

Congress of the United States

House of Representatives

COMMITTEE ON SCIENCE, SPACE, AND TECHNOLOGY

2321 RAYBURN HOUSE OFFICE BUILDING

WASHINGTON, DC 20515-6301

(202) 225-6371

www.science.house.gov

November 16, 2023

Sethuraman Panchanathan, Ph.D.,
Director
National Science Foundation
2415 Eisenhower Ave,
Alexandria, VA 22314

Dear Director Panchanathan:

Since 2017, the House Committee on Science, Space, and Technology (Committee) has been aware of serious allegations of sexual assault and harassment across the scientific research enterprise, including within the National Science Foundation's (NSF) United States Antarctic Program (USAP).¹ The Committee has taken multiple official and unofficial actions to investigate various allegations, including those raised in the Sexual Assault/Harassment Prevention Response (SAHPR) report that was released by NSF on June 22, 2022.² In addition to the allegations of sexual assault and harassment, the SAHPR report articulated specific concerns with the USAP, including a culture and climate of blacklisting and retaliation. These allegations directly implicate NSF's management and leadership as the agency of authority and raise serious questions about the competency of the contractor and subcontractors chosen. As part of our ongoing investigation, this Committee requests that NSF and all applicable contractors and subcontractors maintain all documents related to these issues and any incidents going forward.

The Committee remains dedicated to understanding the allegations of sexual assault and harassment, blacklisting, and retaliation in the USAP. As a follow-up to the SAHPR report, on December 6, 2022, the Committee held a hearing titled "Building a Safer Antarctic Research

¹ NAT'L ACADEMIES PRESS, SEXUAL HARASSMENT OF WOMEN: CLIMATE, CULTURE, AND CONSEQUENCES IN ACADEMIC SCIENCES, ENGINEERING, AND MEDICINE, 1-12, (PAULA A. JOHNSON, ET AL. 2018), <https://nap.nationalacademies.org/catalog/24994/sexual-harassment-of-women-climate-culture-and-consequences-in-academic>

² NAT'L SCIENCE FOUND., OFF. OF POLAR PROGRAMS, AND U.S. ANTARCTIC PROGRAM, SEXUAL ASSAULT/HARASSMENT PREVENTION AND RESPONSE (SAHPR), FINAL REPORT, (2022), <https://www.nsf.gov/geo/opp/documents/USAP%20SAHPR%20Report.pdf>

Environment”³ to discuss these concerns and issues raised in the report.⁴ Ms. Kathleen Naeher, Chief Operating Officer of the Civil Group at Leidos, participated in that hearing. Unfortunately, Ms. Naeher provided inadequate responses to member questions during the hearing. Additionally, in her response to questions submitted for the record, as it pertained to the number of reports of sexual assault and harassment, Ms. Naeher failed to inform the Committee of the reported instances of sexual assault that the Committee was aware of via other information.⁵ This information included, along with other outside sources, the number of reports provided by Dr. Marrongelle, Chief Operating Officer at NSF, in her responses to questions for the record that she also received following the December 6, 2022 hearing.⁷

In a good faith effort, the Committee then sent a letter on May 1, 2023 to Leidos requesting they correct the record to reflect the accurate number of reported instances of sexual assault and harassment received by Leidos since taking over the ASC contract.⁸ When Leidos responded to the Committee’s request on May 12, 2023, they admitted that their previous response was “incomplete,” and a revised number was provided.⁹ In its series of requests, the Committee has received inconsistent reporting on the number of reported allegations of sexual assault and harassment in the USAP program, summarized below:

- In response to then-Chairwoman Johnson’s Question for the Record (QFR) from the December 6, 2022, hearing, Ms. Naeher responded: “From May 2017 through April 2022, the ASC team received five allegations of sexual harassment and zero allegations of sexual assault.”
- In response to the Committee’s May 1, 2023, letter seeking clarification of this response, Leidos responded on May 12, 2023, that: “From the start of our performance of the ASC contract in August of 2016 through the date of the congressional hearing (December 6, 2022), Leidos has a record of 23 allegations

³ *Building a Safer Antarctic Research Environment Full Comm. Hearing Before the H. Comm. on Science, Space, and Tech.*, 117th Cong. (2022), <https://science.house.gov/2022/12/full-committee-hearing-building-a-safer-antarctic-research-environment>

⁴ NAT’L SCIENCE FOUND., OFF. OF POLAR PROGRAMS, AND U.S. ANTARCTIC PROGRAM, *supra* note 2.

