

VIA FEDEX AND EMAIL

March 26, 2026

Representative Tim Burchett
1122 Longworth HOB
Washington, DC 20515

Representative Thomas Massie
2371 Rayburn HOB
Washington, D.C. 20515

Representative Tony Wied
424 Cannon House Office Building
Washington, DC 20515

Re: *Immediate Action Requested to Address Geoengineering Start-Up Stardust Solutions and Federal Funding of Geoengineering Research*

Dear Representatives Burchett, Massie, and Wied:

On behalf of our client, Informed Consent Action Network Legislate (“**ICAN Legislate**”), we respectfully urge you to initiate a congressional investigation into Stardust Solutions (“**Stardust**”), a U.S-Israeli start-up developing deployment ready solar geoengineering technologies, and its relationships with federal agencies including but not limited to the National Oceanic and Atmospheric Administration (“**NOAA**”), National Aeronautics and Space Administration (“**NASA**”), National Science Foundation (“**NSF**”), Environmental Protection Agency (“**EPA**”), Department of War (“**DOW**”), Department of Energy (“**DOE**”), Office of Science and Technology Policy (“**OSTP**”), and Central Intelligence Agency (“**CIA**”). Stardust is developing aerosol-based technologies to control the amount of sunlight which reaches the earth, a form of geoengineering known as solar radiation management (“**SRM**”).

ICAN Legislate is concerned by Stardust’s rapid development of SRM technology and planned deployment, as well as the federal government’s funding of geoengineering research more broadly. SRM technologies could adversely impact Americans’ health, irreversibly alter our environment, and create a national security crisis. These concerns are heightened by the growing number of public-private partnerships that fund geoengineering research, raising the possibility that companies like Stardust may be collaborating with federal agencies in ways that are not clearly disclosed to the public.

I. STARDUST IS PREPARING TO DEPLOY SRM FOR PROFIT

Stardust seeks to imminently deploy SRM for profit. According to latest reports, Stardust has already secured \$75 million in funding, “far larger than any previous investment in solar geoengineering.”¹ According to its website, Stardust’s position is that “[h]umanity needs a different class of solution [to so-called climate change]. One that works at planetary scale. One

¹ <https://www.politico.com/news/magazine/2025/11/21/stardust-geoengineering-janos-pasztor-regulations-006464>
14.

that can be deployed this decade, not in some distant future.”² According to a 2023 company pitch deck, **Stardust has already run low-altitude experiments to test its technology, and plans to 1) begin a “gradual temperature reduction demonstration” in 2027, 2) sign government contracts, possibly with U.S. agencies by 2028, 3) conduct a “large-scale demonstration” of its system by 2030 while bringing in a projected \$200 million per year in government contracts, and 4) begin “Global full-scale deployment” by 2035.**³ Stardust CEO, Yanai Yedvab, stated to Politico in November 2025 that **Stardust has enough money to start “outdoor contained experiments” in the stratosphere as soon as April of this year.**⁴

Stardust’s plan is to “develop[] a fully-integrated system for tunable deployment” of its “Sunlight Reflection Technology” which it claims “has [the] potential to cool Earth safely, rapidly, and reversibly.”⁵ Stardust claims its technology is a “safe, measurable, adjustable, and fully reversible system” but has provided no evidence to substantiate these claims—nor can it.⁶ Rather, Stardust’s claims are misleading and disingenuous. For one, Stardust claims that it is developing a safe substance to use for SRM, stating “[t]he highest level of safety and compliance with regulations are our prime considerations; our particles were successfully tested by reputable third-party independent agencies against the strictest regulatory requirements to make sure they are benign to humans, animals, and plants. We welcome any external scientific scrutiny of these findings.”⁷ This claim is demonstrably inaccurate. There are no strict regulatory requirements concerning substances that could be used for SRM, a fact that Stardust should be fully aware of. Moreover, prominent scientists and SRM advocates, David Keith and Danieli Visioni, recently published an op-ed challenging such representations made by Stardust:⁸ “As scientists who have worked on the science of solar geoengineering for decades, we have grown increasingly concerned about the emerging efforts to start and fund private companies to build and deploy technologies that could alter the climate of the planet. We also strongly dispute some of the technical claims that certain companies have made about their offerings.”⁹ As they explain:

Stardust says on its [website](#) that it has developed novel particles that can be injected into the atmosphere to reflect away more sunlight, asserting that they’re “chemically inert in the stratosphere, and safe for humans and ecosystems.” According to the company, “The particles naturally return to Earth’s surface over time and recycle safely back into the biosphere.”

