

Trump's Executive Orders 2025

[Reminders on Executive Orders and Federal Grants](#)

[Trump's Executive Orders Analysis](#)

- **[Executive Order: Restoring Equality of Opportunity and Meritocracy](#)
- **[Executive Order: Protecting American Energy From State Overreach](#)
- **[Executive Order: Reinvigorating America's Beautiful Clean Coal Industry and Amending Executive Order 14241](#)
- **[Executive Order: Strengthening the Reliability and Security of the United States Electric Grid](#)
- **[Presidential Proclamation: Regulatory Relief for Certain Stationary Sources to Promote American Energy](#)
- **[Executive Order: Unleashing American Energy](#)
- **[President's Message: Follow the Law](#)
- **[Presidential Action: Ending Illegal Discrimination and Restoring Merit-Based Opportunity](#)
- [Executive Order: Ending Radical and Wasteful Government Programs and Preferencing](#)
- [Executive Order: Ensuring the Enforcement of Federal Rule of Civil Procedure 65\(c\)](#)
- [Executive Order: Continuing the Reduction of the Federal Bureaucracy](#)
- [Executive Order: Implementing the President's "Department of Government Efficiency" Workforce Optimization Initiative](#)
- [Executive Order: Establishing the National Energy Dominance Council:](#)
- [Executive Order: Council to Assess the Federal Emergency Management Agency](#)
- [Executive Order: Achieving Efficiency Through State and Local Preparedness](#)
- [New Executive Order: Ensuring Accountability for All Agencies](#)
- [Executive Order: Unleashing Prosperity Through Deregulation](#)
- [Executive Order: Initial Rescissions of Harmful Executive Orders and Actions](#)
- [Actions Impacting Federal Workers](#)
- [Executive Order: Declaring a National Energy Emergency](#)
- [Presidential Memorandum: Temporary Withdrawal of All Areas on the Outer Continental Shelf from Offshore Wind Leasing and Review of the Federal Government's Leasing and Permitting Practices for Wind Projects](#)
- [Executive Order: Putting America First in International Environmental Agreements](#)
- [Presidential Memorandum: Delivering Emergency Price Relief for American Families and Defeating the Cost-of-Living Crisis](#)
- [Executive Order: Regulatory Freeze Pending Review](#)

[Appendix/Additional Resources](#)

On Monday, January 20, 2025, President Trump's first day in office, he signed a wide-range of detrimental Executive Orders, which included wholesale attacks on the very foundations of immigration, racial equity, gender, and the environment policies. We can assume that these Executive Orders are also meant to spread fear, noting that the Administration is [asking for federal employees to report on their colleagues](#).

Some of the Executive Orders have an immediate harmful impact, while others are not as detrimental and will take time to implement. With relation to climate and

environmental justice, these Executive Orders reflect a full-scale attack on government programs implementing environmental justice and equity. The Executive Orders also walk back several key climate programs ranging from international agreements to electric vehicle programs, and they also attempt to shift all energy priorities to fossil fuel drilling and natural gas and away from wind energy and other clean energy programs. While the impact of these sweeping actions will be significant, it is also important to remember the limitations of executive orders and that they cannot change existing law. Below is a summary of the Executive Orders (“EOs”) related to climate and environmental justice along with an interpretation of how these executive orders may impact current policies and programs.

*** This reflects our best interpretation to date given the current information, but many of these EOs are vague with unclear implications. Nothing in this memorandum should be construed as a definitive interpretation or legal advice about the impact of these EOs.*

Reminders on Executive Orders and Federal Grants

Reminders about Executive Orders:

- **EOs cannot change law or regulations on their own.**¹ If there is an existing law or finalized regulation/rule, those must go through a longer, more arduous process. For laws, like repealing parts of the Inflation Reduction Act (“IRA”) or the Bipartisan Infrastructure Law (“BIL”) or rescinding a tax credit established by law, those would need to go through Congress. For changing existing regulations, like the EPA rules on coal-fired power plants or coal ash, those would likely need to go through the [federal rulemaking process](#).²
 - After an EO is issued, agencies work with their General Counsel to develop a set of implementation options consistent with their legal authorities.
- **Executive Orders that direct Federal Agencies and the Executive branch are likely the most impactful**, and thus could be the most harmful, primarily because the President has the authority to direct Federal Agencies on their internal policies and how they do their work.

Reminders on Federal Grants:

- **Signed grant awards are legal agreements between the federal government and the grantee with a set of protections enshrined in federal regulations.** So long as

¹ For general discussion of what executive orders are, see: <https://www.npr.org/2025/01/21/nx-s1-5269600/trump-executive-actions-orders-memoranda-proclamation>.

² Some regulations may also be subject to review and potential rescission by Congress under the Congressional Review Act. See <https://crsreports.congress.gov/product/pdf/IF/IF10023> (describing the process for reviewing an agency action under the Congressional Review Act).

the grantee is in compliance with the terms and conditions of their award, then this funding is quite durable.³

- **The vast majority of EPA's funding has been obligated onto such signed award agreements** -- Over 93% of its funding under the Inflation Reduction Act and over 82% of its FY22-24 infrastructure funding is obligated.⁴
- **Agencies are limited in their ability to pause disbursement of funds for signed award agreements.** Federal grant regulations establish that grantees "must be paid in advance" if they are in good standing with appropriate financial controls and at the very least must be reimbursed "within 30 calendar days after receipt of the payment request" unless there is a reasonable belief that the request is improper. (See 2 CFR 200.305:
<https://www.ecfr.gov/current/title-2/subtitle-A/chapter-II/part-200/subpart-D>)
- **EPA cannot arbitrarily withhold a grantees' proper request for such payment** when the grantee is in good standing.⁵

Trump's Executive Orders Analysis

****Executive Order: [Restoring Equality of Opportunity and Meritocracy](#)**

This executive order, signed on April 23, is an attempt to dismantle disparate impact liability, a core tenet of civil rights protections enshrined in Title VI of the Civil Rights Act, among other statutes and judicial precedents.

The executive order:

- Directs federal agencies to rollback all regulations related to disparate impact liability and review all current lawsuits, consent decrees, and investigations based on disparate impact claims;
- Directs all agencies to deprioritize enforcement of statutes and regulations that include disparate impact liability;
- Directs the Attorney General to identify any Federal authorities that preempt state laws, regulations, or policies that include disparate impact and take "appropriate measures"; and
- Directs the Attorney General and the Chair of the Equal Employment Opportunity Commission (EEOC) to create guidance for employers on how to "promote equal access to employment regardless of whether an applicant has a college education."

³ If any organizations have questions about the impact of any of these EOs on their grant, we recommend contacting the Lawyers for Good Government Fund Protection Clinic:

<https://www.lawyersforgoodgovernment.org/fund-protection-legal-guidance-request>.

⁴

<https://www.epa.gov/newsreleases/new-report-celebrates-epas-unprecedented-successes-under-biden-harris-administrations>

⁵ Relevant regulation: [2 CFR. 200.305\(b\)\(1\)](#).

Background on Title VI and Disparate Impact Requirements: Disparate impact liability is incorporated in various statutes, regulations, and judicial precedents as a way to address the discriminatory consequences of actions taken, even if there was no discriminatory intent.⁶ In addition to Titles VI and VII of the Civil Rights Act of 1964, which prohibit discrimination in employment and federal financial assistance, respectively, the Fair Housing Act, Equal Credit Opportunity Act, and the Age Discrimination in Employment Act also incorporate disparate impact standards and have historically been enforced by the Department of Housing and Urban Development (HUD), the Consumer Financial Protection Bureau (CFPB), the Federal Trade Commission (FTC), and the EEOC.⁷

One of the farthest reaching of these laws, Title VI was enacted as part of the Civil Rights Act of 1964 to prohibit both intentional discrimination and actions with a discriminatory effect — or what we call disparate impact — based on race, color, or national origin in programs receiving federal financial assistance. Title VI applies across all federal agencies to all recipients of federal funding, including state and local governments, private entities, and subcontractors.

