

September 22, 2025

Rachel Morgan
Chief, Victimization Statistics Unit
Bureau of Justice Statistics
999 N Capitol Street NE
Washington, DC 20531
Submitted via email to: BJSPRA.Comments@ojp.usdoj.gov

Re: Agency Information Collection Activities; Proposed eCollection eComments Requested; Revision of a Currently Approved Collection: National Crime Victimization Survey (NCVS) [OMB Control No. 1121-0111]

Dear Chief Morgan,

Thank you for the opportunity to comment on the Bureau of Justice Statistics (“BJS”)’s proposed changes to the National Crime Victimization Survey (“NCVS”). *See* 90 Fed. Reg. 34,884 (July 24, 2025). We submit this comment in opposition to changes that have been made to the collection which will undermine its utility in studying patterns of victimization among transgender people.

The undersigned are scholars affiliated with the Williams Institute at the UCLA School of Law. The Williams Institute is dedicated to conducting rigorous and independent research on sexual orientation and gender identity (“SOGI”), including on the demographics and experiences of lesbian, gay, bisexual, and transgender (“LGBT”) people. The Williams Institute collects and analyzes original data, as well as analyzes governmental and private data, and has long worked with federal agencies to improve data collection on the U.S. population. These efforts include producing widely cited best practices for the collection of SOGI information on population-based surveys.¹

Scholars affiliated with the Williams Institute have long relied upon data from the NCVS to study experiences of crime and victimization among LGBT and non-LGBT community members.² We have previously submitted comments about the importance of including SOGI

¹ *See, e.g.*, GENDER IDENTITY IN U.S. SURVEILLANCE (GENIUSS) GROUP, WILLIAMS INST., BEST PRACTICES FOR ASKING QUESTIONS TO IDENTIFY TRANSGENDER AND OTHER GENDER MINORITY RESPONDENTS ON POPULATION-BASED SURVEYS (2014), <https://williamsinstitute.law.ucla.edu/wp-content/uploads/Survey-Measures-Trans-GenIUSS-Sep-2014.pdf>; SEXUAL MINORITY ASSESSMENT RESEARCH TEAM (SMART), WILLIAMS INST., BEST PRACTICES FOR ASKING QUESTIONS ABOUT SEXUAL ORIENTATION ON SURVEYS (2009), <https://williamsinstitute.law.ucla.edu/wp-content/uploads/Best-Practices-SO-Surveys-Nov-2009.pdf>.

² *See, e.g.* Andrew R. Flores, et al., *Victimization Rates and Traits of Sexual and Gender Minorities in the United States: Results from the National Crime Victimization Survey, 2017*, 6 SCIENCE ADVANCES 2375 (2020); ILAN H. MEYER & ANDREW R. FLORES, WILLIAMS INST., ANTI-LGBT VICTIMIZATION IN THE UNITED STATES: RESULTS FROM

questions on the NCVS in 2018 (regarding the proposed removal of the measures for 16- and 17-year-olds)³ and 2021 (commenting on the reinstatement of SOGI measures for 16-and 17-year-olds).⁴ We have also publicly opposed and produced a fact sheet about the impact of removing SO and GI questions from federal surveys in general, with emphasis on the particular importance of GI-inclusive NCVS data.⁵ We submit this comment to reiterate the importance of including gender identity measures on the NCVS.

I. The NCVS is a Vital Resource for Understanding the Impact of Crime

The NCVS “is the nation's primary source of information on criminal victimization.”⁶ Each year, data are obtained from a nationally representative sample of about 240,000 persons in about 150,000 households regarding demographics, a wide range of crimes, and characteristics of victimization incidents.⁷ The NCVS is an important complement to the UCR, the other national crime statistics dataset. The NCVS was developed specifically “to provide previously unavailable information about crime (including crime not reported to police), victims, and offenders.”⁸ The NCVS is particularly important for understanding victimization that is not reported to police: NCVS data has shown that close to 50% of incidents are not reported to police, with even higher likelihood of non-reporting among people of color compared to white victims.⁹