⁵ *Building a Safer Antarctic Research Environment Full Comm. Hearing Before the H. Comm. on Science, Space, and Tech.*, 117th Cong. 2 (2022) (Leidos Response to Questions for the Record). <https://science.house.gov/cache/files/8/a/8ad9885a-81b1-4c6f-a3db-6f7315efb360/6AD721B361FF743DA0641D3AAEC31F93.qfr-responses---leidos.pdf>

⁶ *Building a Safer Antarctic Research Environment Full Comm. Hearing Before the H. Comm. on Science, Space, and Tech.*, 117th Cong. 2 (2022) (Leidos Response to Questions for the Record). <https://science.house.gov/cache/files/8/a/8ad9885a-81b1-4c6f-a3db-6f7315efb360/6AD721B361FF743DA0641D3AAEC31F93.qfr-responses---leidos.pdf>

⁷ *Building a Safer Antarctic Research Environment Full Comm. Hearing Before the H. Comm. on Science, Space, and Tech.*, 117th Cong. 2 (2022) (NSF Response to Questions for the Record), [EFF289FEFB1FA103F531C5F145906171.qfr-responses---marrongelle.pdf](https://science.house.gov/cache/files/8/a/8ad9885a-81b1-4c6f-a3db-6f7315efb360/6AD721B361FF743DA0641D3AAEC31F93.qfr-responses---marrongelle.pdf) (house.gov).

⁸ U.S. House Science, Space, and Technology Committee, Letter from Chairman Lucas and Ranking Member Lofgren to Roger Krone, May 1, 2023, https://democrats-science.house.gov/imo/media/doc/lofgren_lucas_letter_to_leidos.pdf

⁹ See Leidos Response to U.S. House Science, Space, and Technology Committee letter from Chairman Lucas and Ranking Member Lofgren, May 12, 2023; compared to *Building a Safer Antarctic Research Environment Full Comm. Hearing Before the H. Comm. on Science, Space, and Tech.*, 117th Cong. 2 (2022) (Leidos Response to Questions for the Record). <https://science.house.gov/cache/files/8/a/8ad9885a-81b1-4c6f-a3db-6f7315efb360/6AD721B361FF743DA0641D3AAEC31F93.qfr-responses---leidos.pdf>

related to sexual harassment and assault. Of these allegations, four allegations are related to sexual assault and 19 allegations are relation to sexual harassment.¹⁰

- In response to then-Chairwoman Johnson’s QFRs to NSF from the December 6, 2022, hearing, Dr. Marrongelle responded, “Over the past five years, there have been eight total harassment and sexual assault incidents reported to NSF.”¹¹ Dr. Marrongelle also responded, “Since 2018, OECR has received nine complaints or communications on inappropriate sexual behavior or actions in the USAP program.”¹²

These discrepancies – and the Committee’s awareness of multiple allegations of assault involving USAP employees – raise questions about the sufficiency of communication among Leidos, its subcontractors, and NSF, and has called into question the accuracy of information the Committee has received on these matters.

The NSF is the agency of authority and is ultimately responsible for establishing clear expectations and holding their contractors accountable for the culture they foster within the USAP.¹³ It appears that the agency is failing to adequately conduct oversight of how Leidos and its subcontractors handle reports and investigations of sexual assault and harassment. Specifically, it seems that NSF has not demanded transparency into the policies and procedures contractors follow when they receive reports of sexual harassment and assault. Worse, since learning of these issues, NSF does not appear to have implemented the significant changes necessary to adjust and inspire confidence in all the employees on the ice.

In the months since receiving the Leidos response letter, the Committee staff has had the opportunity to gather documentation and speak with many individuals whose accounts of their experiences are markedly different from the description of events provided by Leidos and NSF. In addition to the aforementioned discrepancy between NSF’s and Leidos’ reported numbers of sexual assault, these conversations with witnesses have brought to light further mischaracterizations of self-initiated statements, alarming and unprofessional responses from human resource personnel, and failures to engage and inform the relevant parties during an ongoing investigation. These conversations raised serious concerns as to NSF’s commitment to conducting appropriate oversight of their contractors’ and subcontractors’ purported investigations of sexual assault and harassment. The Committee asks for the continued cooperation of Leidos and

¹⁰ See Leidos Response to U.S. House Science, Space, and Technology Committee letter from Chairman Lucas and Ranking Member Lofgren, May 12, 2023; compared to *Building a Safer Antarctic Research Environment Full Comm. Hearing Before the H. Comm. on Science, Space, and Tech.*, 117th Cong. 2 (2022) (Leidos Response to Questions for the Record).