Under Title VI statutory and regulatory requirements, each agency is charged with investigating complaints, ensuring affirmative compliance before giving out funds, and setting forth clear standards. Agencies have the power to withhold federal funds and to refer cases to the Department of Justice for enforcement actions, but the statute also allows for negotiation and voluntary compliance. Some agencies have historically been more proactive on this front. However, the Environmental Protection Agency (EPA) has historically [poorly and slowly responded](#) to Title VI complaints. In fact, EPA has [nearly never found](#) that any of its actions result in a disparate impact.

Potential Impacts of Executive Order: Title VI and its requirements are a valuable tool to protect communities from disparate impacts from federally-funded projects and programs, so this EO may signal further risks of disproportionate harm for communities of color. Considering EPA's historically poor implementation of Title VI, elimination of the enforcement of disparate impact requirements may not as impactful as related to EPA, but

⁶ Disparate impact liability was first recognized by the Supreme Court of the United States in 1971, in the context of interpreting Title VII of the Civil Rights Act of 1964, which prohibits discrimination in employment based on race, color, religion, sex, or national origin. In the case of *Griggs v. Duke Power Co.*, 401 U.S. 424 (1971), the Court held that this prohibition applied to "practices, procedures, or tests neutral on their face, and even neutral in terms of intent... if they operate to 'freeze' the status quo of prior discriminatory employment practices."

⁷ This EO does not name Title VI, but raises concerns in line with those described in Project 2025. A blueprint for a conservative president developed by the Heritage Foundation and others, Project 2025 called for eliminating data collection by the EEOC and barring the Department of Labor's Office of Federal Contract Compliance Programs from using disparate impact in its analysis. [Project 2025](#) at 583. Project 2025 also proposed to end Title VI investigations that rely on disparate impact in the context of school discipline and revise Department of Education Title VI regulations "to state that Title VI... does not include a disparate impact standard." *Id.* at 335.

it may have greater impacts at agencies like HUD, which has relied on the disparate impact requirements under the Fair Housing Act to effectively investigate violations to fair housing practices and discrimination.

Without the federal agencies enforcing disparate impact complaints under Title VI, the potential options for individuals and communities to contest discriminatory effects of federal financial assistance are limited. In a 2001 decision in *Alexander v. Sandoval*, the Supreme Court held that individuals could not enforce Title VI disparate impact regulations in federal court. The government, however, has historically interpreted *Sandoval* as limited to Title VI disparate impact enforcement, meaning that individuals may still be able to bring disparate impact cases under other statutes like the Fair Housing Act. After *Sandoval*, to bring a case under Title VI, an individual would need to show discriminatory intent, which is difficult to show.

In addition, Section 7(a) of this EO directs the Attorney General to report on state laws, regulations, policies, and practices that “impose disparate-impact liability based on a federally protected characteristic such as race, sex, or age” which may be preempted by Federal authorities or otherwise “have constitutional infirmities that warrant Federal action.” This suggests that the federal government may investigate or eventually attempt to challenge state and local requirements that prohibit disparate impact, even though these requirements are based on state and local laws. Numerous states have enacted anti-discrimination laws that incorporate disparate impact standards, including California’s Fair Employment and Housing Act, Massachusetts’ General Law Chapter 151B, the New York State Human Rights Law, and New Jersey’s Law Against Discrimination.

****Executive Order: [Protecting American Energy From State Overreach](#)**

This Executive Order, signed by President Trump April 8, attacks state and local climate action and policies in an attempt to deter states from exercising their rights to protect their sovereign interests. The EO seeks to remove “illegitimate impediments,” or barriers, at the state and local level to fossil-fuel and nuclear energy development and use, including specific references to California’s cap-and-trade and Vermont and New York’s climate superfund laws.

While these attacks are purely rhetorical at this point, this EO lays out the Administration’s latest targets for further action. The EO directs the U.S. Attorney General to identify and take action against state and local laws that address or include:

- State and local climate laws that are unconstitutional or may be pre-empted by federal law;
- Climate change;
- Environmental, Social, and Governance (ESG) initiatives;
- Environmental justice;

- Carbon or greenhouse gas (GHG) emissions; and
- Fund to collect carbon penalties or carbon taxes.

After the EO was signed, numerous [Governors released statements to push back](#) on their efforts to curb GHG emissions and address pollution.

What this could mean for state climate laws

While the EOs proposed attacks have little, if any, legal basis, the challenges to climate policies could include the potential for costly litigation, which, especially for smaller localities, could be significant and create a chilling effect that deters local governments from taking actions to address climate or environmental justice. In line with similar illegal attempts at [commandeering](#) state enforcement resources and [withholding](#) federal financial assistance appropriated and obligated to states, the Administration may attempt to use this EO as a reason to withhold federal funds to states with climate and environmental justice laws, trying to push them to walk back on their climate and environmental justice commitments. This is just a piece of the Administration's larger plan to create a toxic environment for climate and environmental justice policy, discouraging state and local governments as well as private industry from investing in solutions.

****Executive Order: [Reinvigorating America's Beautiful Clean Coal Industry and Amending Executive Order 14241](#)**

This EO was also signed on April 8, focusing on reinvigorating an already dying industry—coal. The EO:

- Declares coal as an essential part of U.S. economic and national security;
- Designates coal as a critical mineral for energy purposes and calls for evaluating coal as a critical material for steel production;
- Directs federal agencies to remove regulatory barriers to coal;
- Prioritizes coal leasing on federal lands;
- Promotes coal exports; and
- Supports coal-powered AI data centers and development of coal technologies.

The coal industry has been declining for years, with [wind and solar surpassing coal production in 2024](#). *The issue of data center build out and this EO indicating that coal should be prioritized to power AI data centers is extremely worrisome. AI data centers' energy demand is expected to be significant and increasing, and this EO could prop up uneconomical coal-fired power plants and delay planned retirements. State and local advocacy will be incredibly important to prevent this from happening.*

****Executive Order: [Strengthening the Reliability and Security of the United States Electric Grid](#)**

This Executive Order, also signed on April 8, states it is strengthening energy reliability to meet an increase in energy demand and grid infrastructure due to the Administration's

purported [national energy emergency](#) from earlier this year. This EO specifically requires DOE to identify and try to prevent power plants from leaving the grid (decommissioning) or transitioning to another energy source (i.e. coal-fired power plants being converted to other energy generation systems, like methane gas power plants) if needed to meet DOE reliability requirements.

- By requiring DOE to ensure energy supplies meet reliability and prevent resources from changing their fuel source, *this EO is likely overreaching into areas that have traditionally fallen within state authority and are not clearly authorized by the cited statutory authority, the emergency provision of the [Federal Power Act](#).*
- *This EO is worrisome since it may halt the plans for coal-fired power plants to either leave the grid through planned retirements or transition to different, cleaner fuel sources. Although the legality of this EO's overreach is unclear, this EO could be used to try to prevent retirements and fuel switches, which would increase harmful pollution.*

****Presidential Proclamation: [Regulatory Relief for Certain Stationary Sources to Promote American Energy](#)**

This proclamation was also signed on April 8, and attempts to provide "relief" to the coal industry. The proclamation provides a 2-year extension on the new Mercury Air Toxic Standard (MATS) rule, which requires coal-fired power plants to comply with the more stringent standards by July 8, 2027. This deadline is now extended to July 8, 2029. This extension is a blanket application of the exemption authority which the [EPA offered](#) to invoke by inviting polluters to email a request for a Presidential exemption under the Clean Air Act.

In combination with the effects of the EOs above, more coal-fired power plants may delay retirements, leading to continued emissions of mercury and other hazardous air pollutants. Coal-fired power plants would still be required to limit mercury and other hazardous air pollutants based on the previous MATS standard.

