

Whereas, on September 30, the USDA posted guidance on its website indicating that SNAP “has been provided with multi-year contingency funds that can be used for State Administrative Expenses to ensure that the State can also continue operations during a Federal Government shutdown” and that “[t]hese multi-year contingency funds are also available to fund participant benefits in the event that a lapse occurs in the middle of the fiscal year”;

Whereas, earlier in 2025, the Government Accountability Office explained that “SNAP is considered an appropriated entitlement, meaning that the government is legally required to make payments to those who meet the program requirements” and “USDA’s liability [extends to] the availability of appropriations for these payments”;

Whereas the Secretary of Agriculture has discretion under section 702(b) of the Department of Agriculture Organic Act of 1944 (7 U.S.C. 2257) to transfer funds within nutrition programs via interchange authority; and

Whereas, in October 2025, the Trump administration used its interchange authority to fund the Special Supplemental Nutrition Program for Women, Infants, and Children (WIC): Now, therefore, be it

Resolved, That it is the sense of the Senate that—

(1) the Trump administration is legally obligated to fund the supplemental nutrition assistance program (referred to in this resolution as “SNAP”) through the use of the contingency fund;

(2) the Trump administration has the legal authority and the funds to finance SNAP through the month of November;

(3) exercising this power is extremely important for the health and wellness of families experiencing hunger, including about 16,000,000 children, 8,000,000 seniors, 4,000,000 people with disabilities, and 1,200,000 veterans; and

(4) the administration should immediately exercise its legal authority to fund SNAP in November 2025.

AUTHORITY FOR COMMITTEE TO MEET

Mr. THUNE. Mr. President, I have one request for a committee to meet during today’s session of the Senate. It has the approval of the Majority and Minority Leaders.

Pursuant to rule XXVI, paragraph 5(a), of the Standing Rules of the Senate, the following committee was authorized to meet during today’s session of the Senate:

COMMITTEE ON AGRICULTURE, NUTRITION, AND FORESTRY

The Committee on Agriculture, Nutrition, and Forestry is authorized to meet during the session of the Senate on Monday, November 3, 2025, at 5:30 p.m., to conduct a business meeting.

PRIVILEGES OF THE FLOOR

Mr. MERKLEY. Mr. President, I ask unanimous consent to grant floor privileges to my interns for their shadow days on the following dates: Flora Xia on November 5, 2025; Nidhi Nair on November 20, 2025; and Maxwell Robben on December 4, 2025.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. Without objection.

ORDERS FOR TUESDAY, NOVEMBER 4, 2025

Mr. THUNE. Mr. President, I ask unanimous consent that when the Senate completes its business today, it stand adjourned until 10 a.m. on Tuesday, November 4, 2025; that following the prayer and pledge, the Journal of proceedings be approved to date, the morning hour be deemed expired, the time for the two leaders be reserved for their use later in the day, and the Senate be in a period of morning business, with Senators permitted to speak therein for up to 10 minutes each; and that the closure motion with respect to Calendar No. 168, H.R. 5371, ripen at 11:30 a.m.; further, that the Senate recess from 12:30 to 2:15 p.m. to allow for the weekly conference meetings; and that at 2:15 p.m., the Senate execute the order of October 30 in relation to the confirmation of the Dunlap nomination.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. Without objection, it is so ordered.

ORDER FOR ADJOURNMENT

Mr. THUNE. If there is no further business to come before the Senate, I ask that it stand adjourned following the remarks of Senator MERKLEY.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. Without objection, it is so ordered.

The Senator from Oregon.

UNANIMOUS CONSENT REQUEST

Mr. MERKLEY. Mr. President, President Trump has developed a new MAHA strategy. Instead of Make America Healthy Again, his new strategy is “Make America Hungry Agenda.” He is weaponizing food against America’s most vulnerable families. In my State of Oregon, that means cutting off food to 757,000 people, including 210,000 children and 130,000 seniors.

Now, when you think about these numbers, they are hard to envision, but Oregon is roughly 300 miles from the northern border to the southern border. I-5 runs the entire length of the State. So if all of those individuals were lined up on the highway, they would be just 2 feet apart for 300 miles, and every third person, approximately, would be a child. That is the level of impact we are talking about.