² <https://www.stardustsolutions.com/> (<https://perma.cc/EKK9-EAFC>).

³ <https://www.politico.com/news/magazine/2025/11/21/stardust-geoengineering-janos-pasztor-regulations-00646414>.

⁴ *Id.*

⁵ <https://www.stardustsolutions.com/> (<https://perma.cc/EKK9-EAFC>).

⁶ *Id.*

⁷ <https://www.stardustsolutions.com/faq> (<https://perma.cc/68AH-MGKZ>).

⁸ <https://climate.uchicago.edu/insights/why-the-for-profit-race-into-solar-geoengineering-is-bad-for-science-and-public-trust/> (<https://perma.cc/9GSH-SHMQ>).

⁹ *Id.*

But it’s nonsense for the company to claim they can make particles that are inert in the stratosphere. Even diamonds, which are extraordinarily nonreactive, would alter stratospheric chemistry. First of all, much of that chemistry depends on highly reactive radicals that react with any solid surface, and second, any particle may become coated by background sulfuric acid in the stratosphere. That could accelerate the loss of the protective ozone layer by spreading that existing sulfuric acid over a larger surface area.

...

In materials presented to potential investors, which we’ve obtained a copy of, Stardust further claims its particles “improve” on sulfuric acid, which is the most studied material for SRM.

...

Grandiose claims notwithstanding—and especially considering that Stardust hasn’t disclosed anything about its particles or research process—it would be very difficult to make a pragmatic, risk-informed decision to start SRM efforts with these particles instead of sulfate.¹⁰

Thus, even the most ardent proponents of SRM, scientists who have dedicated their professional lives to the study of geoengineering, have voiced criticism of Stardust’s opacity, unsupported representations, and its push to accelerate SRM deployment. These “researchers say the company’s current lack of transparency makes it impossible to trust. ‘There’s absolutely no reason to believe anything they say without them providing evidence of it,’ [said] Cornell aerospace expert [and SRM proponent Douglas] MacMartin.”¹¹ Indeed, even SilverLining, a non-profit which advocates for funding geoengineering research, has publicly expressed concerns over the “potential for private intervention efforts to outpace society’s ability to understand and respond to them,” given that Stardust’s “[c]laims that any specific technology will or should be 'ready to deploy' by the end of this decade outpace our current knowledge.”¹²

Alarming, Stardust already has deep ties with multinational governments and intelligence agencies. Stardust reportedly, “has contracted with lawyers, lobbyists and advisers who previously served in the White House, Congress and the Pentagon.”¹³ According to recent reporting, “Stardust has been secretly lobbying Congress; Stardust’s lobbying firm blamed its failure to disclose on a

¹⁰ *Id.*

¹¹ <https://www.politico.com/news/magazine/2025/11/21/stardust-geoengineering-janos-pasztor-regulations-00646414>.

¹² <https://www.silverlining.ngo/statement-stardust-funding> (<https://perma.cc/PV4J-NYSL>).

¹³ <https://www.politico.com/news/magazine/2025/11/21/stardust-geoengineering-janos-pasztor-regulations-00646414>.

clerical error.”¹⁴ Recent disclosure filings now show Stardust paid Holland & Knight LLP \$370,000 in 2025 to lobby Congress.¹⁵ Moreover, one of Stardust’s investors is Awz Ventures, an Israeli-Canadian venture capital fund. According to its website, Awz is based in “Canada, Israel & the US” and its “partners and strategic advisors” are “former senior directors of Israeli and global security and intelligence agencies like the CIA, FBI, MI5, CSIS, Mossad, Shin Bet, and Unit 8200,” including former heads of British, American, Israeli, and Canadian intelligence¹⁶ and manages over \$300 million.¹⁷ Stardust is also working with consulting firm WestExec Advisors, founded by Antony Blinken and operated by veterans of the Clinton, Bush, Obama and Biden administrations.¹⁸ WestExec “is helping Stardust to shape potential U.S. and international regulations around solar geoengineering.”¹⁹

In light of the foregoing, ICAN Legislate is deeply concerned that public-private partnerships may be formulating between Stardust and federal agencies, and that such activities could lead to imminent SRM deployment.