****Executive Order: [Unleashing American Energy](#)**

This executive order establishes a policy to encourage fossil-fuel energy production and exploration on Federal lands and waters and to eliminate the electric vehicle ("EV") "mandate". It requires the heads of departments to review all regulations that "burden" domestic energy production and use, and to implement action plans to rescind or revise such regulations. The order rescinds a number of Biden's Executive Orders on energy and the environment and implements actions to terminate the "Green New Deal". It directs agency heads to eliminate permitting delays and to expedite projects deemed "essential" to the Nation's economy or security. It also directs DOE to restart review of LNG export applications and to identify all agency actions that impose "undue burdens" on domestic mining. Below is a summary and some initial thoughts related to some aspects of this EO:

- **Ending “Green New Deal” Funding:** This EO orders federal agencies to “immediately pause the disbursement of funds” under the IRA and Bipartisan Infrastructure Act (“BIL” also known as the Infrastructure Innovation and Jobs Act (“IIJA”), this is also been known as the **federal funding freeze on clean energy and climate programs**. It requires agencies to report to the Office of Management and Budget (“OMB”) in 90 days how the spending aligns with the President’s energy goals. The majority of IRA and BIL funding has been obligated.
 - On Monday January 27, the Office of Management and Budget (OMB) **published a [memo](#) directing agencies to pause all “financial assistance** for foreign aid, nongovernmental organizations, DEI, woke gender ideology, and the green new deal.” This moratorium was going to take effect on Tuesday January 28 at 5pm ET, however, a [judge temporarily blocked](#) part of the Trump Administration’s plans to freeze federal aid until February 3. On January 29, [OMB rescinded its call](#) for a pause on federal assistance.
 - Court actions:
 - **23 States Attorneys General Sue.** On January 31, the U.S. District Court for the District of Rhode Island granted a [temporary restraining order](#) prohibiting the Trump Administration from “giving effect to the OMB Directive” with respect to financial assistance to 23 states and requiring the [issuance of notice](#) to agencies of this order.
 - The Trump Administration attempted to reinstate the funding freeze, but the 1st Circuit Court of Appeals [denied the request on Feb. 11](#).
 - On Thursday, March 6, the judge in the Rhode Island case [extended the preliminary injunction](#).
 - *PA Governor Shapiro filed a separate [lawsuit](#) to release the frozen state funding, and he [announced](#) that all of the Commonwealth’s federal funding had been restored as of February 24, 2025.*
 - **Democracy Forward and other Nonprofits Sue.** On February 3, the U.S. District Court for the District of Columbia [granted another temporary restraining order](#) of the OMB’s freeze on federal grant disbursements.
 - On February 25, in the same case, the D.C. District Court issued a [preliminary injunction](#) blocking the blanket freeze from the OMB memo and any freezes under another name and ordering that written notice of this order be given to federal agencies. The federal defendants [appealed](#) the preliminary injunction to the D.C. Circuit Court on April 24.
 - On March 13, a [group of nonprofits filed a lawsuit](#) in Rhode Island challenging the freeze on funding from the IRA and IIJA.
 - On April 15, a federal judge [granted plaintiffs’ request for a preliminary injunction](#), ordering federal agencies, like EPA,

USDA, and others, enjoined from “from freezing, halting, or pausing on a non-individualized basis the processing and payment of funding” and to **immediately resume disbursing already-awarded IRA and Infrastructure Act funds**. The federal defendants [appealed](#) the preliminary injunction to the First Circuit on April 30.

- ******On May 6, following four status conferences about the federal defendants’ compliance with the preliminary injunction, Judge McElroy issued [an order](#) finding that EPA’s decision to terminate approximately 800 awards **did not violate** the April 15 preliminary injunction. The judge further ordered defendants to file its motion to stay further proceedings pending the First Circuit’s resolution of defendants’ appeal of the preliminary injunction.
- **** Current State of Frozen Federal Funds:** Most funds for all EPA programs, except for the two Greenhouse Gas Reduction Fund (GGRF) programs [discussed below](#), were reportedly released following the February 25 preliminary injunction described above. **Following the [decision on April 15](#), all federal agencies must resume disbursing frozen funds.**
- ****Current State of Grant “Cancellations”:**
 - Prior to the April 15 decision, EPA Administrator Zeldin had announced [multiple rounds](#) of **grant “cancellations”**, and some awardees across several different programs have received notices from EPA purporting to terminate their awards.
 - EPA and other agencies is likely not complying with legal requirements to carry out terminations, which means that awardees facing cancellation or termination notices may likely win in court if they challenged it. While Judge McElroy ruled in the Rhode Island nonprofit case that EPA’s decision to terminate hundreds of grants did not violate the April 15 preliminary injunction, she acknowledged that this conclusion was based on a limited analysis due to the context and posture of that case, and that “[a] separate lawsuit with these terminations as the central agency actions might require a closer look or a different analysis.”
- **** On the Issue of Jurisdiction for these cases:** There are two opinions related to the issue of *where* these cases challenging funding freezes and terminations against the Administration should be heard. The Administration believes these cases should *only* be heard in the Court of Federal Claims, which would likely lead to long delays because the Court of Federal Claims has a long waitlist of claims.
 - On April 5, the U.S. Supreme Court gave the Trump Administration a [temporary win](#) in a case where [states](#) contested the termination of

federal grants administered by the Department of Education. The Court found that the states needed to address their claim in the Court of Claims. This decision, however, likely has limited impact, as the relevant issues — regarding whether the dispute is heard in the Court of Federal Claims — were not fully briefed or argued. Based on this emergency decision, the Administration could argue that claims should *only* be heard in the Court of Federal Claims.

- In the [April 15 nonprofit decision](#), the judge dismissed the Administration's claims that the judge lacked the jurisdiction to make a ruling because the case should be heard in the Court of Federal Claims reasoning, in part, that the Supreme Court's decision was based on an emergency request, which does not overrule a long line of precedent that gives her jurisdiction. **While this may be challenged again, it's a good precedent set for other claims this Administration may push for a change in jurisdiction.**
- **What Organizations and Awardees can do now:**
 - For EPA grant recipients: If your funding is currently missing or suspended from ASAP or if you are otherwise denied a drawdown, it is important to document all of your efforts to legally draw down funding from your ASAP account. [Environmental Protection Network](#) (EPN) recommends emailing your Program Officer about this immediately; this [email template](#) can be customized with details specific to your grant and impacts of being unable to access funding.
 - If you have a finalized federal grant and are unable to access funding, Lawyers for Good Government (L4GG) offers a [Fund Protection Clinic](#) to provide free legal support to grantees.
 - L4GG, EPN, NRDC, and Communities First are also offering a variety of free resources on [grant management](#), including webinars on best practices regarding issues like procurement and financial management, 1:1 assistance, and office hours.
- The OMB Director, Russell Vought, has argued that a president can withhold funds appropriated by Congress through "impoundment", but that challenges the constitutionality of a law barring the president interfering with Congress' power over taxing and spending. *If the Administration attempts to impound obligated funding, it will likely be challenged in court as unconstitutional. This would likely go to the Supreme Court, and [some believe](#) Trump may have a chance of succeeding.* Others, including [legislators](#), strongly believe impoundment is unconstitutional and illegal.
- **NEPA Streamlining:** This EO proposes taking NEPA enforcement out of CEQ's jurisdiction, rescinding existing regulations, and developing streamlined processes to ease permitting. Specifically, CEQ is directed to provide guidance on implementing NEPA and propose rescinding CEQ's NEPA regulations, and then to

coordinate agency-level NEPA regulations for consistency. *While an EO cannot rescind regulations, this EO's language **changes the process for reviewing projects, which would likely streamline harmful projects.** Those actions, however, are still subject to judicial review so there is still an avenue to uphold NEPA's requirements even if the Administration streamlines harmful projects.*