You know, when children go without food, the impact is pretty significant. There is the impact on their physical development. There is the impact on their mental development. And, of course, if you are hungry, you can’t learn a damn thing in school—so three ways of really hurting America’s children, millions of American children.

Congress together, Democrats and Republicans, said this should never happen. The House and the Senate together said this should never happen. So together we created two tools. The first tool is the SNAP contingency fund meant to ensure that families can keep putting food on the table. The

second tool is interchange authority that allows the Secretary of Agriculture to use tariff funds to supplement the contingency fund.

Back in September, USDA’s—the U.S. Department of Agriculture—website noted that it planned to use the contingency funds in order to make sure that SNAP was delivered in November, but then in October, last month, it deleted that language, and the President said: My hands are tied. America’s most vulnerable families must go hungry.

Well, now we know that the administration certainly was well aware of the contingency fund because it was on their website, and we know that the Department of Agriculture is well aware of its ability to use the interchange to transfer funds from a program that would enable it to provide the full SNAP benefits in the month of November. In fact, it just used this interchange recently in both October and November for the WIC Program.

Right now, section 32 funds—there is \$23 billion in there. So just one-fifth of those funds would enable the full November SNAP funds to be distributed.

Last week, I saw a speech by MIKE JOHNSON, the Speaker of the House, on television, and he was saying that Republicans are not going to provide SNAP funds because it would reduce pressure on Democrats to reopen the government. In other words, the Speaker of the House was saying that America’s families, the most vulnerable families—the health and welfare of children, seniors, the most vulnerable adults—that they are just bargaining chips.

Well, let me tell you, our vulnerable families are not bargaining chips. Basic food for children is not a bargaining chip. So we are here to say: Hell no. It is not acceptable to use children and the most vulnerable as bargaining chips.

That is why 25 States and the District of Columbia filed a suit against the U.S. Department of Agriculture to say that it is illegal to stop funding SNAP. On Friday of last week, two judges agreed in two different jurisdictions—in Massachusetts and in Rhode Island—and they said to the Trump administration: You must proceed to fund SNAP. The contingency fund is there for that purpose, and you have other funds to enable, through the interchange, to provide the full amount in November.

Both are needed, because there is about \$4.65 billion, we are told, left in the contingency fund, but SNAP, in a single month, can be \$8 to \$9 billion. So that second tool is essential. And, again, there is \$23 billion in there waiting to be used. So there is absolutely no reason not to fund the full SNAP benefits for the month of November.

But then the administration responded to the court, and they said: We are not going to do it. We will use the contingency funds, but we are not going to use the interchange authority.

We cannot fund—we choose not to fund the full benefits for November.

Well, this results in two problems. The first is that, instead of about \$6 a day—which is the standard, average SNAP benefit—it will be about \$3 a day. Well, \$3 a day isn't very much to feed any member of a family. But there is a second problem that is even worse, and this problem is that the U.S. Department of Agriculture said in a court document filed today—and I have it right here.

I ask unanimous consent that this court document be printed in the official RECORD, Mr. President.

There being no objection, the material was ordered to be printed in the RECORD, as follows:

IN THE UNITED STATES DISTRICT COURT FOR
THE DISTRICT OF RHODE ISLAND

[Rhode Island State Council of Churches, et al., Plaintiffs, v. Brooke Rollins, in her official capacity as Secretary of the United States Department of Agriculture, et al., Defendants.]

(No. 25-cv-00569-JJM-AEM)

SUPPLEMENTARY DECLARATION OF PATRICK A.
PENN

1. I am the Deputy Under Secretary of the Food, Nutrition, and Consumer Services (FNCS) at the United States Department of Agriculture (USDA). As part of my responsibilities, I oversee the FNCS programs including the Supplemental Nutrition Assistance Program (SNAP), which is administered by the Food and Nutrition Service (FNS) within FNCS. The statements made herein, which supplement my October 29, 2025, declaration made in *Commonwealth of Massachusetts, et al. v. USDA*, 1:25-cv-13165 (Penn Decl. Doc. No. 14-2), are based on my personal knowledge and information made available to me in the course of carrying out my official duties and responsibilities.

