



OFFICE OF CIVIL RIGHTS AND ADJUDICATION

WASHINGTON, D.C. 20460

February 27, 2026

Aisha N. Braveboy, County Executive
Prince George's County
1301 McCormick Dr., Suite 4000
Largo, MD 20774
via email: countyexecutive@co.pg.md.us

RE: Rejection of EPA Complaint No. 02-26-R3

Dear County Executive Aisha Braveboy:

As you are aware, the U.S. Environmental Protection Agency (EPA), Office of Civil Rights and Adjudication (OCRA), External Civil Rights Division (ECRD) received the above-referenced complaint against Prince George's County (the County). The complaint raises allegations of discrimination by the County on the basis of race by:

1. adopting a county resolution that removed safeguards that prevented developers from building additional developments in areas where police cannot timely respond to emergencies;
2. approving a special exception for the expansion of an existing surface mine in Brandywine, Maryland that is part of a pattern of more mining approvals in majority-Black areas and less mining approvals in majority-White areas;
3. introducing a county resolution that directed the start of a new trash collection program in certain parts of the county;
4. introducing county bills that will act as a "potential gateway to disparate siting and approvals," and enable "accelerated approvals without community safeguards;" and
5. failing to advance the Southern Maryland Rapid Transit (SMRT) Corridor while advancing other public transit projects.

Sixth, the complaint also alleges that the County adopted a county resolution that allocated funding to celebrity-affiliated and politically favored communities over communities without that status.

This letter serves to notify you that ECRD is rejecting the complaint.

Pursuant to EPA's nondiscrimination regulation, ECRD must conduct a preliminary jurisdictional review of administrative complaints to determine whether to accept, reject, or refer it to an appropriate federal agency. *See* 40 C.F.R. § 7.120(d)(1). To be accepted for investigation, a complaint must meet the jurisdictional requirements described in EPA's nondiscrimination regulation.

First, the complainant must submit a complaint in writing. *See* 40 C.F.R. § 7.120(b)(1). Second, the entity that the complainant identifies as allegedly engaging in discrimination must be an applicant for, or recipient of, EPA financial assistance. *See* 40 C.F.R. § 7.15.

Third, the complainant must describe an alleged discriminatory act that, if true, may violate EPA's nondiscrimination regulation. *See* 40 C.F.R. § 7.120(b)(1). An alleged discriminatory act is one based on race, color, national origin, sex, age, or disability. Fourth, a complainant must file the complaint within 180 days of the alleged discriminatory act. *See* 40 C.F.R. § 7.120(b)(2).

In general, ECRD will accept, reject, or refer a complaint after considering jurisdictional factors discussed above. However, if ECRD obtains information leading ECRD to conclude that an investigation is unjustified for prudential reasons, ECRD may reject the complaint.

After careful consideration, ECRD must reject the allegations in this complaint for jurisdictional reasons except for the third and fourth allegations, which ECRD is rejecting for prudential reasons.

ECRD must reject the first, second, fifth, and sixth allegations because these allegations do not allege discriminatory acts that, if true, would violate one of the laws and/or regulations ECRD enforces.

The third and fourth allegations meet ECRD's jurisdictional criteria. However, ECRD is rejecting the allegations for prudential reasons because the allegations are unripe for review. Although the county resolutions and bills have been introduced or adopted, the complainant has not alleged any specific actions that are occurring as a result of the introduction or adoption of the county bills and resolutions. The harms are speculative in nature. ECRD's rejection of these allegations is without prejudice. If Complainant believes an entity has discriminated against Complainant in the last 180 days based on a protected class, Complainant may wish to file a new written complaint alleging as much.

Pursuant to EPA's non-discrimination regulations at 40 C.F.R. § 7.120(d), and due to the subject matter of the first allegation, the claim may fall under the jurisdiction of the United States Department of Justice (DOJ). Therefore, ECRD has referred the complaint to DOJ for it to make a determination regarding ECRD's referral.

Due to the subject matter of the fifth allegation, the claim may fall under the jurisdiction of the U.S. Department of Transportation (DOT). Therefore, ECRD has referred the complaint to DOT for it to make a determination regarding ECRD's referral.

Finally, EPA's nondiscrimination regulation prohibits applicants, recipients, and other persons from intimidating, threatening, coercing, or engaging in other discriminatory conduct against anyone because they have acted or participated in an action to secure rights protected by the civil rights requirements EPA enforces. See 40 C.F.R. § 7.100. Any individual that opines a recipient has engaged in such misconduct can file a complaint with EPA.

If you have any questions, please contact Case Manager Nell Cormack by email at Cormack.Nell@epa.gov.

Sincerely,

A handwritten signature in black ink that reads "Juan Carlos Hunt". The signature is written in a cursive, flowing style.

JuanCarlos M. Hunt, Director
U.S. EPA, Office of Civil Rights and Adjudication

cc: Catherine Libertz, Deputy Regional Administrator/Deputy Civil Rights Official
Allison Gardner, Regional Counsel
U.S. EPA, Region 3