<https://science.house.gov/cache/files/8/a/8ad9885a-81b1-4c6f-a3db-6f7315efb360/6AD721B361FF743DA0641D3AAEC31F93.qfr-responses---leidos.pdf>

¹¹ *Building a Safer Antarctic Research Environment Full Comm. Hearing Before the H. Comm. on Science, Space, and Tech.*, 117th Cong. 2 (2022) (NSF Response to Questions for the Record), [FFF289FEFB1FA103F531C5F145906171.qfr-responses---marrongelle.pdf](https://www.house.gov/imo/media/doc/FFF289FEFB1FA103F531C5F145906171.qfr-responses---marrongelle.pdf) (house.gov).

¹² *Building a Safer Antarctic Research Environment Full Comm. Hearing Before the H. Comm. on Science, Space, and Tech.*, 117th Cong. 2 (2022) (NSF Response to Questions for the Record), [FFF289FEFB1FA103F531C5F145906171.qfr-responses---marrongelle.pdf](https://www.house.gov/imo/media/doc/FFF289FEFB1FA103F531C5F145906171.qfr-responses---marrongelle.pdf) (house.gov).

¹³ THE WHITE HOUSE, PRESIDENT’S MEMORANDUM REGARDING ANTARCTICA, MEMORANDUM 6646, FEB. 5, 1982, https://www.nsf.gov/geo/opp/ant/memo_6646.jsp

its subcontractors as we continue our investigation into the policies and procedures for handling reports of sexual misconduct in the USAP.

The apparent inadequacy of these investigations and others ultimately falls to the NSF for failing to conduct sufficient oversight of its contractors and subcontractors and not requiring them to meet expectations. In accounts of these reports by both Leidos and the witnesses, NSF's involvement in the investigations appears to be entirely absent. Leidos and the subcontractors seem to be conducting what they claim are "investigations" without being held to any standards by the agency of authority. Our conversations have also shown, when criminal acts have been alleged, the NSF employees on the ground in Antarctica charged with law enforcement activities have skirted their responsibility. As the Committee continues our investigation, we hope to better understand NSF's actual role and why witnesses have described a lack of NSF involvement in investigating their reports and keeping them safe.

The Committee continues to correspond with these individuals and others who have expressed serious concerns with the management of the USAP. In these discussions, individuals expressed concerns related to the lack of safety accommodations individuals are provided after reporting incidents of sexual assault or harassment. The Committee heard accounts that management has not valued or prioritized the safety of individuals who have come forward with claims of assault or harassment. Some individuals were so fearful for their safety that they felt the need to carry a weapon. Others have shared their disappointment with the lack of resources for separating aggressors from their victims; instead, management would recommend the victim self-isolate or leave Antarctica as the only viable option for maintaining their safety. These allegations call into question whether NSF and its contractors handle these reports with the seriousness they deserve.

From the testimonies provided, it appears the lack of priority given to these safety concerns by USAP leadership has contributed to the distrust of management and further deterred reporting. This concern is shared by the Committee, which heard from Dr. Marrongelle at the December 2022, hearing that physical safety measures would be enhanced by installing peepholes on dormitory room doors, requiring security clearances for those who have access to master keys, and increasing the availability of satellite phones. These proposed solutions are an inadequate response to the concerns raised by current and former USAP participants; especially when witnesses report incidents of assault and harassment repeatedly occurring during work hours or in community spaces. Furthermore, individuals who deployed in the years immediately preceding the SAHPR report publication informed the Committee that a number of these dormitory improvement measures were already underway before the report had been initiated. Yet, these improvements are often touted by NSF as an adequate response to the issues identified in the SAHPR report.

NSF has also pointed to the alcohol policy as a lever for positive change and recently updated the policy to only allow the sale of non-alcoholic beverages at the bars. To be clear, the Committee rejects the idea that sexual assault and harassment within the USAP can be meaningfully addressed through these policies. Alcohol must not be used as a scapegoat. Furthermore, alcohol is still available for purchase, and all who wish to consume it will no longer have a sober bartender monitoring their consumption and preventing over serving. It is extremely

disappointing that NSF repeatedly emphasizes infrastructural and alcohol-related changes to the Committee and the National Science Board while, in the Committee's view, giving far less attention to the deeper, more complex cultural issues highlighted in the SAHPR report.