II. THE FEDERAL GOVERNMENT IS ALREADY DEFYING THE WILL OF THE AMERICAN PEOPLE AND PUTTING AMERICAN LIVES IN DANGER BY FUNDING GEOENGINEERING RESEARCH

For at least two decades, the U.S. federal government has employed taxpayer-derived federal funding to sponsor geoengineering research. For example, since at least 2010, NSF has used taxpayer-supported federal funding to award more than \$6.3 million in grants to advance geoengineering research across multiple institutions.²⁰ In a 2023 Dear Colleague Letter, NSF actively invited and encouraged proposals for geoengineering research to “ameliorate anthropogenic climate change.”²¹ As of December 2025, NSF was funding over \$2.7 million in active grants to research climate intervention technologies.²² Such vast expenditures of federal funding toward geoengineering research could “contribute to the perception that geoengineering is an appropriate and important area of research as global temperatures rise” and that such research

¹⁴ <https://www.washingtonpost.com/climate-solutions/2025/12/03/stardust-make-sunsets-geoengineering-startups/> (<https://perma.cc/P4R2-GKUY>).

¹⁵ <https://icandecide.org/wp-content/uploads/2026/02/Stardust-2025-LD-2-Disclosure-Forms.pdf> (<https://perma.cc/SCL4-F5BH>).

¹⁶ <https://www.awzventures.com/about> (<https://perma.cc/ZD6V-KLGA>). Awz’s team includes Yaron Ashkenzai, former Israel Security Agency VIP Protection Division; Dame Stella Rimington, former MI5 Director-General; Richard Fadden, former CSIS Director, James Woolsey, former CIA Director, Tamir Pardo, former Mossad Director; Buck Revell, former FBI Associate Deputy Director.

¹⁷ <https://www.awzventures.com/awz-story> (<https://perma.cc/5NNP-KAXJ>).

¹⁸ <https://web.archive.org/web/20201129215329/https://westexec.com/our-team/>; <https://westexec.com/our-team/> (<https://perma.cc/CV93-W2Q9>).

¹⁹ <https://www.politico.com/news/magazine/2025/11/21/stardust-geoengineering-janos-pasztor-regulations-00646414>.

²⁰ This figure is derived from analysis of more than thirty grant entries available on usaspending.gov.

²¹ <https://www.nsf.gov/funding/opportunities/dcl-co2-removal-solar-radiation-modification-strategies-science/nsf23-151> (<https://perma.cc/8ZCU-HVBE>).

²² See NSF grant Nos. 2017113, 2218758, 2218777, 2218785, and 2417874.

is supported by the taxpayers.²³ Yet, given the sums NSF has invested in geoengineering research, NSF should be aware of the grave risks and potentially irreversible affects geoengineering poses to human health and the environment if SRM research is continued and ultimately deployed. Even its proponents admit SRM deployment could have potentially catastrophic effects on weather, agriculture, natural ecosystems, and human health if deployed.²⁴

Specifically, proponents of SRM acknowledge deployment could lead to stratospheric ozone depletion,²⁵ global food production and biodiversity disruptions,²⁶ increases in air pollution and UV exposure-related premature mortality,²⁷ disruptions of local and regional weather patterns leading to intensified droughts or flooding,²⁸ disruptions of monsoon cycles which provide critical rain to agriculture,²⁹ ocean acidification,³⁰ increased acid deposition resulting in air pollution and acid rain,³¹ diminution of solar power systems,³² geopolitical conflicts over control of the global thermostat,³³ and unintended warming or excessive cooling due to uncertainty in estimates of the amount of SRM needed. Because it would be impossible to precisely define and limit the target impact area of SRM to a particular nation, SRM conducted in one country may adversely affect neighboring countries and cause international conflicts. Furthermore, there are unknown health risks to SRM as the chemicals being discussed for SRM, namely sulfur dioxide, sulfate aerosols, aluminum oxide, calcium carbonate, titanium dioxide and diamond dust, have not been sufficiently studied to ensure safety. SRM proponents acknowledge these risks while simultaneously acknowledging that the effects of SRM, good or bad, are incredibly complex and unknowable without the full-scale deployment of SRM and assessment of its impacts.³⁴