- This section of the EO also directs agency heads to “use all possible authorities, including emergency authorities, to expedite the adjudication of Federal permits” for “any project an agency head deems essential for the Nation’s economy or national security.”
- The Director of the National Economic Council and Office of Legislative Affairs are also directed to prepare recommendations to Congress to facilitate permitting and construction of interstate energy transportation and other critical energy infrastructure, especially pipelines “in regions of the Nation that have lacked such development in recent years,” and to provide greater certainty in the permitting process, particularly in “streamlining” judicial review of NEPA. There is no timeline provided for when this should occur.
- The Council for Environmental Quality (“CEQ”) has published an [interim final rule](#), which removes CEQ’s regulations implementing the National Environmental Policy (“NEPA”) from the Code of Federal Regulations. This interim final rule, which is open for comment until March 27, 2025, would undo decades of NEPA regulations and streamline permitting and review of harmful projects.
- **Revokes Previous EOs, Ending Justice40:** Section 4 revokes a series of Biden Administration Executive Orders and abolishes any offices created by them, including EO 14008, which established the Justice40 initiative, and EO 14096, which created the White House Office of Environmental Justice. Many government websites containing information about Justice40 are no longer available.
- **Endangerment Finding Revision:** Section 6 of the EO directs the EPA Administrator to submit recommendations to the OMB Director “on the legality and continuing applicability of” the 2009 Endangerment Finding within 30 days.
 - Generally, the Endangerment Finding underpins the EPA’s authority to regulate greenhouse gases under the Clean Air Act. Revising or withdrawing it could mean EPA would no longer be able to regulate climate pollution in most contexts.
 - Revising or withdrawing this finding, however, would be [difficult](#). To revise the Endangerment Finding, the EPA would need to go through a lengthy notice and comment period, and it would also have to defend changing a finding that the Supreme Court has previously upheld when Congress included language in the Inflation Reduction Act requiring EPA action related to climate change.

- EPA Administrator Zeldin [announced plans](#) to reconsider 31 rules that largely address climate change or reduce pollution from burning fossil fuels. This is essentially a “roadmap” of the **rules that EPA plans to try to rollback over the next year**. A rollback of the rules on the list would increase dangerous pollution and climate risks across the country. Some of the rules that EPA plans to reconsider and try to rollback include:
 - EPA’s **endangerment finding** for GHGs, which provides the scientific basis for EPA’s GHG rules;
 - EPA’s rules **limiting GHGs and mercury from power plants** (some know this as the Clean Power Plan rules);
 - EPA rules **limiting pollution from vehicles**; and
 - EPA’s **particulate matter** standard.
- EPA provided no details about whether it plans to weaken or get rid of these rules, but this announcement is the first step in a process to roll them back.
- **End Liquefied Natural Gas (LNG) Pause** - In early 2024, Biden paused permits for new liquefied natural gas projects. This EO resumes LNG permitting as part of Trump’s effort to raise U.S. fossil energy output.

You can also see [Sierra Club’s resource](#) summarizing the different parts of the Unleashing American Energy.

****President’s Message: [Follow the Law](#)**

On February 13, 2025, Trump signed a message that announced his administration making a referral to the EPA Office of Inspector General over a purported “scheme by outgoing Biden EPA staffers to bury billions of dollars of federal funding at an outside financial institution,” in reference to the the Congressionally-directed GGRF program. Trump is referring to EPA Administrator Zeldin’s announcement that he is trying to [claw back the \\$20 billion from the GGRF](#) (the NCIF and CCIA programs, *not Solar for All* at this point). It is important to remember that:

- The money is already out of the federal government and is in a separate bank account, and the awardees have already been completing projects using this funding.
- As even the EPA administrator admitted, there is no reason to suspect any wrongdoing in this important, transformative program that is already providing important economic, resilience, and job benefits to communities across the country.
- Any action to clawback money will likely face legal challenges.
- **EPA Moves to Terminate GGRF Funding** – EPA has pursued a targeted campaign to terminate \$20 billion in GGRF Funding, and the NCIF awardees and some [states](#) are fighting back. In a series of cases filed in federal district court, the awardees and four states with green banks are asking courts to block EPA’s efforts to

terminate the program. On March 18, 2025, a [district court judge temporarily blocked](#) EPA's attempt to recoup the money from GGRF, finding the agency failed to provide a "legal justification" for terminating the contracts. On Wednesday April 2, Climate United, Coalition for Green Capital, and Power Forward Communities asked a federal judge to [order Citibank to grant them access to award funds](#) while litigation continues over whether the Trump Administration can terminate the program. Two CCIA awardees, Justice Climate Fund and Inclusiv have also filed suit against EPA and Citibank.

- On April 15, the [Judge ruled in favor of Climate United](#), granting a [preliminary injunction](#), the ruling:
 - Blocks EPA from acting on their unlawful grant termination;
 - Prevents EPA from "unlawfully suspending or terminating the grants," including by issuing a notice of exclusive control;
 - Bars EPA and Treasury from impeding Citibank from releasing funds;
 - Stops Citibank from transferring funds back to the Treasury;
 - Orders Citibank to disburse any funds properly incurred before the mid-February suspension of funds.
- EPA, in anticipation of the ruling in the District Court case, filed an appeal with the District of Columbia U.S. Court of Appeals asking for an emergency stay of the anticipated preliminary injunction, which [granted](#) a temporary stay of the requirement to disburse the funds on April 16.
 - Climate United will formally oppose the administrative stay and expects a final decision on the stay later next week. The appeals court will then consider the merits of the case, which will take several weeks to reach a decision.
 - **Currently, funds remain frozen at Citibank.**

****Presidential Action: [Ending Illegal Discrimination and Restoring Merit-Based Opportunity](#)**

This Presidential Action rolls back decades of civil rights protections, and includes guidance for federal agencies encouraging private industry to follow suit. All of these rollbacks are made using the argument of "**removing diversity, equity, and inclusion.**" This Action includes rolling back Executive Order 12898, [Federal Actions to Address Environmental Justice in Minority Populations and Low-Income Populations](#), which established the Interagency Working Group on Environmental Justice and directed federal agencies to make environmental justice part of their mission. Some of the likely impacts of this EO include:

- **Eliminates Environmental Justice Programs for the Federal Government** - This Action along with the other EOs below effectively will remove environmental justice programs from federal agencies and the executive branch. While much of environmental justice and equity considerations are enshrined in law that will need

to be changed by Congress, this again will create a gap in the administration of those requirements, accountability, and transparency.

- **Pressure on Private Companies** - This Action also requires federal agencies to put pressure on companies to discontinue policies that are focused on diversity, equity and inclusion. The federal government does not have jurisdiction to require companies to end diversity, inclusion and equity programs, but this EO tries to figure out ways to influence that in other ways. This is setting a dangerous precedent attempting to roll-back equity protections beyond the federal government.
- The National Urban League, National Fair Housing Alliance, and the AIDS Foundation of Chicago [filed a lawsuit](#) in the D.C. District Court challenging the DEI Executive Order on a number of constitutional and administrative law grounds.
 - ******On May 2, Judge Kelly issued [an order](#) denying plaintiffs' motion for preliminary injunction.
- On February 21, a [federal judge blocked](#) substantial portions of the anti-DEI Executive Orders, finding that certain provisions of the anti-DEI EOs were unconstitutionally vague and constituted viewpoint discrimination. On February 24, the Trump Administration filed [notice](#) that they are appealing this preliminary injunction at the Court of Appeals for the Fourth Circuit. On March 14, the [Fourth Circuit halted a temporary injunction](#) on aspects of the anti-DEI EOs. This means that at least temporarily, the federal government can move forward with its efforts to terminate equity grants and require certification from grantees that their DEI work does not violate anti-discrimination laws.

Executive Order: [Ending Radical and Wasteful Government Programs and Preferencing](#)

This EO orders the Office of Management and Budget ("OMB") to end all diversity, equity and inclusion programs. Requires each agency to terminate environmental justice offices and positions, "equity" actions, initiatives, or programs, and equity-related grants or contracts. Orders agencies to provide OMB with a list of federal grantees that advance environmental justice programs, and directs agencies to assess the impact of all diversity, equity and inclusion programs and recommend actions to Congress and the President to advance this EO. Some of the likely impacts of this EO include:

- **End of Environmental Justice Federal Programs:** This EO essentially calls for the end of the federal government's EJ program as it exists today. This has already started to be implemented:
 - On February 5, 2025, DOJ published a memo eliminating consideration of EJ in enforcement.
 - A DOJ section focusing on EJ has been disbanded.
 - [EPA employees who work on EJ have been put on leave](#), likely just a precursor to being fired. There has also been a [report](#) that some of these employees have been rehired after EPA assessed its statutory requirements.