The NCVS plays an important role for law enforcement because it aids BJS in meeting its statutory requirement to document hate crimes, including crimes motivated by gender identity. The James Byrd/Matthew Shepard Hate Crimes Prevention Act (“HCPA”) was passed in 2009 and expanded the definition in preexisting hate crimes law to include gender/gender identity and sexual orientation.¹⁰ As a component of the HCPA, the 1990 Hate Crimes Statistics Act was also

THE NATIONAL CRIME VICTIMIZATION SURVEY (2025), <https://williamsinstitute.law.ucla.edu/publications/anti-lgbt-victimization-us/>; Andrew R. Flores, et al., *Gender Identity Disparities in Criminal Victimization: National Crime Victimization Survey, 2017–2018*, 111 AM. J. PUBL. HEALTH 726 (2021).

³ Williams Institute Scholars, Public Comment: National Crime Victimization Survey (83 Fed. Reg. 15624) (May 11, 2018), <https://williamsinstitute.law.ucla.edu/wp-content/uploads/Comment-NCVS-May-2018.pdf>.

⁴ Williams Institute Scholars, Public Comment: Agency Information Collection Activities: Proposed eCollection eComments Requested; Extension of a Currently Approved Collection; Comments Requested: National Crime Victimization Survey (NCVS) [OMB No. 1121-0111] (October 20, 2021), <https://williamsinstitute.law.ucla.edu/wp-content/uploads/Comment-NCVS-Reinstatement-Oct-2021.pdf>.

⁵ ILAN H. MEYER & LAUREN J. BOUTON, WILLIAMS INST., IMPACT OF EXECUTIVE ORDERS ON ACCESS TO FEDERAL DATA (Feb. 2025), <https://williamsinstitute.law.ucla.edu/publications/access-federal-lgbt-data/>.

⁶ *National Crime Victim Survey*, BUREAU OF JUST. SERV., <https://bjs.ojp.gov/data-collection/ncvs> (last visited Sept. 19, 2025).

⁷ *Id.*

⁸ *The Nation's Two Crime Measures*, FED. BUREAU OF INVESTIGATION, https://ucr.fbi.gov/crime-in-the-u.s/2013/crime-in-the-u.s.-2013/resource-pages/nations-two-crime-measures/nations_two_crime_measures (last visited Sept. 22, 2025).

⁹ Andrew R. Flores, et al., *Violent Victimization at the Intersections of Sexual Orientation, Gender Identity, and Race: National Crime Victimization Survey, 2017–2019*, 18 PLOS ONE e0281641(2023).

¹⁰ Matthew Shepard and James Byrd, Jr. Hate Crimes Prevention Act, Pub. L. No. 111-84, Div. E. (2009); 18 U.S.C. § 249 (a)(2).

amended to require that law enforcement officials collect and report data on anti-transgender hate violence to the Federal Bureau of Investigation (“FBI”).¹¹ These data are directly reported through the FBI’s Uniform Crime Reporting System.¹² However, FBI data are not complete because accuracy is dependent upon: (1) victims choosing to report such incidents; (2) law enforcement entities accurately categorizing a crime as a hate crime; and (3) accurate reporting by the jurisdictions to the federal government, which is voluntary and unfunded, placing burden on local jurisdictions.¹³ All of these elements create inconsistency, undermining the quality of data reported.¹⁴

The NCVS supplements and expands upon information collected through the UCR. It provides a reliable means for individuals who have experienced violence to document those experiences directly, without the complications imposed by relying on law enforcement agencies as an intermediary. In 2016, BJS added questions about SOGI to the NCVS, allowing law enforcement, researchers, and policymakers to quantify for the first time the victimization of LGBT people.¹⁵

II. LGBT People are a Substantial Population in the U.S. Who Are Disproportionately Likely to Experience Violence

There are approximately 18 million LGBT adults (aged 18 and older) and 3.8 million LGBT youth (aged 13 to 17) in the United States.¹⁶ This includes 2.1 million adults and 724,000 youth who identify as transgender.¹⁷

¹¹ See 34 U.S.C. § 41305; 28 U.S.C. § 534.