USE OF SNAP CONTINGENCY FUND FOR REDUCED
NOVEMBER BENEFITS

2. At the beginning of fiscal year 2026, FNS had \$6 billion in SNAP contingency funds. In October 2025, FNS used \$450 million from the contingency fund for SNAP State agencies' administrative expenses (SAE) and an additional \$300 million for the Nutrition Assistance Program (NAP) block grants for Puerto Rico and American Samoa.

3. Per orders issued by the United States District Courts for the Districts of Massachusetts and Rhode Island, FNS intends to deplete SNAP contingency funds completely and provide reduced SNAP benefits for November 2025.

4. Even in the absence of an appropriation, states must by law continue to accept applications and conduct eligibility determinations. 7 C.F.R. 271.7(e)(1). States also must incur necessary expenses to re-calculate and distribute benefits. Accordingly, states continue to incur SAE necessary to operate SNAP. For November, FNS will obligate \$450 million from the contingency fund for SAE, and an additional \$150 million for NAP in Puerto Rico and American Samoa (50% of the value of one month of each block grant).

5. The above will leave a total of \$4.65 billion in the contingency fund for November SNAP benefits that will all be obligated to cover 50% of eligible households' current allotments.

6. This means that no funds will remain for new SNAP applicants certified in November, disaster assistance, or as a cushion against the potential catastrophic consequences of shutting down SNAP entirely. See Penn Decl. Doc. No. 14-2 ¶ 21.

CONSIDERATION OF DIVERTING SECTION 32 CHILD
NUTRITION FUNDS OR OTHER FUNDS TO SNAP

7. In addition to routing the remaining SNAP contingency funds to partial November 2025 SNAP benefits, USDA has carefully considered tapping Section 32 funds that, pursuant to statute, were transferred to FNS to be used for Child Nutrition Programs. USDA would need at least \$4 billion from those Child Nutrition funds to provide full SNAP benefits instead of reduced benefits for the month of November.

8. USDA contemplated various factors including the statutory mandate evidencing clear Congressional intent that Section 32 funds transferred to FNS be used for Child Nutrition Programs (see 7 U.S.C. 612c-6(b)(1)), which are a group of programs that are distinct from SNAP in terms of legal authority, appropriations accounts, and operations. In addition, USDA considered the impact a transfer of the magnitude necessary to support SNAP would have on Child Nutrition Programs, the likelihood (or lack thereof) of Congress's ability to appropriate additional billions of dollars for Child Nutrition Programs for FY26 to make up the funding shortfall such an additional transfer would create, and the Courts' orders.

9. Ultimately, USDA has determined that Section 32 Child Nutrition Program funds must remain available to protect full operation of Child Nutrition Programs throughout the fiscal year, instead of being used for SNAP benefits. Section 32 Child Nutrition Program funds are not a contingency fund for SNAP. Using billions of dollars from Child Nutrition for SNAP would leave an unprecedented gap in Child Nutrition funding that Congress has never had to fill with annual appropriations, and USDA cannot predict what Congress will do under these circumstances.

10. The Child Nutrition Programs, which include the National School Lunch and Breakfast Programs, Summer Food Service Program, and Summer EBT (SUN Bucks), provide critical, nutritionally-balanced meals and food assistance benefits to millions of children every day. Through the National School Lunch Program alone, approximately 29 million children per day receive nutritionally balanced, low-cost or no-cost lunches.

11. Funding for Child Nutrition Programs derives primarily from two sources—annual appropriations and funds transferred from the Section 32 account, the latter of which constitutes the bulk of Child Nutrition Programs funding. See 7 U.S.C. 612c-6(b)(1).

12. Section 32 refers to a mandatory appropriation (7 U.S.C. 612c) that receives 30 percent of customs receipts on all imports from the prior calendar year. A large portion of those funds go to Child Nutrition Programs. See Penn Decl. Doc. No. 14-2 ¶ 30. To make them available for SNAP, USDA would need to execute its discretionary authority under 7 U.S.C. 2257. Much of the public discussion of Section 32 misunderstands the funding; Congress has designated uses for Section 32 funds that do not include SNAP, and Congress purposefully avoided keeping any remainder and/or unallocated Section 32 funds for general contingency purposes.

13. While Section 32 funds are essential to Child Nutrition Programs, they do not fully fund Child Nutrition Programs. Rather, Congress must fund the remainder through annual appropriations.

