Updated April 8, 2026

2026 AIMBE Congressional Visits: Talking Points

Who Are We:

- Begin your meeting by acknowledging that you are representing the American Institute for Medical and Biological Engineering (AIMBE) - an honorific society of the most accomplished medical and biological engineers responsible for the innovation and discovery that improves health, lowers medical costs, and/or expands access.

Introduce Yourself

- Give a **brief "elevator" introduction** explaining your name, area of research focus, and less than 60 seconds summarizing your credentials as a biomedical researcher.
- Make sure they know you are a **constituent and live in their district**.
- Explain **your research focus** by telling **which agency or company funds your work** and why your research wouldn't happen without strong federal investment in research. Keep it simple.

Tell a Personal Story

- Tell your lawmaker: a) why basic research is critical to discovery, b) why discovery takes time and federal financial investment, c) relate your research to a discovery/cure.
- Tell **why your research is important**. How will your research improve health, provide a cure, or address a problem.
- **Share an interesting story**. Make it personal. Research should be more than discovery but about finding a cure, giving hope, addressing an illness or disease.

Make your ASK (Pick **ONE** issue area to address during your meeting):

1) **Keep facilities and administrative costs paid by federal grants at a competitive level.** Facilities and administrative costs, also known as indirect costs, fund essential infrastructure that makes research possible, this includes, labs, core facilities, data storage, and critical administrative support. Cutting these funds jeopardizes the very infrastructure that has made the U.S. a global leader in scientific innovation. Every dollar of NIH funding generates $2.56 in economic activity in the U.S. A $4 billion cut to "indirect" costs, as an example, would reduce economic activity by $10 billion annually, and thousands of workers would lose their jobs.

2) **Reject the devastating cuts proposed in the President's budget and support NIH with a $4 billion increase for FY2027** ($51.3 billion total). The proposed cuts would cripple the U.S. biomedical research enterprise and risk the surrender of scientific leadership to our adversaries, creating a national security risk. A $4 billion increase would allow the US to keep pace with inflation and allow meaningful growth. Federally funded researchers drive robust economic activity directly and indirectly in their communities while also supporting the pharmaceutical industry through the development of new knowledge. For every $1 in NIH research, $2.56 of new economic activity is spurred in the U.S. Cutting this investment doesn't just harm science, it weakens our health, our economy, and our security.

3) **Oppose the destructive cuts proposed in the President's budget and support NSF with at least $9.9 billion in FY2027** to restore the agency to its FY2023 level and reverse years of cuts. While America has been slashing federal support for science and engineering, China, the EU, and other competitors have been

aggressively increasing their investments in foundational research. We are ceding ground we may not recover. NSF is the only federal agency supporting basic science and engineering across all disciplines. Its programs power our scientific ecosystem, support early-career scientists, and feed the translational research that drives entire industries and the next generation of STEM workers. This is also a national security issue. NSF-funded research underpins advances in AI, semiconductors, and quantum computing that are central to military readiness and economic competitiveness.

4) **Fund ARPA-H at $1.7 billion** in FY 2027, an increase of $200 million. As a distinct agency, funding for ARPA-H should supplement, rather than supplant, the essential foundational investment in the NIH. ARPA-H's unique focus on "high potential, high impact" research beyond what is traditionally supported by the NIH will foster the type of innovation needed to keep U.S.'s global research competitiveness and solve urgent public health problems. Reject the prosed cut to ARPA-H in the President's budget. Cutting this investment now means forfeiting the breakthroughs of tomorrow, from new cancer treatments to pandemic defenses, to the next generation of medical technologies that could transform how we prevent, diagnose, and treat disease. These advances don't just save lives; they create industries, generate jobs, and cement American leadership in the global bioeconomy.

5) **Protect the National Institutes of Health's ability to determine how and when to use multi-year funding**, rather than having these decisions dictated by the Office of Management and Budget. While multi-year funding can be a useful tool when implemented gradually, rapid front-loading of 4–5 years of funding has reduced the number of new grants, lowered success rates, and disproportionately harmed early-career investigators. With nearly 60% of U.S. R&D supported by federal funding, these disruptions ripple across the entire research ecosystem. At the same time, binding future budgets limits NIH's ability to respond to emerging scientific opportunities and public health needs. Congress should ensure NIH retains the flexibility to phase in multi-year funding in a deliberate and balanced way that does not undermine new investigators or future discoveries.

6) **Support the next generation of researchers through stable policies and sustained funding.** Recent policy changes and funding instability have harshly impacted biomedical and engineering training programs, narrowing opportunities for students to gain the skills they need to enter the STEM workforce. Budget cuts and disruptions to federally-funded research programs are already forcing biomedical training programs to accept fewer trainees, with some closing applications for the 2026–2027 cycle entirely. The consequences fall on trainees and early-career researchers, and are driving talented researchers out of science, and out of the country, entirely. America is ceding its scientific leadership and cannot remain competitive without a STEM pipeline to fill the nation's highly skilled jobs. Congress must adopt funding levels and research policies that provide trainees and early-career researchers with the stability they need to stay in science and stay in the United States. Our economy and national security depend on it.