The intent of the Committee's investigation is to fully understand the extent of the issues in the USAP, and we are prepared to take the necessary actions to mitigate these problems. As such, the Committee is aware of the retention schedule¹⁴ established by NSF under the Federal Records Act¹⁵ and requests that the agency refrain from the destruction of, and provide any, documents related to the incident reports and investigations included in the Leidos response letter sent to the Committee on May 12, 2023. We seek your answers to the following questions no later than December 6, 2023.

Document Requests:

1. The Committee requests all email correspondence, reports, and any other documentation related to allegations of sexual harassment and assault within the USAP in the time period covered in Dr. Marrongelle's QFR responses from the December 6, 2022, hearing and all allegations since.
2. The Committee requests any and all documents that have been provided to any requesters via the Freedom of Information Act pertaining to the USAP.
3. The Committee requests the Annual Performance Reviews (APRs) for Leidos since they assumed the contract, as well as any instructions or templates provided to the ASC relating to the APR, self-evaluations, or other factors that go into NSF's evaluation of the ASC's performance.
4. The Committee requests the current sexual assault and sexual harassment training materials and procedures required for NSF and its contractors within the USAP.
5. The Committee requests any sexual assault and harassment prevention and reporting materials provided by NSF to USAP participants over the last 5 years to communicate standards of conduct and reporting mechanisms.
6. The Committee requests any sexual assault and harassment prevention and reporting materials provided to USAP participants by any other entity – including the contractor and subcontractors – that NSF has in its possession from the last 5 years.
7. The Committee requests all Incident Reports and quarterly summary reports submitted by Leidos from August 2016 to present.

¹⁴ National Science Foundation, Records Retention Schedule, October 31, 2023, <https://www.nsf.gov/policies/records/retention-schedule.jsp>

¹⁵ FEDERAL RECORDS ACT, 44 U.S.C. CHAPTER 31, MANAGEMENT BY FEDERAL AGENCIES.

8. The Committee requests all ASC contract modifications that have been implemented since the publication of the SAHPR report in June 2022, as well as confirmation that all entities within the ASC have approved these modifications.

Leidos May 12 Response Letter: Attached to this letter is a letter from Leidos to the Committee, dated May 12, 2023, sent in response to the Committee's request that Leidos correct the misstatements made by Ms. Naeher at the December hearing. The following questions refer to the information contained in that letter.

9. In Leidos's response to question 6 on page 5 of the May 12 Leidos response letter, Leidos mentions that they would be willing to share with NSF the names of the individuals that have been banned due to termination for sexual harassment or assault. They also informed the Committee that they are now screening ASC applicants and determining they are ineligible for deployment if they have been disciplined for sexual harassment or assault within the last three years.
 - a. Does NSF conduct a screening process of NSF applicants to determine if they have been disciplined for sexual assault or harassment?
 - b. Has NSF asked Leidos for the list of employees who have been disciplined for sexual assault and/or harassment or have been terminated and deemed ineligible for rehire, or has Leidos otherwise provided it to NSF since May 12, 2023?
 - c. NSF has previously informed the Committee that receipt of this list may elicit debarment issues. Please explain the legal concerns that NSF has with the exchange of individuals who have been deemed ineligible for rehire between the agency and the contractors. Please also provide any documentation to support this perspective.
 - d. How does NSF track the NSF employees that have received a 3-year rehire ban pursuant to NSF policies and ensure they are not hired by Leidos, a subcontractor, or any other entity?
10. In the oversight responses that are detailed on page 7 of the May 12 Leidos response letter, Leidos describes the monthly meetings between their management and human resources representatives of the subcontractors to review each reported incident and the associated resolution. Is NSF involved in these meetings?
 - a. Does NSF get updates from these weekly meetings?
 - b. Is NSF aware of the changes made to the HR reporting policies that Leidos claims have been made?

11. In the incident that was reported in 2019 and discussed on page 2 of the Leidos response letter, Leidos stated that the claim was unsubstantiated. Was NSF aware of this determination and notified as to how Leidos made this decision?
 - a. Does NSF know what procedures were followed in this investigation?
 - b. How engaged and involved was NSF in this investigation?
 - c. At what point was NSF notified of this incident?
 - d. Did NSF review the findings of the investigation and reach the same conclusion?
 - e. Does NSF verify the conclusions of investigations conducted by contractors and subcontractors or simply accept that the contractor process was followed?
 - f. What documentation was reviewed to reach this determination? Please provide all evidence to validate this determination.
 - g. Did NSF agree the claim was unsubstantiated?
 - h. What steps were taken to address the concerns of the community regarding the claims of retaliation for the filing of a report?