Nonetheless, in 2019, Congress approved at least \$4 million for NOAA to begin a research program focused on geoengineering.³⁵ In response, NOAA launched the Earth's Radiation Budget³⁶ (ERB) program to “investigate natural and human activities that might alter the chemistry and reflectivity of the stratosphere, or the reflectivity of the marine boundary layer, through the

²³ <https://climate.mit.edu/posts/us-government-developing-solar-geoengineering-research-plan>.

²⁴ <https://nap.nationalacademies.org/read/25762/chapter/4#90> (<https://perma.cc/8AZK-M3U3>).

²⁵ <https://nap.nationalacademies.org/read/25762/chapter/4#43> (<https://perma.cc/AA5B-MNFK>).

²⁶ <https://phys.org/news/2024-09-climate-crisis-scientists.html>; (<https://perma.cc/R526-5X87>).

²⁷ <https://online.ucpress.edu/elementa/article/10/1/00047/195026/Stratospheric-aerosol-injection-may-impact-global> (<https://perma.cc/J43T-45RC>).

²⁸ <https://www.nature.com/articles/s41598-024-73149-6> (<https://perma.cc/FJ99-A2YC>).

²⁹ *Id.*

³⁰ <https://www.tandfonline.com/doi/epdf/10.1080/00963402.2008.11461140?needAccess=true>.

³¹ *Id.*

³² *Id.*

³³ <https://www.frontiersin.org/journals/climate/articles/10.3389/fclim.2021.720312/full> (<https://perma.cc/U29Q-6XMH>).

³⁴ <https://phys.org/news/2024-09-climate-crisis-scientists.html> (<https://perma.cc/R526-5X87>).

³⁵ <https://www.technologyreview.com/2019/12/20/131449/the-us-government-will-begin-to-fund-geoengineering-research/> (<https://perma.cc/F9VR-MV8T>).

³⁶ <https://csl.noaa.gov/research/erb/> (<https://perma.cc/GVQ2-WQU8>).

addition of aerosols, and to understand the potential impacts on the Earth system.”³⁷ ERB’s goals “include proposed climate intervention approaches to influence climate warming by reflecting sunlight from the atmosphere.”³⁸ To that end and under the ERB umbrella, NOAA launched the Stratospheric Aerosol process, Budget and Radiative Effects³⁹ (SABRE) program to “strengthen[] the scientific foundation to inform policy decisions related to regulating global emissions that impact the stratosphere...and the potential injection of material into the stratosphere to combat global warming (climate intervention).”⁴⁰ SABRE is collaborating with NASA to use its WB-57 high-altitude research aircraft to fly high into the stratosphere to evaluate the stratospheric response to natural and man-made changes to the stratosphere including “potential climate intervention activities.”⁴¹

This cannot continue. These federally funded geoengineering research programs, meant to “ameliorate anthropogenic climate change,” continue to operate despite the aforementioned risks and the fact that they directly contradict President Trump’s commitment to eliminating taxpayer funding for the “globalist climate agenda.”⁴²

Thus, ICAN Legislate calls on the federal government to terminate all funding of geoengineering research and activities to respect the will of the American people and protect human health and the environment. The American people do not support these programs. In the last two years, prompted by their constituents, legislators in more than thirty states have introduced bills to ban geoengineering, with Tennessee, Florida, and Louisiana passing laws to prohibit such activities within their states.⁴³ Thus, every dollar spent on geoengineering research, development, and validation of any such technology defies the wishes of many Americans and the policy goals of the current administration.

In sum, the American people have not been adequately informed and have not consented to geoengineering-related activities, including research, experimentation, and technological development, as these activities present profound and unacceptable risks to our national security, humanity’s survival, and the planet’s delicate ecosystems. Congress cannot ignore these risks, the will of the American people, and the policy goals of the Trump administration and must act immediately to cease federal support for geoengineering-related research and activities.