¹² *Crime/Law Enforcement Stats (Uniform Crime Reporting Program)*, FED. BUREAU OF INVESTIGATION, <https://www.fbi.gov/how-we-can-help-you/more-fbi-services-and-information/ucr> (last visited Sept. 19, 2025); *UCR Program – Summary of Authorities*, FED. BUREAU OF INVESTIGATION, <https://ucr.fbi.gov/ucr-programsummary-of-authorities> (last visited Sept. 19, 2025).

¹³ See EMILY J. HANSEN & NATHAN JAMES, CONG. RSCH. SERV., FEDERAL DATA ON HATE CRIMES IN THE UNITED STATES (March 22, 2021), <https://www.congress.gov/crs-product/R46318> (“Implementing [the new FBI crime reporting system] does not address hate crime victims being reluctant to report an offense to the police, the need for training for law enforcement officers on how to identify potential hate crimes, or the need to improve law enforcement agencies processes for investigating potential hate crimes...”).

¹⁴ See Ken Schwenke, *Why America Fails at Gathering Hate Crime Statistics*, ProPublica (Dec. 4, 2017), <https://www.propublica.org/article/why-america-fails-at-gathering-hate-crime-statistics>; Ronald L. Davis & Patrice O’Neill, *The Hate Crimes Reporting Gap: Low Numbers Keep Tensions High*, THE POLICE CHIEF (May 2016), <https://www.policechiefmagazine.org/the-hate-crimes/>.

¹⁵ BUR. JUST. STAT., NCVS OMB SUPPORTING STATEMENT PART A (Sept. 22, 2021), https://www.reginfo.gov/public/do/PRAViewDocument?ref_nbr=202109-1121-002.

¹⁶ JODY L. HERMAN & ANDREW R. FLORES, WILLIAMS INST., HOW MANY ADULTS AND YOUTH IDENTIFY AS LGBT IN THE UNITED STATES? (forthcoming 2025); JODY L. HERMAN & ANDREW R. FLORES, WILLIAMS INST., HOW MANY ADULTS AND YOUTH IDENTIFY AS TRANSGENDER IN THE UNITED STATES? (2025), <https://williamsinstitute.law.ucla.edu/publications/trans-adults-united-states/>. To produce the estimates of the number of LGBT adults and youth, researchers at the Williams Institute utilized data from the Centers for Disease Control and Prevention, including the 2021-2023 Behavior Risk Factor Surveillance System, the 2021 and 2023 Youth Risk Behavior Survey, and the U.S. Census Bureau’s 2023 American Community Survey, along with statistical modeling.

¹⁷ HERMAN & FLORES, *How Many Adults and Youth Identify as Transgender in the United States?*, *supra* note 16.

NCVS data is the only dataset available that allows for the reliable assessment of victimization of LGBT people in the United States. The NCVS dataset is particularly important because of the challenges in collecting data on representative (probability) samples of LGBT people.¹⁸ In other words, this data would be nearly impossible to replicate through other data collection methods.

Analyses of NCVS data have shown that LGBT people are five times more likely to experience violent victimization, compared to non-LGBT people.¹⁹ Violent victimization includes rape, sexual assault, and aggravated or simple assault. Rates are particularly high among transgender people: using pooled data from 2022-2023, researchers found that transgender people experienced victimization at a rate of 93.7 per 1,000, compared with 21.1 per 1,000 among non-LGBT persons.²⁰ Similar findings using pooled data from 2017-2018 showed that transgender people experienced 86.2 victimizations per 1,000 people compared to 21.7 victimizations per 1,000 people for non-transgender people.²¹ NCVS data also allowed researchers to look in great detail at the data – for example, using the 2017-2018 data, researchers found that transgender women and men had higher rates of violent victimization (86.1 and 107.5 per 1,000 people, respectively) than cisgender women and men (23.7 and 19.8 per 1,000 people, respectively).²² The study also found that transgender households had higher rates of property victimization (214.1 per 1,000 households) than cisgender households (108 per 1,000 households).²³