14. As an example of the dual funding streams for Child Nutrition Programs, in FY24, the total cost of Child Nutrition Programs was approximately \$33 billion. See Consolidated Appropriations Act, 2024, Pub. L. 118-42, 138 Stat. 25, 92 (Mar. 9, 2024). Roughly \$28.8 billion came from Section 32

funds and \$4.5 billion came from annual appropriations. For FY25, the total cost of Child Nutrition Programs was approximately \$32.4 billion, with \$22.4 billion coming from Section 32 funds and \$10 billion coming from annual appropriations.

15. For FY26, there is \$25.2 billion in Section 32 funds derived from customs receipts, and approximately \$23 billion was transferred to FNS for the Child Nutrition Programs. See 7 U.S.C. 612c-6(b)(1). Based on the FY26 USDA budget request, this would mean Congress must still appropriate at least \$13.2 billion for Child Nutrition Programs in FY26 for a total of \$36.27 billion.

16. However, using USDA's discretionary authority at 7 U.S.C. 2257 to transfer such a significant portion of Child Nutrition funds to "top off" SNAP contingency funds and issue full November SNAP allotments would leave Child Nutrition Programs, which feed no fewer than 29 million children, with an unprecedented and significant shortfall.

17. Under current law, another infusion of Section 32 tariff funds to Child Nutrition Programs will not occur until FY27. In other words, the \$4 billion removed from Child Nutrition Programs for one month of SNAP benefits would be a permanent loss to Child Nutrition Programs for the entirety of their annual operations in FY26.

18. If Congress were to pass an annual appropriations act or continuing resolution with usual terms and conditions, that \$4 billion gap would not be filled because Congress would not replenish the Section 32 portion with annual appropriations (again, the Section 32 transfer is funded annually with customs receipts).

19. To make Child Nutrition Programs whole for FY26, Congress would need to appropriate an additional \$4 billion in new budget authority. In other words, instead of Congress appropriating the estimated \$13.2 billion for Child Nutrition Programs in FY26, Congress would need to appropriate more than \$17.2 billion for Child Nutrition Programs to continue funding the Child Nutrition Programs at the level required to serve all eligible children. The pending continuing resolution makes no such additional appropriation.

20. While USDA transferred approximately \$300 million in October 2025 to support the Special Supplemental Nutrition Program for Women, Infants, and Children (WIC), there are key differences. For example, the magnitude of the amounts (\$300 million for WIC in October 2025 versus \$4 billion for SNAP) is a material consideration. While USDA believes there are sufficient funds in the Child Nutrition Programs to support WIC during these unprecedented circumstances, the agency does not believe the same is true for SNAP due to the significant differences between the amounts at issue.

21. USDA also believes a transfer of Child Nutrition Program funding to support SNAP would further stray from Congressional intent. While Congress has developed a statutory scheme for providing partial SNAP benefits and, according to the Courts, provided contingency funds at a level it has deemed sufficient, USDA would ignore those provisions while also threatening its ability to administer Child Nutrition Programs if it were to repurpose funds Congress explicitly intended be used only for Child Nutrition Programs. A much smaller transfer for WIC does not undermine performance of the Child Nutrition Programs and raises no such concerns.

22. Amid this no-win quandary and upon further consideration following the Courts' orders, USDA has determined that creating a shortfall in Child Nutrition Program funds to fund one month of SNAP benefits is an unacceptable risk, even considering the procedural difficulties with delivering a partial

November SNAP payment, because shifting \$4 billion dollars to America's SNAP population merely shifts the problem to millions of America's low income children that receive their meals at school.

23. The discretionary interchange authority at 7 U.S.C. 2257 allows transfers within the same "bureau, division, or office". SNAP, Child Nutrition Programs, and WIC are in the same "bureau, division, or office," namely FNCS. As explained, using Section 32 Child Nutrition Program funds jeopardizes those crucial programs, and WIC does not have funds to spare for SNAP. There are no other large blocks of funding—that is, funding not tied to yearly appropriations—within FNCS that could be used to supplement SNAP.

ACTIONS TO IMPLEMENT REDUCTION IN BENEFITS

24. There are procedural difficulties that States will likely experience which would affect November SNAP benefits reaching households in a timely manner and in the correctly reduced amounts. See Penn Decl. Doc. No. 14-2 ¶¶ 22-28.