- The White House Environmental Justice Advisory Council has been disbanded.
- Important information like the EPA's EJ Screen has been taken offline.
- **End of Diversity, Equity and Inclusion Federal Programs:** This EO requires a broad termination of all federal government "diversity, equity, and inclusion" and environmental justice programs, offices, and positions.
 - On Tuesday, January 21, the Office of Personnel Management issued a memo directing all federal employees in roles of "diversity, equity, and inclusion" to be put on Administrative leave by 5pm Wednesday January 22. The memo also instructs federal agencies to submit plans by January 31 on firing these individuals.
 - Many employees throughout the federal government were put on leave under the guise of this executive order. This appears to be a [retaliatory attempt](#) to remove many career service employees from the government.
- **End of EJ Grants and Contracts:** This EO requires agencies to end all EJ grants and contracts, but it is not clear what action will be taken for obligated and awarded contracts.
 - If it tries to "impound" obligated and awarded contracts, it will likely be subject to legal challenge as violating an existing contract and law requiring Congressional control over taxes and spending.
 - On January 27, DOE sent a [memo](#) citing this EO to grant recipients and subrecipients directing them to "cease any activities, including contracted activities, and stop incurring costs associated with DEI and [Community Benefits Plan] activities." The memo indicated that recipients with DEI and CBP activities in their awards would be contacted "to initiate award modifications consistent with this order."
 - On January 31, citing the same EO, the Small Business Administration [reportedly](#) sent notices to all grant recipients, directing them to "immediately cease conducting and reporting under any DEI or DEIA mandates, policies, programs, preferences, or activities required by their awards." Grantees were also directed to "list of each and every mandate, policy, program, preference, or activity under your award that meets the criteria outlined in the Executive Order" and to certify compliance with the EO. Similar notices have been issued from other agencies and offices, including the Department of Education and Health Resources and Services Administration (with Health and Human Services).
 - It is unlikely that courts would allow agencies to unilaterally modify executed award agreements. We urge any awardee being pressured to change an agreement to not change now given the uncertainty and the potential conflict with existing agency guidance.

- EPA has [reportedly](#) canceled “equity” and “environmental justice” grants in response to these EOs. [It is not clear](#) from the announcement or available materials what contracts have been cancelled, although Democratic members of the Senate Environment and Public Works Committee have published a [leaked list](#) of over 400 grants and the Sierra Club got another [list](#) of 49 grants through a Freedom of Information Act request.
 - At least some participants in the EPA’s [Thriving Communities Grantmaking \(TCGM\) Program](#) received [termination notices](#) from the Trump Administration and some of the grantmakers are now [suing](#). Green and Healthy Homes Initiative (GHHI), the grantmaker for Region 3 (MD, PA, VA), filed a [lawsuit on April 2](#) claiming EPA wrongfully cancelled an \$8 million grant, meant to support GHHI in Administering the program, and froze another \$52 million, that was meant to be regranted to organizations in their region. The complaint was joined by Minneapolis Foundation, which is the grantmaker in Region 5 (MN, IL, MI), and Seattle-based Philanthropy Northwest, representing Region 10 (AK, ID, OR, WA and 271 Tribal Nations). The lawsuit alleges that, between the three grantmakers, EPA has illegally blocked access to \$180 million.
- **Review List of EJ Grantees:** This EO requires agencies to provide a list of grantees to OMB and directs agencies to assess the impact of all equity programs, including environmental justice programs.
 - Several resources are available to EJ grantees in the event of harassment including the [Fund Protection Clinic by Lawyers for Good Government](#),
- Several EJ programs are based on laws that have been passed by Congress, but the Administration has significant authority over how it uses its resources. Given this, it is likely that the Administration will be able to dismantle many of its EJ programs and initiatives.
- This anti-DEI executive order has already been [challenged in federal court](#). As described above, on [February 21, 2025, a federal judge blocked substantial portions of the anti-DEI Executive Orders](#), finding that they were unconstitutionally vague and constituted viewpoint discrimination. On February 24, 2025, the Trump Administration filed [notice](#) that they are appealing this preliminary injunction at the Court of Appeals for the Fourth Circuit. As described [above](#), the Fourth Circuit halted the preliminary injunction on March 14, 2025.
- EPA and the Department of Government Efficiency (DOGE) [announced on March 4](#) the cancellation of another 21 grants related to “DEI” and environmental justice, totaling \$116,449,761.

Executive Order: [Ensuring the Enforcement of Federal Rule of Civil Procedure 65\(c\)](#)

In a new March 11, 2025 Executive Order, President Trump said that the United States should demand that parties seeking injunctions against the Federal Government must cover costs and damages incurred if the Government is found to have been wrongfully enjoined or restrained. President Trump attacked “activist organizations” as orchestrating an “anti-democratic takeover” by forum shopping. While this could have a chilling impact on future litigation, judges have wide latitude whether any security amount should be placed on plaintiffs and what that amount should be.

- Trump has also issued statements attacking law firms, including a March 14, 2025 statement entitled “[Addressing Risks from Paul Weiss](#)” and a March 6, 2025 statement entitled “[Addressing Risks from Perkins Cole LLP](#)”
- This all reflects Trump’s increased attacks on the judicial system and the rule of law.

Executive Order: [Continuing the Reduction of the Federal Bureaucracy](#)

In a new March 14, 2025 Executive Order, President Trump purports to eliminate, to the maximum extent possible, federal programs that provide critical community services, including the Community Development Financial Institutions Fund and Minority Business Development Agency. Aspects of this EO have faced bipartisan opposition and the scope of this EO is vague and unclear, so it is not clear whether the Administration will move forward with gutting these entities.

Executive Order: [Implementing the President’s “Department of Government Efficiency” Workforce Optimization Initiative](#)

On February 26, 2025, President Trump signed an order that requires agencies to cut costs by terminating or modifying contracts and grants (through negotiation) “where appropriate and consistent with applicable law.” It also requires agencies to change how they review contracts and freezes credit cards of all agency employees for 30 days.

Executive Order: [Establishing the National Energy Dominance Council](#):

On February 14, 2025, President Trump signed an executive order setting up a new “National Energy Dominance Council,” which he directed to drive up fossil fuel production. In addition to setting up this Council, President Trump also announced that it:

- Conditional approval of new LNG project in Louisiana;
- Directed the Department of Interior to undo the ban on offshore oil drilling;
- Vowed to revive a cancelled pipeline.

Notably, the Administration is tying “energy dominance” to fossil fuel production, while largely stepping away from and sometimes actively blocking wind and solar energy. Many of the Administration’s actions will likely be subject to legal actions.

Executive Order: [Council to Assess the Federal Emergency Management Agency](#)

On January 24, 2025, Trump signed an executive order that said the Federal Emergency Management Agency needed to “drastically improve” its “efficacy, priorities, and

competence.” This EO established a review council to assess the Federal Emergency Management Agency with no more than 20 members. The members will include department heads as well as people from outside the government that are appointed by Trump. The potential impacts of this EO are:

- **Potential Attempt to Abolish FEMA** – Trump may try to abolish FEMA and require that disasters should be handled by local and state governments. Trump has suggested this in [recent comments](#), and it is a recommendation of Project 2025.
- **No Authority** – Trump likely does not have authority to abolish FEMA. It would take an act of Congress. Although it was created as an executive order in 1978, it has since been established by Congress, and it was also put under the Department of Homeland Security in the [Homeland Security Act of 2002](#).
- **FEMA Has Bipartisan Support** – FEMA has historically received bipartisan support, as much of the aid has gone to red states, such as Louisiana and Texas, that have been hit with natural disasters.⁸

Executive Order: [Achieving Efficiency Through State and Local Preparedness](#)

On March 19, President Trump signed an executive order that [appears to commit to the federal government retaining a role](#) in disaster response by opting instead to overhaul the federal government’s response to disasters.