Research on hate crimes specifically has found that LGBT people experienced 6.6 violent hate crime victimizations per 1,000 persons compared with non-LGBT people's 0.6 per 1,000 persons. Additionally, compared to LGBT victims of non-hate violence, more LGBT hate crime victims reported experiencing problems in their social lives, negative emotional responses, and physical symptoms of distress.²⁴

The addition of SOGI questions to the NCVS has therefore provided invaluable insight into the disparate rates of violent victimization, and hate crimes specifically, experienced by transgender people, and all LGBT people.

¹⁸ Ilan H. Meyer & Patrick A. Wilson, *Sampling Lesbian, Gay, and Bisexual Populations*, 56 J. COUNSELING PSYCHOLOGY 23 (2009).

¹⁹ Press Release, Williams Inst., LGBT People Five Times More Likely Than Non-LGBT People to Be Victims Of Violent Crime, Feb. 13, 2025, <https://williamsinstitute.law.ucla.edu/press/lgbt-volent-crime-press-release/>.

²⁰ ILAN H. MEYER & ANDREW R. FLORES, ANTI-LGBT VICTIMIZATION IN THE UNITED STATES: RESULTS FROM THE NATIONAL CRIME VICTIMIZATION SURVEY, *supra* note 2.

²¹ Andrew R. Flores, et al., *Gender Identity Disparities in Criminal Victimization: National Crime Victimization Survey, 2017–2018*, *supra* note 2.

²² *Id.* at 727.

²³ *Id.*

²⁴ Andrew R. Flores, et al., *Hate Crimes Against LGBT People: National Crime Victimization Survey, 2017-2019*. 17 PLoS one 17 e0279363 (2022).

III. Removal of GI from the NCVS Undermines the Ability to Use the Data to Analyze Violent Crime Experienced by Transgender People

On March 1, 2025, BJS issued a Non-substantive Change Request memorandum to the Office of Management and Budget, proposing to remove gender identity (GI) questions and other questions using the term “gender” from the NCVS²⁵ in compliance with President Trump’s Executive Order 14168, “Defending Women from Gender Ideology Extremism and Restoring Biological Truth to the Federal Government.”²⁶ On May 5, 2025, BJS clarified that the NCVS would continue to allow reporting of gender and gender identity as motivation of hate crimes, while moving forward with the removal of the demographic questions related to GI.²⁷ BJS explained:

“The Matthew Shepard and James Byrd, Jr., Hate Crimes Prevention Act of 2009 uses the term ‘gender’ and ‘gender identity’ as an actual or perceived characteristic that can be the basis for a hate crime. The Census Bureau collects NCVS data on hate crimes to fulfill BJS’s statutory requirement to report on Hate Crime Statistics under 34 U.S.C. 41305. Collecting these data is not in conflict with Executive Order 14168 titled “Defending Women from Gender Ideology Extremism and Restoring Biological Truth to the Federal Government.”²⁸

Including gender identity items only in the hate crimes motivation questions, which is asked only if the person reported being a victim of crime,²⁹ is not sufficient for understanding victimization of transgender people. Removing questions about gender identity from the segment of the NCVS pertaining to respondents’ characteristics³⁰ will prevent the identification of transgender population in the NCVS data. This is because the rate of victimization is calculated by considering the number of victimizations reported by transgender people out of the total transgender population. Disparities in victimization are calculated by comparing the rate of victimization in transgender people with the rate of victimization in non-transgender people.³¹ As

²⁵ See Memorandum from Rachel E. Morgan, Bureau of Just. Stat., to the Off. of the Chief Statistician, Off. of Mgmt. & Budg. (March 3, 2025), *Non-substantive Change Request for the National Crime Victimization Survey* (OMB Control No. 1121-0111), https://url.us.m.mimecastprotect.com/s/pu_JCmZgWXSpR9rJu3F4fRVpnN?domain=sonicwall.url-protection.com (last visited Sept. 19, 2025); *ICR Documents*, (NCVS Redesign), REGINFO.GOV, https://www.reginfo.gov/public/do/PRAViewDocument?ref_nbr=202503-1121-001 (last visited Sept. 19, 2025).

