



March 25, 2026

The Honorable Jim Jordan
Chair, House Judiciary Committee
364 Cannon House Office Building
Washington, DC 20515

The Honorable Jamie Raskin
Ranking Member, House Judiciary Committee
2078 Rayburn House Office Building
Washington, DC 20515

Re: Opposition to H.R. 6453, ADA 30 Days to Comply Act

Dear Chair Jordan and Ranking Member Raskin:

The undersigned members and allies of the Consortium for Constituents with Disabilities (CCD) Rights Task Force write in strong opposition to H.R. 6453, the “ADA 30 Days to Comply Act.” This bill, if enacted, would diminish the ability of disabled people to participate in the mainstream of society by reducing their access to stores, theaters, hotels, restaurants, doctors’ offices, private schools, and other places of public accommodation. CCD is the largest coalition of national organizations advocating for federal policy that ensures the self-determination, independence, empowerment, integration and inclusion of children and adults with disabilities in all aspects of society.

H.R. 6453 would amend the Americans with Disabilities Act’s (ADA) remedial provisions by creating new and burdensome notice requirements that must be undertaken by people with disabilities when they encounter barriers to access in the built environment of public accommodations under title III of the ADA. On the ground that it is too heavy a burden for businesses to be aware of their obligations under the ADA 36 years after that law was enacted, this bill would place that burden instead on people with disabilities. Shifting the responsibility for ensuring access to the built environment from businesses and other public accommodations onto people with disabilities would be a radical departure from the current remedial provisions of the ADA.

In addition to the other defects in the bill set forth below, the bill provides no mechanism for informing people with disabilities that it would now, and for the first time, be their responsibility to give sufficient and highly technical and specific legal notice to owners and operators of public accommodations that they are out of compliance with title III of the ADA. People with

disabilities, most of whom are not attorneys, would have to comply with legally specific, complicated notice requirements requiring them to gather information about owner/operators, engage in an ongoing relationship with the business, and wait even more time to enforce their civil right to access the goods and services of public accommodations that Congress granted them in 1990.

Most importantly, if this bill were to become law, there would be no incentive for businesses to comply with the ADA's accessibility requirements unless and until they received the requisite notice. There would be *no consequence* for a business that failed to comply with the ADA until that point, as Title III of the ADA permits only forward-looking remedies. Businesses could ignore the law with impunity until receiving a notice. Even then, if the business declared that it could not remove the barriers within 30 days due to factors beyond its control, the business would merely have to make "substantial progress." Progress, rather than access, would become the new goal of Title III of the ADA.

We are aware of no other civil rights law that allows covered entities to discriminate without any consequence until individuals experience violations of their rights and educate the entities perpetrating those violations about their obligations. Customers with disabilities would now be bound to give specific legally sufficient notice that "detail the circumstances under which an individual was actually denied access to the public accommodation, including the address of property, whether request for assistance in removing an architectural barrier to access was made, and whether the barrier to access was permanent or temporary." No mention is made in the bill as to who the arbiter of the adequacy of the notice will be. Will a court decide later if the notice was sufficient under the principles of agency and provisions of the bill? If the court finds the notice lacking, does the disabled customer repeat the process with more specific notice to the title III entity or will the lawsuit serve as sufficient notice at that point?

Under the scheme of H.R. 6453, public accommodations that are already out of compliance will benefit from waiting for a disabled customer to give them notice of their need to comply before acting. Such a scheme does little other than stall the progress in increasing physical access to American life that Congress promised to people with disabilities when it passed the ADA. We urge the Committee not to move this bill forward.

Respectfully,

Access Ready, Inc.

American Association of People with Disabilities

American Association on Health and Disability

American Civil Liberties Union

American Council of the Blind

American Foundation for the Blind

American Network of Community Options and Resources

Autistic Women & Nonbinary Network

The Arc of the United States

Autistic Self Advocacy Network

Bazelon Center for Mental Health Law

Center for Public Representation

CommunicationFIRST

Deaf Equality

Disability Belongs

Disability Rights Education and Defense Fund

Lakeshore Foundation

Muscular Dystrophy Association

National Academy of Elder Law Attorneys (NAELA)

National Disability Rights Network

National Federation of the Blind

National Health Law Program

National Organization of Nurses with Disabilities

Paralyzed Veterans of America

Perkins School for the Blind

United Spinal Association

World Institute on Disability