25. Before States begin making the novel system changes to implement the benefit reductions, USDA must notify States of the effective date of the reduction and by what percentage maximum SNAP allotments are to be reduced. See 7 C.F.R. § 271.7(d)(1)(i) and (ii).

26. USDA is prepared to issue such notice and revised issuance tables to State agencies on November 3, 2025. States will rely on the issuance tables to calculate the benefits due to each eligible household in their respective States. To assist State agencies with the massive changes, USDA will have staff available for technical assistance.

27. As is required by Federal law, after receiving notice from FNS, State agencies must recode their eligibility systems to adjust for the reduced maximum allotments. See 7 C.F.R. 271.7(d)(1)(ii); 274.2(a). The resulting reduced benefits amounts for certified SNAP households will be sent to States' EBT processors in "issuance files." See Penn Decl. Doc. No. 14-2 ¶ 7, 24.

28. Given the variation among State systems, some of which are decades old, it is unclear how many States will complete the changes in an automated manner with minimal disruption versus manual overrides or computations that could lead to payment errors and significant delays. See Penn Decl. Doc. No. 14-2 ¶ 24.

29. For at least some States, USDA's understanding is that the system changes States must implement to provide the reduced benefit amounts will take anywhere from a few weeks to up to several months. See Penn Decl. Doc. No. 14-2 ¶ 25.

30. In addition to adjusting eligibility and benefit issuance files to accommodate the reduction, States must notify all SNAP households of the reduction, as well as handle any requests for fair hearings from SNAP households related to the reduction, See 7 C.F.R. 271.7(d)(4) and (f).

31. As noted above, USDA will issue the appropriate notice and issuance tables today to comply with the Court's order.

I declare under penalty of perjury that the foregoing is true and correct.

PATRICK A. PENN,

Deputy Under Secretary, Food Nutrition and Consumer Services, United States Department of Agriculture.

Mr. MERKLEY. Mr. President, this court document was filed today by Patrick Penn. He is the Deputy Under Secretary for Food, Nutrition, and Consumer Services at the Department of Agriculture. He says:

USDA's understanding is that the system changes States must implement to provide

the reduced benefit amounts will take from a few weeks to up to several months.

So here is the situation. The court said: Fund SNAP, and do it right away.

Today, the administration filed this document saying it will take weeks to months because they are choosing to fund only half, and everything has to be reprogrammed in the computer system to make that happen at the Federal level and for most States. That is not an acceptable strategy. That is going back to saying people are not going to get SNAP benefits in November.

You know, this resolution that I have tonight—it is very simple and expresses a number of thoughts that I have heard from both sides of the aisle. It is a sense of the Senate that the Trump administration is obligated to fund SNAP through the use of the contingency fund. And the courts have made that very clear.

Second, the administration has the authority and the funds to finance SNAP through the month of November, which we know because they have both the contingency fund and they have the interchange fund.

Third, exercising this power is extremely important to the health and wellness of families experiencing hunger, including about 16 million children, 8 million seniors, 4 million people with disabilities, and about 1.2 million veterans.

Finally, the administration should exercise its legal authority to fund SNAP in November.

Pretty simple. Pretty straightforward.

Mr. President, children, seniors, the disabled, the veterans, our most vulnerable families—they are not bargaining chips. It is simply wrong to treat them as bargaining chips. It is wrong to adopt a position in which they will not even get funded in November after the courts have said: Fund it.

There is enormous damage that is done when children are deprived of food—to their health, to their mental development, to their physical development, to their ability to learn in school. And, of course, there is damage done mentally and physically to all of the adults who are funded in this program.

Food deprivation is not a correct strategy for any government in the United States of America.

Trump's "Make America Hungry Again" agenda is wrong. It is immoral. There is just something that really seems like the United States is way off kilter when we have a President who is absolutely passionately excited about building a giant, golden ballroom worthy of Louis XIV to feast, to dine, and to dance with billionaires and power brokers of the world, while letting—in fact, forcing—America's children and vulnerable families to go hungry.