New Executive Order: [Ensuring Accountability for All Agencies](#)

On February 18, 2025, President Trump signed an executive order greatly increasing his power over agencies that have historically been independent of the President, including the [Federal Energy Regulatory Commission](#), Securities and Exchange Commission and the Federal Trade Commission.

- The EO would attempt to require previously independent agencies to submit potential regulations to the President before promulgation.
- These agencies were set up to be independent by Congress because lawmakers wanted the government to perform some functions like overseeing elections and regulating financial markets without direct presidential involvement. For example, a statute bars anyone at the Department of Energy from directly the Federal Energy Regulatory Commission’s (“FERC’s”) actions. Implementation of this could seriously undermine FERC’s work.
- This is likely to be challenged as an overreach of the President’s authority.

⁸ <https://abcnews.go.com/Politics/trump-terminate-fema-fast/story?id=118076946>;
<https://www.fox13news.com/news/president-trumps-proposal-eliminate-fema-raises-concerns-among-florida-lawmakers>

Executive Order: [Unleashing Prosperity Through Deregulation](#)

On January 31, Trump issued a [fact sheet](#) referring to an [Executive Order](#), only available on a non-official website, which states that if a department or an agency wants to create a regulation, they need to get rid of ten first. The executive order and factsheet provides:

- More Power to OMB – This executive order provides OMB with significant power to not allow agencies to promulgate regulations until after their regulatory agenda is approved by OMB. It also transferred review authority for tax regulations back to OMB.
- Trying to Stop All New Regulations - It requires that the total incremental cost of all new regulations, including repealed regulations, be less than zero. *This essentially means that Trump does not want any new regulations.*
- Deregulation Rhetoric – The fact sheet reasons that regulations hurt business, discourage innovation and infringe on liberties, even though regulations are most often protections from harms.
- Previous Administration – The fact sheet also discusses taking a similar action in the previous administration and requiring that 2 regulations were eliminated for every single one. *The previous administration [failed](#) to meet this goal, so they will likely involve some creative accounting to attempt to meet it now.*
- Exemptions: The [executive order](#) provides a number of exemptions including those related to military, immigration, and national security and those that impose minimal costs and burdens.

This Executive Order cannot repeal regulations by itself. This action cannot by itself require regulations to be repealed. The law requires procedures to be followed before any previous regulatory requirement can be repealed. **The procedures to repeal regulations take time and multiple steps before being finalized.**

Check out this [helpful thread](#) from James Goodwin of Center for Progressive Reform

Executive Order: [Initial Rescissions of Harmful Executive Orders and Actions](#)

This EO rescinds a wide range of President Biden's EOs covering racial equity, climate change, and environment justice policies and more. The Appendix includes a list of environmental justice and climate change EOs that were rescinded along with the full list of EOs that were [rescinded here](#). With relation to environmental justice and climate change, this EO rescinds a wide-range of President Biden's EOs that set forth the Justice 40 Initiative, an environmental justice focus for the federal government, and goals related to clean energy and electric vehicles.

Likely Impact: Some of the EO rescissions related to environmental justice will not have a significant impact, but many of them will substantially change the government's approach to environmental justice and federal bodies like the White House Environmental Justice Advisory Committee and other bodies focused on equity and justice will be shut down or removed completely from the federal government. This continues the

Administration's attempt to remove "equity" from any federal programs. The rescissions of Biden's key EOs, along with the other EOs described below, will also mean likely less oversight of the implementation and development of beneficial federal programs and policy, lack of new or continued investment or communication with underserved communities, and the elimination of positions that touch on civil rights and environmental/climate justice.

Actions Impacting Federal Workers

Trump signed a series of executive orders that make it easier to fire federal employees and to hire new federal employees that support the Administration. Some believe that it may be laying the groundwork for mass firings. Some of these executive orders include:

- [Reforming the Federal Hiring Process and Restoring Merit to Government Service](#)
- [Restoring Accountability to Policy-Influencing Positions Within the Federal Workforce](#)
 - *This Executive Order, which has previously been called Schedule F, rebrands various important federal jobs as exempt from civil service hiring rules and protections, making it easier for them to be fired. It is attempting to require that federal employees in certain positions support the Administration.*
 - [A major union](#) has already sued to block this order.
- Since this executive order, the Office of Personnel Management sent a memo called "Fork in the Road" encouraging employees to leave. It tries to force them to resign or potentially face firing if they do not follow the Administration's policies. This memo was [temporarily stayed](#) until February 12, when the judge in that case [lifted](#) that pause and denied preliminary injunctive relief.
- Other federal employees including employees who have worked on EJ, equity, diversity and inclusion, US AID, and several other agencies have been put on leave.
- [Implementing the President's "Department of Government Efficiency" Workforce Optimization Initiative](#) – On February 11, 2025, Trump signed a new executive order to shrink the federal workforce by requiring that no more than one employee should be hired for every four replaced and requiring large-scale reductions in force. It also requires:
 - OMB to develop rulemaking providing more reasons someone can be fired; and
 - Agencies to develop reorganization plans to reduce the federal workforce.
 - A [February 26, 2025 OMB Memorandum](#) requires agencies to submit reorganization plans by March 13, 2025 by cutting federal government jobs.
- The Administration is [reportedly](#) planning to reduce EPA by 65%, although it is not clear if that is EPA's budget or workforce. Cuts of this magnitude will significantly impede the EPA to do any work to protect the country for environmental harms.

Executive Order: [Declaring a National Energy Emergency](#)

This executive order requires agencies to identify and exercise any lawful emergency authorities available to them to facilitate the identification, leasing, siting, production, transportation, refining, and generation of domestic energy resources, including, but not limited to, on Federal lands. Orders the Administrator of the EPA and Secretary of Energy to consider issuing emergency fuel waivers to allow the year-round sale of E15 gasoline to meet any projected temporary shortfalls in the supply of gasoline. Agencies will identify actions that may require emergency permitting under the Clean Water Act.

- This is the first time a president has called a “national energy emergency,” but regional energy emergencies were declared in the 1970s when there were shortages of fossil fuels. When an emergency was called in the 1970s, a focus was on conservation, but that is unlikely to be a focus of Trump.
- There is no shortage of fossil fuels in the U.S. right now to justify calling an energy emergency. In fact, the U.S. is a net exporter of fossil fuels, producing more oil and gas than any other country in the world.
- President Trump is **likely calling a National Energy Emergency to have more power to suspend environmental requirements.**⁹

Presidential Memorandum: [Temporary Withdrawal of All Areas on the Outer Continental Shelf from Offshore Wind Leasing and Review of the Federal Government’s Leasing and Permitting Practices for Wind Projects](#)

Withdraws wind energy leasing for all areas within the Offshore Continental Shelf. It requires a temporary cessation and immediate review of federal wind leasing and permitting practices. It places a temporary stay on all activities related to the Lava Ridge Wind Project. Some potential impacts of this Memorandum include:

- Onshore Wind - This Memorandum is unlikely to significantly impact onshore wind development, because the vast majority of onshore wind projects are on private land.¹⁰
- Offshore Wind - This Memorandum’s impact to offshore wind is expected to be more significant as many offshore wind projects rely on leasing and permitting on areas of the outer continental shelf. As a result of this EO and the President’s efforts to halt offshore wind, several companies have paused plans to move forward with offshore wind projects.¹¹
- A coalition of environmental and health groups challenged Trump’s order to revoke Biden’s ban on offshore drilling.

⁹ See <https://www.brennancenter.org/our-work/research-reports/guide-emergency-powers-and-their-use> (describing emergency powers).