Sexual Assault/Harassment Procedures:

12. Please describe how the sexual assault and sexual harassment report procedures changed following the release of the Sexual Assault/Harassment Prevention and Response (SAHPR) report.
13. What were the sexual assault and sexual harassment resources available to individuals within the USAP before and after the SAHPR report?
14. What communications regarding the legal remedies available to victims of sexual assault and harassment are provided to individuals on the ice? Please provide copies of these resources to the Committee.
15. Are all available resources for sexual assault and harassment provided to employees through the onboarding and deployment training sessions?
 - a. If there are other methods and instances of communication to the contractor, subcontractors, and USAP employees, what are they?
 - b. Are the contractor and subcontractors required to communicate the available resources for sexual assault and harassment, or do all communications come from NSF?

- c. How is NSF ensuring the availability of resources to individuals in the USAP?
 - d. How are these documents and resources made available after the training?
16. Does NSF have procedures in place for when reports are filed against NSF employees within the USAP?
- a. Do these procedures and policies differ from those that are in place for contractors and subcontractors?
 - b. When reports of sexual assault or harassment are made against NSF employees, what is the investigations process?
 - c. Does NSF conduct their own investigations of reports of incidents from the contractors or do they fully rely on the processes followed by the contractors?
 - d. Does NSF have authority over the investigative processes that are conducted by the contractors and subcontractors? Does NSF provide standards, guidelines, or procedures for contractors and subcontractors to follow when they conduct investigations of reports of sexual harassment or assault within the USAP?
17. In what circumstances does NSF refer reports of sexual harassment, assault, stalking, or other issues to the Department of Labor, law enforcement, Department of Justice, or any other third-party government entity?
18. Has NSF conducted any further climate studies since the sending of this letter?
- a. If so, please provide the surveys and their results.
 - b. Does NSF intend to continue to conduct climate surveys? If so, how often?
 - c. How does NSF plan to utilize climate surveys and other tools to measure and track the climate within the USAP?
 - d. Will former USAP participants be allowed to participate in the climate surveys? Please provide a list of the populations who will be offered the opportunity to participate.
19. Since the publication of the SAHPR report, what interviews, listening sessions, and meetings has NSF had with stakeholders including Leidos, subcontractors, and current and former USAP participants in order to address the failings identified in the report and improve SAHPR-related policies and procedures?

- a. The Committee is not requesting the names of any former USAP participants or any non-leadership-level current USAP participants but requests a description of the stakeholder groups consulted.
- b. Does NSF Plan to continue to hold the listening sessions with or without management?

Contracting Authority/ Transparency:

20. How does NSF communicate the changes in procedures and policies to the prime contractor?
 - a. Does NSF facilitate or require the communication of these changes in procedures and policies from the prime contractor to the subcontractors?
 - b. Are there mechanisms in place for when the subcontractors or the prime contractor fail to meet and follow these requirements?
21. To what extent does NSF have the authority to require contractors and subcontractors to abide by procedures and policies for the handling and investigation of reports?
22. What are the current background check requirements and processes of approval that NSF employs?
 - a. How are these requirements communicated to applicants to the USAP?
 - b. How have these policies and procedures changed in the last 10 years?
 - c. Do the background check requirements differ between NSF employees and ASC workers in Antarctica?
 - d. Can NSF contractually require Leidos to include these standards for employment in their hiring processes?
 - e. If so, why has NSF failed to include these requirements in the previous contract with the prime contractor?
23. Is each subcontractor responsible for their own investigation into reports of sexual assault or harassment?
 - a. The Committee has heard allegations that prior to the SAHPR report, Leidos rarely communicated to NSF regarding these investigations outside of notification that someone was being removed from the USAP. Is this correct?

24. How is NSF supporting the increased role of the OIG this season, and how will the agency continue to support the OIG's work as a third-party investigator of sexual assault reports within the USAP?
25. The Committee has received various accounts of individuals who were alleged or found to be "in violation of the Polar Code of Conduct." Please provide clarification related to the following:
- a. What standard of review is being applied in the determination of a violation of the Polar Code of Conduct?
 - b. Who determines violations of the Polar Code of Conduct?
 - c. What is the process for reporting an alleged violation of the Polar Code of Conduct?
 - d. What are the consequences for violation of the Polar Code of Conduct?
 - e. How is this communicated to the contractor and subcontractor employees?
26. What safeguards does NSF employ to prevent retaliation based on reporting history, an issue that was brought up in the SAHPR report?
- a. Does NSF have visibility into contractor and subcontractor seasonal hiring? How much oversight does NSF have and exercise over the hiring and firing practices of Leidos and its subcontractors?
 - b. Does NSF allow for contractors and subcontractors to consider the reporting history of individuals when considering contract renewals?
 - c. Are considerations and criteria used in re-hiring individuals who have already been deployed different from the criteria considered for new employees?
 - d. Has NSF considered implementing revisions to the hiring processes utilized by the prime contractor and subcontractors?