I thank Senator SCHUMER and the other 44 additional cosponsors who have joined this resolution. I invited

all 100 Senators to join it. The five points are certainly ones I have heard expressed on both sides of the aisle. Let's all together say: Fund SNAP, not weeks or months from now but right now, so America's families in every State—regardless of how they are represented in this Chamber—will benefit.

Mr. President, I ask unanimous consent that the Senate proceed to the immediate consideration of my resolution, which is at the desk; further, that the resolution be agreed to, the preamble be agreed to, and that the motions to reconsider be considered made and laid upon the table with no intervening action or debate.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. Is there objection?

The majority whip.

Mr. BARRASSO. Mr. President, reserving the right to object, this isn't lawmaking. This is a political stunt by the Democrats. The resolution they are offering is empty. It is meaningless.

Democrats shut down this government. Democrats have voted against reopening the government 13 times. Democrats are holding food assistance for 42 million Americans hostage, and they are going to do it again tomorrow. They are doing it tonight.

Democrats knew their actions threatened food assistance. They were fully aware of it. This was organized and orchestrated in CHUCK SCHUMER's office months in advance of the shutdown. The Department of Agriculture warned the Democrats weeks ago what was going to happen. The local newspapers around the country—as a matter of fact, a newspaper in the Senator's home State of Oregon reported:

Food is the first thing to go.

The Oregon paper went on to say:

Oregonians brace for SNAP delays if federal shutdown drags on.

And still, for 34 days, Democrats have voted time and time again to keep the government closed. If Democrats hadn't voted 13 times to shut down the government, there wouldn't be the lines we are seeing on television down and around the block at food banks and all around the country.

The Senator from Oregon talked about children, using people as pawns, as political pawns. That is exactly what the Democrat whip in the House had said. So, of course, there is going to be suffering. She said it gives them leverage. Senators in this body—Democrats—have said exactly the same thing.

The Democrats have continued to use people as pawns for political purposes, and it is wrong. It has to stop. If Democrats really wanted to help struggling families, they would stop blocking a clean continuing resolution.

The shutdown ends when Democrats end their dangerous political games. And it is a dangerous political game that even the Washington Post has pointed that out. You want to end the food assistance cliff? It is easy. Pass the clean, bipartisan continuing resolution. Democrats should vote for it immediately. Until then, the Schumer

shutdown is going to continue to hurt struggling families. Therefore, I object. The PRESIDING OFFICER. Objection is heard.

The Senator from Oregon.

Mr. MERKLEY. Mr. President, I had really hoped that given the five basic planks of this resolution, which had been expressed on both sides of the aisle, that we would have something other than arguments that sound like, I don't know, moldy bread, stale cheese; arguments we heard time and time again about a shutdown.

But my resolution and my remarks tonight didn't even mention the shutdown. Why is that? Because the shutdown is irrelevant as to whether or not the November SNAP payments are made. We have a contingency fund for that purpose. We created, Democrats and Republicans together, interchange authority for that purpose. There is more than \$23 billion sitting in that interchange fund, section 32, tariff funded.

The money is there. The legal authority is there. And this resolution simply says that failing to provide SNAP benefits hurts millions of people and encourages the President to do what the courts asked him to do—told him to do last Friday—provide the funds.

But the administration sneered at the court. They said we are going to adopt a strategy in which the funds may not get to people for weeks or months because we are going to do it in a fashion that requires a reprogram of computers across America.

Really?

There is only one desk that has the power to immediately make these funds available, and that is the desk in the Oval Office. Shouldn't we, representing the people in each of our States, come together in a bipartisan fashion to say that depriving people of food—the most vulnerable families of food—across America is simply wrong, Mr. President? I am speaking to President Trump. President Trump, you have the authority, you have the funds, you have the responsibility. Your “Make America Hungry Agenda,” your agenda of starving children and vulnerable families is wrong. Surely, that is something both Democrats and Republicans can agree on. Let's keep pressing for the President to get those funds to America's vulnerable families immediately.

ADJOURNMENT UNTIL 10 A.M. TOMORROW

The PRESIDING OFFICER. Under the previous order, the Senate stands adjourned until 10 a.m. tomorrow.

Thereupon, the Senate, at 6:35 p.m., adjourned until Tuesday, November 4, 2025, at 10 a.m.