¹⁰ <https://www.nrdc.org/press-releases/trumps-wrong-turn-wind-energy>

¹¹

Executive Order: [Putting America First in International Environmental Agreements](#)

This EO the US out of the Paris Agreement. This EO would start the process of the U.S. withdrawing from the 2015 Paris climate agreement, which is a United Nations pact agreed to by 195 countries to limit global warming. Trump also signed a letter to the United Nations setting the departure in motion, but it takes one year to formally withdraw. This means that the U.S. will participate in the next rounds of talks in Brazil at the end of the year, but in a year, the U.S. could join Iran, Libya, and Yemen as the only nations that are not part of the accord.

- *While Trump did this in his first term, there were stipulations within the Agreement that slowed the process such that the US did not officially leave the Paris Agreement until late 2020, which President Biden then re-joined the agreement 4 months later in 2021 when he took office. This time around, it will only take 1 year to officially leave the Agreement.*
- *[Carbon brief](#) estimated that Trump's anti-climate change actions would result in an extra 4 billion metric tons of climate pollution, negating all the emission savings from clean energy*
- *There is [speculation](#) that given unmet goals from the Paris Agreement, and given that Climate Change is not necessarily the top priority of many countries, that you could see other countries follow suit with leaving the Paris Agreement too.*

Presidential Memorandum: [Delivering Emergency Price Relief for American Families and Defeating the Cost-of-Living Crisis](#)

Directs agencies and executive departments to "deliver emergency price relief, consistent with applicable law, to the American people and increase the prosperity of the American worker" and eliminate "coercive climate policies" that increase the costs of food and fuel.

- There are no specifics with this Memorandum and requires that the Assistant to the President on Economic Policy report to the President every 30 days on the movement with the Memorandum.
- ***What this could look like:*** *It is not clear what this Memorandum is intending to do, but it could be an attempt to attack things like energy efficiency measures, building requirements, or other policies that require renewables or a shift away from nonrenewable sources.¹² Given the vagueness of this Memorandum, it is unlikely to lead to immediate action, and any action to undo a federal regulation would take time to go through the notice and comment process and would likely face legal action.*

¹² Conservative groups have historically opposed energy efficiency measures. See, e.g., <https://natlawreview.com/article/three-legal-takeaways-fifth-circuit-decision-scrubbing-away-doe-rules-app-liance> (describing a conservative challenge to energy efficiency rules).

Executive Order: [Regulatory Freeze Pending Review](#)

This EO requires agencies to not propose or issue any rule until a department or agency head appointed or designated by the President reviews and approves the rule. Requires the withdrawal of any rules that have been sent to the Office of Federal Register, but not published. Requires a 60 day delay of any rules that have been published but not yet taken effect. What this will impact:

- All proposed rules or rules that have not yet been finalized: This will put an indefinite pause on any rule that was not finalized during the Biden administration.
- Withdrawal of rules not yet published in the federal register: In the final days of the Biden administration, Treasury finalized a number of rules related to the IRA tax incentives. These rules were published in the federal register already, so they are not subject to this provision.
- Treasury's rules for the low-income adder, investment tax credit, and the hydrogen tax credit are also already effective, so this EO's requirement for delaying rules that are not yet effective will not impact those rules.

Appendix/Additional Resources:**List and Description of Rescinded Climate Change and Environmental Equity EOs:**

- Executive Order 13985 of January 20, 2021 (Advancing Racial Equity and Support for Underserved Communities Through the Federal Government). This EO addressed systematic racism and required all federal agencies to ensure that their missions advance racial equity and support for underserved communities.
- Executive Order 13990 of January 20, 2021 (Protecting Public Health and the Environment and Restoring Science To Tackle the Climate Crisis). This EO required federal agencies to review actions taken during the first Trump administration that conflicted with public health, clean water and air, mitigating climate change, increasing resilience, and environmental justice objectives.
- Executive Order 14008 of January 27, 2021 (Tackling the Climate Crisis at Home and Abroad). This EO required that the United States work with international partners and domestically to build resilience to climate changes impacts. This EO also established the Justice 40 Initiative, which directed 40% of the overall benefits of certain Federal investments to disadvantaged communities.
- Executive Order 14027 of May 7, 2021 (Establishment of the Climate Change Support Office). This EO established a Climate Change Support Office in the Department of State.
- Executive Order 14030 of May 20, 2021 (Climate-Related Financial Risk). This EO required that the United States advanced consistent, clear, and accurate disclosures of climate-related financial risks.

- Executive Order 14031 of May 28, 2021 (Advancing Equity, Justice, and Opportunity for Asian Americans, Native Hawaiians, and Pacific Islanders). This EO established a Commission on Asian Americans, Native Hawaiians, and Pacific Islanders, and required the advancement of equity, justice and opportunity for these communities.
- Executive Order 14037 of August 5, 2021 (Strengthening American Leadership in Clean Cars and Trucks). This EO set a goal of 50 percent of all new passenger cars and light trucks sold in 2030 to be zero-emission vehicles, including electric, hybrid and fuel cell vehicles.
- Executive Order 14057 of December 8, 2021 (Catalyzing Clean Energy Industries and Jobs Through Federal Sustainability). This EO required that the federal government develop a plan to meet clean energy goals.
- Executive Order 14082 of September 12, 2022 (Implementation of the Energy and Infrastructure Provisions of the Inflation Reduction Act of 2022). This EO required the federal government to effectively implement the Bipartisan Infrastructure Law.¹³
- Executive Order 14091 of February 16, 2023 (Further Advancing Racial Equity and Support for Underserved Communities Through the Federal Government). This EO directed federal agencies to take additional efforts to advance equity initiatives.
- Executive Order 14096 of April 21, 2023 (Revitalizing Our Nation's Commitment to Environmental Justice for All). This EO developed a policy to pursue a whole-of-government approach to environmental justice.
- The Presidential Memorandum of January 6, 2025 (Withdrawal of Certain Areas of the United States Outer Continental Shelf from Oil or Natural Gas Leasing). In this Memorandum, President Biden withdrew oil and natural gas leasing from areas on the Outer Continental Shelf under the Outer Continental Shelf Lands Act.
- The Presidential Memorandum of January 6, 2025 (Withdrawal of Certain Areas of the United States Outer Continental Shelf from Oil or Natural Gas Leasing).

Federal-level Advocacy Resources. The Equity Fund is compiling federal defense resources we see from organizations, this includes know your rights toolkits, factsheets, analyses and more. Sharing a few of the resources included:

- **[Project 2025 Environment, Climate, and Public Safety Tracker](#)**. Tracker from Center for Progressive Reform and Governing for Impact on the various actions the Administration has taken and how they match up to Project 2025 plans.
- **Democracy Forward Legal Response Center [launched](#)** a legal response center Monday. They plan to [post analyses](#) on the executive orders (EOs) and other attacks from the Trump Admin and have already started doing individual analysis on the 100 EOs yesterday.
- **[List of Current Federal Litigation Related to Executive Orders](#)** - This provides links to all the current lawsuits against Trump's EOs.

¹³ Because the Bipartisan Infrastructure Law was passed by Congress, the government was required to implement it, even without this EO.

