—for everyone.

For these reasons, I strongly oppose the direct final rules at Docket Numbers DOE-HQ-2025-0015 and DOE-HQ-2025-0024. Thank you for considering my comment.

Sincerely,

**[Your contact information]**