NOMINATIONS

Executive nominations received by the Senate:

IN THE AIR FORCE

THE FOLLOWING NAMED OFFICER FOR APPOINTMENT TO THE GRADE INDICATED IN THE UNITED STATES AIR FORCE UNDER TITLE 10, U.S.C., SECTION 624:

To be colonel

KRISTEN D. SHADDEN

THE FOLLOWING NAMED OFFICER FOR APPOINTMENT TO THE GRADE INDICATED IN THE UNITED STATES AIR FORCE UNDER TITLE 10, U.S.C., SECTION 624:

To be major

ANA I.L. JACINTO

THE FOLLOWING NAMED OFFICER FOR APPOINTMENT TO THE GRADE INDICATED IN THE RESERVE OF THE AIR FORCE UNDER TITLE 10, U.S.C., SECTION 12203:

To be colonel

JOSHUA N. PAYNE

IN THE ARMY

THE FOLLOWING NAMED OFFICER FOR APPOINTMENT TO THE GRADE INDICATED IN THE RESERVE OF THE ARMY UNDER TITLE 10, U.S.C., SECTION 12203:

To be colonel

ELMO M. CLONCH

THE FOLLOWING NAMED OFFICER FOR APPOINTMENT TO THE GRADE INDICATED IN THE RESERVE OF THE ARMY UNDER TITLE 10, U.S.C., SECTION 12203:

To be colonel

ROBERT J. MILLER

THE FOLLOWING NAMED OFFICER FOR APPOINTMENT TO THE GRADE INDICATED IN THE UNITED STATES ARMY UNDER TITLE 10, U.S.C., SECTION 624:

To be lieutenant colonel

ERIC J. O'CONNOR

THE FOLLOWING NAMED OFFICER FOR APPOINTMENT TO THE GRADE INDICATED IN THE UNITED STATES ARMY UNDER TITLE 10, U.S.C., SECTION 624:

To be major

BRANDON S. WOOD

THE FOLLOWING NAMED OFFICERS FOR APPOINTMENT TO THE GRADE INDICATED IN THE UNITED STATES ARMY UNDER TITLE 10, U.S.C., SECTION 624:

To be major

MATTHEW L. ALTENBERG
COLIN J. CHARPENTIER
KYLE R. WEINERTH

THE FOLLOWING NAMED OFFICERS FOR APPOINTMENT TO THE GRADE INDICATED IN THE UNITED STATES ARMY UNDER TITLE 10, U.S.C., SECTION 624:

To be lieutenant colonel

GREGORY L. DAVIS
MATTHEW D. SHARP

THE FOLLOWING NAMED OFFICERS FOR APPOINTMENT TO THE GRADE INDICATED IN THE UNITED STATES ARMY UNDER TITLE 10, U.S.C., SECTION 624:

To be major

DUSTIN J. DREWRY
MARYNELL E. DWYER
JONATHAN D. PUGH
DAVID E. RAMIREZ

THE FOLLOWING NAMED OFFICER FOR APPOINTMENT TO THE GRADE INDICATED IN THE UNITED STATES ARMY AS A CHAPLAIN UNDER TITLE 10, U.S.C., SECTIONS 624 AND 7064:

To be major

BOLIVAR G. MOLINA

THE FOLLOWING NAMED OFFICERS FOR APPOINTMENT TO THE GRADE INDICATED IN THE UNITED STATES ARMY JUDGE ADVOCATE GENERAL'S CORPS UNDER TITLE 10, U.S.C., SECTIONS 624 AND 7064:

To be lieutenant colonel

BENJAMIN A. ACCINELLI
THOMAS J. AKACKI
DAVID N. ALLEN
ALAN E. BALLWEG
JOSEPH C. BORLAND
VOLARIA N. BROOKS
ROBERT C. BROSSETT
DEREK J. CARLSON
JOHN T. CASTLEN
ADAM E. CHOATE
SIMON CHUNG
MICHAEL A. COLUCCI
JOSEPH A. DEFLORIO
STEVEN J. DEAY
DEREK V. EICHHOLZ
DIMITRI J. FACAROS
PATRICK B. GARRY
TARA O. GOBLE
DUSTIN D. HARRISON
BRIAN K. HARTLEY
MEGAN A. HERRIFORD
ALANA R. HINES
PATRICK G. HOFFMAN
KENNETH D. JONES
RACHEL P. LARSON
DAVID C. MANGAN