³⁷ <https://csl.noaa.gov/research/erb/goals.html> (<https://perma.cc/43HH-3KQ4>).

³⁸ *Id.*

³⁹ <https://csl.noaa.gov/projects/sabre/> (<https://perma.cc/N7CS-K2WC>).

⁴⁰ *Id.*

⁴¹ *Id.*

⁴² <https://www.whitehouse.gov/wp-content/uploads/2025/05/Ending-the-Green-New-Scam-Fact-Sheet.pdf> (<https://perma.cc/7DFR-8PGR>).

⁴³ <https://srm360.org/us-bans/> (<https://perma.cc/ZS4M-WN65>).

III. ICAN HAS WARNED FEDERAL AGENCIES OF THE INHERENT RISKS OF WEATHER MODIFICATION AND GEOENGINEERING

In late 2023, ICAN wrote three letters to EPA asking it to review and address the activities of Make Sunsets,⁴⁴ a private company deploying SRM for profit.⁴⁵ Rather than responding with decisive action, EPA initially sent ICAN a dismal letter acknowledging that Make Sunsets was engaging in geoengineering and, incredibly, admitting to participating in geoengineering research.⁴⁶ Thankfully, current EPA Administrator Zeldin took decisive action on ICAN's concerns upon taking office, undertaking an investigation into Make Sunsets.⁴⁷ As stated by Administrator Zeldin, “[t]he idea that individuals, supported by venture capitalists, are putting criteria air pollutants into the air to sell ‘cooling’ credits shows how climate extremism has overtaken common sense . . . Based on Make Sunsets’ responses to our information request, we will look into all our authorities to ensure that we continue maintaining clean air for all Americans.”⁴⁸

On November 14, 2024, ICAN submitted a comment⁴⁹ to NOAA’s July 30, 2024, Request for Comment on the petition to amend NOAA’s reporting regulations under the Weather Modification Reporting Act (docket No. NOAA-OAR-2024-0091).⁵⁰ In the comment, ICAN implored NOAA to implement a policy strategy to discourage all research, field experiments, or deployment of SRM activities, emphasizing the potentially severe and devastating risks these activities pose to public health and the environment. ICAN also urged NOAA to revise its regulations by expanding and clarifying reporting requirements to mandate reporting of all public and private research, experimentation, and deployment involving any form of weather modification or climate intervention, with explicit inclusion of SRM. Finally, ICAN requested that NOAA ensure full public accessibility to all research, reports, and related information received under the revised regulations, including advanced notice of any planned activities along with detailed information on their purpose, scale, projected impacts, and potential risks, thereby enabling the American public to remain fully informed about these endeavors. As of the date of this letter, no final rulemaking decision has been issued.

⁴⁴ <https://makesunsets.com/> (<https://perma.cc/GB52-URX8>).

⁴⁵ <https://icandecide.org/wp-content/uploads/2024/08/ICAN-follow-up-letter-to-EPA.pdf>; <https://icandecide.org/wp-content/uploads/2024/08/OctLettersEPA.pdf> (<https://perma.cc/PZ87-E9HU>) (<https://perma.cc/6HCU-HF6D>).

⁴⁶ <https://icandecide.org/wp-content/uploads/2024/08/EPA-Letter.pdf> (<https://perma.cc/8CLS-A832>).

⁴⁷ <https://www.epa.gov/newsreleases/epa-demands-answers-unregulated-geoengineering-start-launching-sulfur-dioxide-air> (<https://perma.cc/NJ2H-QXUV>).

⁴⁸ *Id.*

⁴⁹ https://icandecide.org/wp-content/uploads/2024/11/NOAA-OAR-2024-0091-0099_attachment_1.pdf (<https://perma.cc/56G9-R4DL>).

⁵⁰ <https://www.federalregister.gov/documents/2024/09/20/2024-21567/notice-of-receipt-and-request-for-public-comment-on-petition-for-rulemaking-regarding-maintaining#open-comment> (<https://perma.cc/LW9V-CVFX>).