Additional EOs rescinded under [Initial Rescissions of Harmful Executive Orders and Actions](#)

- Executive Order 13986 of January 20, 2021 (Ensuring a Lawful and Accurate Enumeration and Apportionment Pursuant to the Decennial Census).
- Executive Order 13987 of January 20, 2021 (Organizing and Mobilizing the United States Government To Provide a Unified and Effective Response To Combat COVID-19 and To Provide United States Leadership on Global Health and Security).
- Executive Order 13988 of January 20, 2021 (Preventing and Combating Discrimination on the Basis of Gender Identity or Sexual Orientation).
- Executive Order 13989 of January 20, 2021 (Ethics Commitments by Executive Branch Personnel).
- Executive Order 13992 of January 20, 2021 (Revocation of Certain Executive Orders Concerning Federal Regulation).
- Executive Order 13993 of January 20, 2021 (Revision of Civil Immigration Enforcement Policies and Priorities).
- Executive Order 13995 of January 21, 2021 (Ensuring an Equitable Pandemic Response and Recovery).
- Executive Order 13996 of January 21, 2021 (Establishing the COVID-19 Pandemic Testing Board and Ensuring a Sustainable Public Health Workforce for COVID-19 and Other Biological Threats).
- Executive Order 13997 of January 21, 2021 (Improving and Expanding Access to Care and Treatments for COVID-19).
- Executive Order 13999 of January 21, 2021 (Protecting Worker Health and Safety).
- Executive Order 14000 of January 21, 2021 (Supporting the Reopening and Continuing Operation of Schools and Early Childhood Education Providers).
- Executive Order 14002 of January 22, 2021 (Economic Relief Related to the COVID-19 Pandemic).
- Executive Order 14003 of January 22, 2021 (Protecting the Federal Workforce).
- Executive Order 14004 of January 25, 2021 (Enabling All Qualified Americans To Serve Their Country in Uniform).
- Executive Order 14006 of January 26, 2021 (Reforming Our Incarceration System To Eliminate the Use of Privately Operated Criminal Detention Facilities).
- Executive Order 14007 of January 27, 2021 (President's Council of Advisors on Science and Technology).
- Executive Order 14009 of January 28, 2021 (Strengthening Medicaid and the Affordable Care Act).
- Executive Order 14010 of February 2, 2021 (Creating a Comprehensive Regional Framework To Address the Causes of Migration, To Manage Migration Throughout North and Central America, and To Provide Safe and Orderly Processing of Asylum Seekers at the United States Border).

- Executive Order 14011 of February 2, 2021 (Establishment of Interagency Task Force on the Reunification of Families).
- Executive Order 14012 of February 2, 2021 (Restoring Faith in Our Legal Immigration Systems and Strengthening Integration and Inclusion Efforts for New Americans).
- Executive Order 14013 of February 4, 2021 (Rebuilding and Enhancing Programs To Resettle Refugees and Planning for the Impact of Climate Change on Migration).
- Executive Order 14015 of February 14, 2021 (Establishment of the White House Office of Faith-Based and Neighborhood Partnerships).
- Executive Order 14018 of February 24, 2021 (Revocation of Certain Presidential Actions).
- Executive Order 14019 of March 7, 2021 (Promoting Access to Voting).
- Executive Order 14020 of March 8, 2021 (Establishment of the White House Gender Policy Council).
- Executive Order 14021 of March 8, 2021 (Guaranteeing an Educational Environment Free From Discrimination on the Basis of Sex, Including Sexual Orientation or Gender Identity).
- Executive Order 14022 of April 1, 2021 (Termination of Emergency With Respect to the International Criminal Court).
- Executive Order 14023 of April 9, 2021 (Establishment of the Presidential Commission on the Supreme Court of the United States).
- Executive Order 14029 of May 14, 2021 (Revocation of Certain Presidential Actions and Technical Amendment).
- Executive Order 14035 of June 25, 2021 (Diversity, Equity, Inclusion, and Accessibility in the Federal Workforce).
- Executive Order 14044 of September 13, 2021 (Amending Executive Order 14007).
- Executive Order 14031 of May 28, 2021 (Advancing Equity, Justice, and Opportunity for Asian Americans, Native Hawaiians, and Pacific Islanders). This EO established a Commission on Asian Americans, Native Hawaiians, and Pacific Islanders, and required the advancement of equity, justice and opportunity for these communities.
- Executive Order 14045 of September 13, 2021 (White House Initiative on Advancing Educational Equity, Excellence, and Economic Opportunity for Hispanics).
- Executive Order 14049 of October 11, 2021 (White House Initiative on Advancing Educational Equity, Excellence, and Economic Opportunity for Native Americans and Strengthening Tribal Colleges and Universities).
- Executive Order 14050 of October 19, 2021 (White House Initiative on Advancing Educational Equity, Excellence, and Economic Opportunity for Black Americans).
- Executive Order 14052 of November 15, 2021 (Implementation of the Infrastructure Investment and Jobs Act).
- Executive Order 14055 of November 18, 2021 (Nondisplacement of Qualified Workers Under Service Contracts).

- Executive Order 14060 of December 15, 2021 (Establishing the United States Council on Transnational Organized Crime).
- Executive Order 14069 of March 15, 2022 (Advancing Economy, Efficiency, and Effectiveness in Federal Contracting by Promoting Pay Equity and Transparency).
- Executive Order 14070 of April 5, 2022 (Continuing To Strengthen Americans' Access to Affordable, Quality Health Coverage).
- Executive Order 14074 of May 25, 2022 (Advancing Effective, Accountable Policing and Criminal Justice Practices To Enhance Public Trust and Public Safety).
- Executive Order 14075 of June 15, 2022 (Advancing Equality for Lesbian, Gay, Bisexual, Transgender, Queer, and Intersex Individuals).
- Executive Order 14084 of September 30, 2022 (Promoting the Arts, the Humanities, and Museum and Library Services).
- Executive Order 14087 of October 14, 2022 (Lowering Prescription Drug Costs for Americans).
- Executive Order 14089 of December 13, 2022 (Establishing the President's Advisory Council on African Diaspora Engagement in the United States).
- The Presidential Memorandum of March 13, 2023 (Withdrawal of Certain Areas off the United States Arctic Coast of the Outer Continental Shelf from Oil or Gas Leasing).
- Executive Order 14094 of April 6, 2023 (Modernizing Regulatory Review).
- Executive Order 14099 of May 9, 2023 (Moving Beyond COVID-19 Vaccination Requirements for Federal Workers).
- Executive Order 14110 of October 30, 2023 (Safe, Secure, and Trustworthy Development and Use of Artificial Intelligence).
- Executive Order 14115 of February 1, 2024 (Imposing Certain Sanctions on Persons Undermining Peace, Security, and Stability in the West Bank).
- Executive Order 14124 of July 17, 2024 (White House Initiative on Advancing Educational Equity, Excellence, and Economic Opportunity Through Hispanic-Serving Institutions).
- Executive Order 14134 of January 3, 2025 (Providing an Order of Succession Within the Department of Agriculture).
- Executive Order 14135 of January 3, 2025 (Providing an Order of Succession Within the Department of Homeland Security).
- Executive Order 14136 of January 3, 2025 (Providing an Order of Succession Within the Department of Justice).
- Executive Order 14137 of January 3, 2025 (Providing an Order of Succession Within the Department of the Treasury).
- Executive Order 14138 of January 3, 2025 (Providing an Order of Succession Within the Office of Management and Budget).
- Executive Order 14139 of January 3, 2025 (Providing an Order of Succession Within the Office of the National Cyber Director).

- The Presidential Memorandum of January 3, 2025 (Designation of Officials of the Council on Environmental Quality to Act as Chairman).
- The Presidential Memorandum of January 3, 2025 (Designation of Officials of the Office of Personnel Management to Act as Director).
- The Presidential Memorandum of January 3, 2025 (Designation of Officials of the Office of Science and Technology Policy to Act as Director).
- The Presidential Memorandum of January 3, 2025 (Designation of Officials of the United States Agency for Global Media to Act as Chief Executive Officer).
- The Presidential Memorandum of January 3, 2025 (Designation of Officials of the United States Agency for International Development to Act as Administrator).
- The Presidential Memorandum of January 3, 2025 (Designation of Officials of the United States International Development Finance Corporation to Act as Chief Executive Officer).
- The Presidential Memorandum of January 6, 2025 (Withdrawal of Certain Areas of the United States Outer Continental Shelf from Oil or Natural Gas Leasing).
- The Presidential Memorandum of January 6, 2025 (Withdrawal of Certain Areas of the United States Outer Continental Shelf from Oil or Natural Gas Leasing).
- The Presidential Memorandum of January 14, 2025 (Certification of Rescission of Cuba's Designation as a State Sponsor of Terrorism).
- The Presidential Memorandum of January 14, 2025 (Revocation of National Security Presidential Memorandum 5).
- Executive Order 14143 of January 16, 2025 (Providing for the Appointment of Alumni of AmeriCorps to the Competitive Service).