NSF Station Manager/ Fire Department:

27. It is our understanding that the USAP has a Station Manager based out of the McMurdo facility who is an NSF employee. This individual doubles as a Special Deputy Marshal and operates as the sole law enforcement presence on the Ice during both seasons. What are the responsibilities of this individual as NSF Station Manager and then as Special Deputy Marshal? What responsibilities does the NSF Station Manager have in the process of receiving and investigating reports of sexual assault or harassment?

28. What training is required of the NSF Station Manager? Please identify any required training that relates to the Station Manager's responsibilities in SAHPR-related and criminal matters.
 - a. Is this individual instructed by the Marshal Services on policies and procedures to address criminal issues within the USAP?
 - b. Who does this individual directly report to at the U.S. Marshal Service?
29. Can you please distinguish the responsibilities of the ASC Station Manager from the NSF Station Manager?
30. In briefings, NSF has told the Committee that the Antarctic Fire Department serves as the first responder in cases of sexual assault reported to the emergency dispatcher. What measures is NSF taking to ensure that these individuals are trained in the SAHPR-related responsibilities they have?

National Science Board Meeting:

31. What procedural changes are being made or considered on preventative measures other than the pre-deployment training?
32. Has NSF considered other avenues or consulted with the OIG on efforts that could be implemented to prevent these incidents from occurring? What methods of outreach is NSF pursuing to increase the workforce?
33. At the NSB meeting, NSF mentioned that there were ongoing discussions with other institutions about the findings drawn from the climate surveys and what they have found to be effective changes. What are these changes and how are they being implemented?
34. At the NSB meeting, NSF informed the Board that the USAP alcohol policies are changing as part of the overall policy updates in response to the SAHPR report. Please provide the updated policies and the reasoning and evidence for why these changes were made and the expected changes that these policy updates are expected to facilitate.
 - a. Can NSF explain how the removal of a third party (bartender) is helpful in preventing over-intoxication?
 - b. Are there concerns that removing the social, regulated spaces allowing alcohol consumption and moving all sanctioned alcohol consumption to the dorms will have negative impacts, such as increased isolation, overconsumption, or alcoholism?
 - c. If NSF considers alcohol consumption to be a contributing factor to sexual assault and harassment, is there concern that limiting sanctioned alcohol

consumption to dorm rooms may limit the ability for potential victims to have witnesses of poor behavior?

35. How has NSF increased the visibility of SAHPR-related resources since the publication of the report via the USAP webpage? Will NSF continue to increase the visibility of these resources, including on publicly accessible and frequently viewed web pages?
36. The Committee is concerned that there are insufficient mental health resources available to those in need while in such a harsh environment. What authority does NSF have to include counselors, psychiatrists, or mental health professionals as part of the on-ice medical team?
 - a. Can NSF require that all SAHPR employees on the ice and LDSS staffers be trained in some form of professional counseling in order to serve as a mental health resource in the USAP?
37. NSF provided the details of the infrastructure plans for the Antarctic Program in response to the personal safety concerns raised in the SAHPR Report. What is the current status of those projects, specifically the new lodging building?
 - a. There have been concerns raised regarding the location of the SAHPR advocate office. In the infrastructure plans, does NSF plan to address this concern raised by employees within the USAP?

Please consider this letter an official notice for NSF and all applicable contractors and subcontractors to preserve all documents related to these issues and any reports that are made going forward as they may be relevant and requested for submission. Please provide all documents requested and responses to the questions provided by December 6, 2023. Please expect further communication as we continue to investigate this matter. If you have any questions, please contact Victoria Lombardo of the Committee's Majority staff at (202) 225-6371 or Sara Palasits of the Committee's Minority staff at (202) 225-6375. Thank you for your time and consideration regarding this important matter.

Sincerely,



Frank Lucas
Chairman
House Committee on Science, Space,
and Technology



Zoe Lofgren
Ranking Member
House Committee on Science, Space,
and Technology

cc:

Allison C. Lerner, Inspector General, National Science Foundation
Thomas Bell, Chief Executive Officer, Leidos