On May 16, 2025, ICAN sent letters to the U.S. Secretary of State,⁵¹ Secretary of Commerce,⁵² Secretary of Defense,⁵³ and the UN ambassador,⁵⁴ imploring each to act after the United Kingdom’s (“UK”) Advanced Research and Invention Agency’s (“ARIA”) funded \$75 million to research the viability of geoengineering and conduct outdoor geoengineering experiments in the U.S. and other territories as part of its “Exploring Climate Cooling” program.⁵⁵ The letters called on each office to implement a U.S. foreign policy strategy to discourage research, experimentation, and deployment of geoengineering activities thereby protecting Americans and our environment from the potentially devastating consequences of SRM. The letters also implored each office to engage with UK counterparts to urge ARIA to halt all pending or planned SRM activities. Thus far, ICAN is not aware of any such measures being pursued or enacted.

On November 10, 2025, ICAN also wrote to NSF urging it to immediately halt all NSF-funded geoengineering-related research and activities and prohibit any future funding.⁵⁶ Despite this, NSF continues to fund grants to the University Corporation for Atmospheric Research, Louisiana State University, Duke University, Arizona State University, University of Chicago, and the Research Foundation of the University of New York.⁵⁷

IV. ACTIONS REQUESTED

These circumstances underscore the need for rigorous federal oversight and transparency. The public deserves clarity about what activities are being conducted in our atmosphere, who is involved, whether their hard-earned tax dollars are funding it, and what risks may be associated with these interventions.

Considering the far-reaching importance of these topics, ICAN Legislate respectfully encourages you to investigate Stardust Solutions’ activities, advance initiatives for strong regulatory oversight and complete public disclosure of geoengineering operations and direct all possible resources toward ending federal support for continued geoengineering research and endeavors.

⁵¹ https://icandecide.org/wp-content/uploads/2025/05/2025_05_16_US-Sec-of-State_UK-sun-dimming.pdf (<https://perma.cc/2HSC-WBTN>).

⁵² https://icandecide.org/wp-content/uploads/2025/05/2025_05_16_NOAA_UK-sun-dimming.pdf (<https://perma.cc/6B3G-QF6Z>).

⁵³ https://icandecide.org/wp-content/uploads/2025/05/2025_05_16_DOD_UK-sun-dimming.pdf (<https://perma.cc/7Q37-HPPD>).

⁵⁴ https://icandecide.org/wp-content/uploads/2025/05/2025_05_16_UN_Amb_UK-sun-dimming.pdf (<https://perma.cc/LK22-F3RV>).

⁵⁵ <https://www.aria.org.uk/opportunity-spaces/future-proofing-our-climate-and-weather/exploring-climate-cooling/#fundedprojects>.

⁵⁶ https://icandecide.org/wp-content/uploads/2026/01/2025_11_10_Letter-to-NSF-re-Geoengineering-Funding.pdf (<https://perma.cc/2567-TNV3>).

⁵⁷ See NSF grant Nos. 2218758, 2218777, 2218779, 2218785, 2302785, and 2417874.

ICAN Legislate, thus, implores you to take the following steps:

- 1. Hold a congressional hearing to investigate the current funding and status of all geoengineering research, technological development, experimentation, or deployment activities conducted by CIA, DOW, NASA, NSF, EPA, OSTP, DOE and NOAA.**
- 2. Hold a congressional hearing to investigate any public-private partnerships with for-profit organizations such as Make Sunsets and Stardust involving research, experimentation, and/or deployment of geoengineering technologies.**
- 3. Hold a congressional hearing to investigate the U.S. Patent and Trademark Office to scrutinize any recent trends in awarding patents to private companies like Make Sunsets and Stardust that seek to deploy SRM for profit.**
- 4. Urge all relevant federal agencies to ensure transparency by making geoengineering-related spending, research finding, and reports accessible online on their sites, so the public can be thoroughly informed abouts the aims, scale, projected effects, and possible risks of these activities.**
- 5. Audit all federally funded geoengineering-related contracts and grants since Fiscal Year 2015 and make all such records publicly available on a website.**

Thank you for your time and consideration to this important matter of human health and national security. We look forward to a prompt response explaining what actions you will take.

Sincerely,



Aaron Siri, Esq.

Elizabeth A. Brehm, Esq.

Catherine Ybarra, Esq.


ebrehm@sirillp.com

cybarra@sirillp.com