²⁶ *Defending Women from Gender Ideology Extremism and Restoring Biological Truth to the Federal Government*, Exec. Order 14,168, 90 Fed. Reg. 8,615 (January 30, 2025).

²⁷ *Non-substantive Change Request for the National Crime Victimization Survey* (OMB Control No. 1121-0111), BUREAU OF JUST. STAT. (May 5, 2025), <https://omb.report/icr/202504-1121-001/doc/156323001>.

²⁸ *Id.*

²⁹ See *Revised 2025 NCVS Q1-Q2 Questionnaire* (OMB Control No. 1121-0184) *With Track Changes* 153-154, *ICR Documents*, (NCVS Redesign), REGINFO.GOV, https://www.reginfo.gov/public/do/PRAViewDocument?ref_nbr=202503-1121-001 (last visited Sept. 19, 2025) (“Hate Crimes”).

³⁰ *Id.* at 192, 196-197 (“Person Characteristics II”).

³¹ See Andrew R. Flores, et al., *Gender Identity Disparities in Criminal Victimization: National Crime Victimization Survey, 2017–2018*, *supra* note 2, at 726 (Methods).

a result, the removal of the basic gender identity question undermines the ability of researchers to estimate the rate of violent victimizations, including the rate of hate crimes, reported by transgender people as compared with non-transgender people. If the survey were to collect only gender and gender identity as motivation of hate crimes—the questions currently considered eligible for inclusion—it would be impossible to evaluate the rate at which *transgender people* experience such victimizations. For example, a person who was targeted for their gender identity may or may not identify as transgender. Further, this approach makes impossible to evaluate other victimizations reported by transgender people that are not explicitly identified by victims as hate crimes or specifically attributed to gender identity (e.g., a Black transgender woman who attributed her attack to race will not be captured).

Given the usefulness of the data when questions are SOGI-inclusive, and the insights that have been gleaned from the NCVS data set, removal of these data elements is illogical and will undermine the utility of the data.

IV. Conclusion

The government is proposing to adopt a version of the NCVS, a vital tool for understanding crime and victimization nationally, without demographic measures for the gender identity (and therefore transgender status) of respondents. This change to an invaluable federal data source impedes the ability of researchers to describe and study violence, and specifically hate crimes, against transgender people at a time when such violence is likely on the rise.³² The change also undermines the ability of policymakers and law enforcement to understand, intervene, and prevent violence. For these reasons, we write to oppose these changes to the NCVS.

Respectfully Submitted,

Elana Redfield, J.D.

Arnold D. Kassoy Scholar of Law & Federal Policy Director
The Williams Institute
UCLA School of Law

Ilan H. Meyer, Ph.D.

Williams Distinguished Senior Scholar of Public Policy
The Williams Institute
UCLA School of Law

³² See, e.g. Kiara Alfonseca, *Hate Crimes, Particularly Against LGBTQ Community, On the Rise: FBI Data*, ABC NEWS (Sept. 24, 2024), <https://abcnews.go.com/US/hate-crimes-lgbtq-community-rise-fbi-data/story?id=113962673>; GLAAD ALERT 2025 DESK REPORT: GLAAD'S ANTI-LGBTQ EXTREMISM REPORTING TRACKER, GLAAD (2025), <https://glaad.org/2025-alert-desk/>.