HEATHER M. MARTIN
RYAN M. MCCORMICK
MICHAEL K. MEDICI
JOSHUA S. MIKKELSEN
NICHOLAS D. MORJAL
JOSEPH A. MORMAN
JERICA M. MORRISFRAZIER
BRYANT C. MORRISON
BRUCE A. NESSLER, JR.
DANA D. NEUMANN
SARA J. NICHOLSON
TIMOTHY R. OLLIGES
BRADLEY N. OLSEN
JONATHAN S. PATTON
DANIEL D. RAY
MARK T. ROBINSON
VIVEK M. SHAH
JUSTIN L. TALLEY
NHU THI T. TRAN
UILISONE F. TUA
AMBER L. TURNER
NICOLE M. VENIOUS
ROBERT E. WALD
RACHEL L. WALKUP
CLIFFORD C. WALTERS
JEREMY S. WATFORD
EARL M. WILSON
MICHAEL J. WOOD
PATRICK S. WOOD
0002572958

THE FOLLOWING NAMED ARMY NATIONAL GUARD OF THE UNITED STATES OFFICERS FOR APPOINTMENT TO THE GRADE INDICATED IN THE RESERVE OF THE ARMY UNDER TITLE 10, U.S.C., SECTIONS 12203 AND 12211:

To be colonel

GARY L. BARR
JONATHAN I. GERSON
ELLIS C. MONK
CHRISTOPHER D. REBER
JOHN B. ROACHE
HARRY R. WILLE III

THE FOLLOWING NAMED ARMY NATIONAL GUARD OF THE UNITED STATES OFFICERS FOR APPOINTMENT TO THE GRADE INDICATED IN THE RESERVE OF THE ARMY UNDER TITLE 10, U.S.C., SECTIONS 12203 AND 12211:

To be colonel

VINCENTANTHONY S. GUERRERO
ANTHONY T. SEVIER

IN THE MARINE CORPS

THE FOLLOWING NAMED OFFICER FOR APPOINTMENT TO THE GRADE INDICATED IN THE UNITED STATES MARINE CORPS UNDER TITLE 10, U.S.C., SECTION 624:

To be lieutenant colonel

STEPHANIE N. SOKOL

THE FOLLOWING NAMED OFFICERS FOR APPOINTMENT TO THE GRADE INDICATED IN THE UNITED STATES MARINE CORPS UNDER TITLE 10, U.S.C., SECTION 624:

To be major

LUCAS H. AARON
TYLER M. ABBOTT
GREGORY L. ADAMIEC
JOSEPH T. ADAMS
GARETT W. ADCOCK
TIMOTHY C. ADDISON
WESTLEY J. ADELMAN
DENNIS T. ADORNO
CHRISTOPHER C. AFFANNATO
GAURAV AGGARWAL
JOSEPH D. AIELLO
ERIN M. AITCHESON
ELADNA L. ALCOCER
ROBERTO E. ALDAMA
BRANDON M. ALDRED
MARY E. ALDRED
JAMES M. ALEXANDER
MIKAL S. ALI
WILLIAM D. ALLEN
SAMMI T. ALMASRI
CHRISTOS M. ALMEIDA
DIEGO A. ALVAREZ
STEVEN P. ALVES II
JONATHAN T. AMMEN
JUDE H. AMPOLINI
AUSTIN L. ANDERSON
RHAVEAN D. ANDERSON
ZACHARY F. ANDERSON
JOSHUA M. ANDREWS
PHILIP N. ANKLESARIA
DOMINIC V. ANXO
KENDRA S. APPLEBY
SHANE A. ARENA
NICHOLAS C. ARIAS
CAMERON C. ARTHUR
JULIA L. ARTHUR
CRUZ C. ASHE
JONATHAN E. ASHEIM
ROY S. AXCELLMCKEEVER
JERRY L. AXTELL III
ERIK AYALLA
ALAN J. BABINEC
EDNA N. BACKMAN
EDWARD G. BAILEY III
SHEA Y. BAKER
SHAWN R. BALENT
TANNER S. BARNES
JESSICA L. BARNES
ADAM T. BARRETT
EVAN R. BARRETT
JESUS E. BARRIOS