

I am writing to express my strong opposition to the proposed changes to passport forms DS-11, DS-82, and DS-5504, which would require the inclusion of “biological sex at birth” in alignment with Executive Order “Defending Women from Gender Ideology Extremism and Restoring Biological Truth to the Federal Government.” These changes are unnecessary, discriminatory, and legally questionable. As a U.S. citizen, I find this policy not only deeply upsetting but also in direct opposition to the values of fairness, privacy, and efficiency that I expect from my government.

First and foremost, these changes violate existing legal precedents. In *Zzyym v. Blinken*, the U.S. District Court for the District of Colorado ruled against the Department of State for denying accurate gender markers on passports. This case made it clear that arbitrary restrictions on gender markers are unlawful. Moving forward with these revisions defies this legal ruling and invites further litigation, which will ultimately waste taxpayer money.

Furthermore, requiring a sex designation based on birth rather than gender identity serves no practical purpose in verifying a traveler’s identity. A passport exists to confirm a person's name, citizenship, date of birth, and place of origin is not a medical record. Border agents rely on biometric data such as facial recognition, fingerprints, and document verification, not a sex marker, to confirm identity. This change does not enhance national security; it only creates additional obstacles for travelers.

Beyond being unnecessary, these changes will actively harm trans, non-binary, and intersex individuals by increasing the likelihood of harassment, invasive security screenings, and even denial of travel. A transgender man who presents as male but is forced to carry a passport with an “F” marker will immediately be flagged, leading to confusion, delays, and potential mistreatment at security checkpoints. Similarly, women who do not conform to traditional gender norms whether transgender or not could face increased scrutiny, exposing them to invasive questioning and secondary screenings simply because their appearance does not match an outdated, government-imposed definition of gender.

This also directly conflicts with state-level policies. Many states have already enacted processes for changing gender markers on official IDs, often requiring physician verification or court orders. The federal government overriding these legally recognized gender designations undermines both state sovereignty and the rights of individuals who have already undergone extensive legal procedures to update their documentation.

Perhaps most frustratingly, this proposal represents a blatant waste of taxpayer dollars. Revising forms, updating databases, and training personnel to enforce this unnecessary policy will divert government resources away from actual national security concerns. This is nothing more than an ideologically motivated change with no benefit to efficiency or safety.

As a citizen, I want my government to focus on policies that improve lives, not ones that deliberately target marginalized communities. These revisions do nothing but add unnecessary hurdles to travel, expose individuals to harm, and put the Department of State at legal risk. If the executive branch is truly concerned about standardizing documentation, the most logical and fair approach would be to remove gender markers from passports entirely.

I urge the Department of State to reject these changes and uphold a passport system that prioritizes accuracy, privacy, and the dignity of all U.S. citizens.