Andrew R. Flores, Ph.D.
Distinguished Visiting Scholar
The Williams Institute
UCLA School of Law

Lauren J.A. Bouton, M.A.
Peter J. Cooper Policy Fellow & Research Data Analyst
The Williams Institute
UCLA School of Law

Christy Mallory, J.D.
Interim Executive Director and Legal Director
The Williams Institute
UCLA School of Law

September 22, 2025

Rachel Morgan
Chief, Victimization Statistics Unit
Bureau of Justice Statistics
999 N Capitol Street NE
Washington, DC 20531

Re: OMB Control Number 1121-0111: National Crime Victimization Survey (NCVS)

Submitted in Response to Federal Register Notice 89 FR 58219 (July 24, 2025)

The undersigned organizations submit this comment to express serious concern regarding the Bureau of Justice Statistics' (BJS) decision to remove gender identity demographic questions from the National Crime Victimization Survey (NCVS). Although BJS has reversed its decision to remove questions documenting hate crimes motivated by anti-transgender bias,¹ the exclusion of voluntary gender identity demographic questions undermines the ability of the Department of Justice (DOJ) and other federal agencies to meet statutory obligations, enforce civil rights protections, and make evidence-based policy decisions.

The NCVS is uniquely designed to measure both reported and unreported experiences of victimization, making it a critical tool whose collection method relying on victim responses allows for the capture of data from communities who may have a historically strained relationship with law enforcement. The removal of demographic measures of gender identity from this survey creates a significant data gap and weakens the federal government's ability to accurately estimate the prevalence and characteristics of victimization in transgender and gender-diverse populations, to monitor compliance with federal nondiscrimination laws, and to direct resources and enforcement actions to where they are most needed.

1. Federal Law Requires Comprehensive Data Collection on Gender Identity

Congress has made clear that the collection of demographic information—including gender identity—is integral to DOJ's work to prevent hate crimes and enforce civil rights protections:

- **Hate Crimes Statistics Act (HCSA), 34 U.S.C. § 41305:** The Attorney General is required to “acquire data...about crimes that manifest evidence of prejudice based on race, gender and gender identity, religion, disability, sexual orientation, or ethnicity.” Although BJS has reinstated the NCVS question on anti-transgender hate crimes, removing demographic questions about respondents' gender identity prevents BJS from accurately estimating the

¹ See Bureau of Justice Statistics, “Non-substantive change request for the National Crime Victimization Survey (OMB Control No. 1121-0111)” available at <https://omb.report/icr/202504-1121-001/doc/156323001>

risk profile for transgender and gender-diverse people, a key element of fulfilling HCSA's mandate.

- **Matthew Shepard and James Byrd, Jr. Hate Crimes Prevention Act (HCPA), Pub. L. No. 111-84, Div. E:** The HCPA explicitly expanded federal jurisdiction over crimes motivated by gender identity bias, recognizing the historic vulnerability of transgender communities. To operationalize this statute, DOJ requires baseline demographic data to understand prevalence, trends, and geographic distribution of targeted violence.

2. Gender Identity Data Are Critical to Civil Rights Enforcement and Public Safety

Gender identity demographic data collected through the NCVS have been indispensable in revealing disparities in victimization rates. Analyses of these data demonstrate:

- **Fifteenfold higher risk of violent victimization** for LGBTQ people compared to non-LGBTQ respondents,
- **Ninefold higher rates of violent hate crimes**, and
- **Stark intersectional disparities**, with Black transgender and gender-diverse respondents facing the highest rates of victimization.²

Without this data, DOJ cannot enforce civil rights and ensure public safety. For example, DOJ will be unable to:

- Assess whether federal funds distributed through programs such as the Office for Victims of Crime (OVC) Victim Assistance Formula Grants or the STOP Violence Against Women Formula Grants are reaching the most vulnerable populations; or
- Monitor disparities in law enforcement response to gender identity-related crimes, a core objective of the HCSA and DOJ's Hate Crimes Enforcement and Prevention Initiative.

Notably, these demographic questions on the NCVS are not duplicative of Federal Bureau of Investigation (FBI) reporting through the National Incident-Based Reporting System (NIBRS). While NIBRS captures incidents reported to law enforcement, NCVS data are uniquely valuable because they measure victimizations regardless of reporting status, providing a statistically sound understanding of barriers to justice, law enforcement distrust, and disparities in victim services. The 2021 CRS Report on Federal Data on Hate Crimes emphasized that NIBRS cannot serve as a substitute for NCVS data due to persistent underreporting and inconsistent law enforcement classification of hate crimes.³ Allowing transgender people an opportunity to voluntarily provide information in a privacy-protected survey like the NCVS dramatically increases the value and quality of data that DOJ uses to meet its statutorily mandated responsibilities to respond to hate violence.

² Ilan H. Meyer & Andrew R. Flores, Williams Inst., *Anti-LGBT Victimization in the United States* (Feb. 2025), <https://williamsinstitute.law.ucla.edu/publications/anti-lgbt-victimization-us/>

³ Emily J. Hansen & Nathan James, Cong. Rsch. Serv., *Federal Data on Hate Crimes in the United States* (March 22, 2021), <https://www.congress.gov/crs-product/R46318>.

3. Federal Statistical Policy and Case Law Support Comprehensive Data Collection

The federal government has consistently recognized that high-quality demographic data are foundational to civil rights enforcement:

- In *United States v. Maricopa County*, 915 F. Supp. 2d 1073 (D. Ariz. 2012), demographic data were pivotal in proving patterns of discriminatory policing.
- In *United States v. City of New York*, 717 F.3d 72 (2d Cir. 2013), demographic data were central to demonstrating disparate impact in firefighter hiring practices.

Similarly, robust demographic data on gender identity is necessary to detect systemic discrimination and disparities in victimization. Federal statistical directives also emphasize this point. For example, OMB Statistical Policy Directive No. 1 affirms that federal statistical data must be relevant, accurate, and accessible to inform policy and law.⁴ The removal of gender identity questions from NCVS contradicts these legal frameworks and represents a step backward in the modernization of federal data collections.

4. Request for Action

In light of statutory mandates and the overwhelming evidence of the necessity of gender identity demographic data, the undersigned respectfully request that BJS:

1. **Immediately reinstate voluntary gender identity demographic questions** in the NCVS and commit to their inclusion in future collection cycles; and
2. **Publicly disclose the rationale for removing these questions**, including any internal review or justification, to restore trust in DOJ's commitment to unbiased, scientifically valid data collection.

The NCVS is the only nationally representative survey capable of accurately quantifying the victimization experiences of transgender and gender-diverse individuals. Its demographic measures are essential for DOJ's enforcement of hate crime laws and civil rights protections. Removing these voluntary questions undermines statutory compliance, reduces transparency, and risks eroding the credibility of the federal statistical system.

Thank you for your attention to this critical issue.

Arab American Institute
Asian Americans Advancing Justice | AAJC
Association of Population Centers
Association of Public Data Users

⁴ Office of Management and Budget. (2014, December 2). Statistical Policy Directive No. 1: Fundamental Responsibilities of Federal Statistical Agencies and Recognized Statistical Units. Federal Register, 79(231), 71610–71616.

Autistic Self Advocacy Network (ASAN)
Autistic Women & Nonbinary Network
California Pan-Ethnic Health Network
CenterLink
Coalition for a Healthier Frederick County
Coalition on Human Needs
CTData
Desiree Alliance
District Attorney's Office, 20th JD (Boulder County)
Equality California
Equality Florida
Equality Illinois
Equality New Mexico
EqualityMaine
Fair Wisconsin
Family Equality
Government Information Watch
Human Rights Campaign
Impact Fund
Japanese American Citizens League
League of Women Voters of the United States
Maryland Center on Economic Policy
Movement Advancement Project
National Asian Pacific American Bar Association (NAPABA)
National Health Law Program
National Partnership for Women & Families
Oasis Legal Services
OutFront Minnesota
Phoenix Transition Program
Population Association of America
Rocky Mountain Equality
SAGE
Silver State Equality
The Leadership Conference on Civil and Human Rights
The Sikh Coalition
The Trevor Project
Union of Concerned Scientists

Unitarian Universalist FaithAction New Jersey
Western States Center