

# 1. Reflection on First Term

Jayaratne, Sophia. “What Is the Trump Administration’s Track Record on the Environment?” Brookings Institution, January 27, 2021

<https://www.brookings.edu/articles/what-is-the-trump-administrations-track-record-on-the-environment/>

This policy analysis from the Brookings Institution reviews the overarching direction and consequences of Trump’s environmental agenda from 2017–2020. Jayaratne highlights that the administration rolled back over 100 environmental regulations, weakened enforcement at the EPA, and prioritized fossil fuel production over sustainability. Particularly relevant is the critique that Trump’s policies were not simply deregulatory, but anti-regulatory—aimed at dismantling institutions themselves (e.g., hollowing out the EPA’s scientific advisory boards). This source is crucial for contextualizing Trump’s second-term agenda, providing continuity and contrast. It also reinforces how his first term set a precedent for subnational and community-based resistance in places like the San Diego–Tijuana region.

Popovich, Nadja, Livia Albeck-Ripka, and Kendra Pierre-Louis. “The Trump Administration Rolled Back More Than 100 Environmental Rules. Here’s the Full List.” The New York Times, January 20, 2021.

<https://www.nytimes.com/interactive/2020/climate/trump-environment-rollbacks.html>

This investigative piece catalogs over 100 environmental regulations that were either rolled back or in the process of being dismantled between 2017 and 2021. The list includes air pollution standards, water protections, drilling restrictions, and emissions rules—each with citations, status updates, and agency involved. Many rollbacks directly impacted the San Diego–Tijuana region, such as reduced enforcement of the Clean Water Act and changes to NEPA reviews. The source is a high-value reference for building a timeline or visual in your lit review showing how deep the dismantling went—and which rules remain

vulnerable or were reinstated. It demonstrates how executive power, especially under Trump, can reshape environmental governance rapidly and without much legislative involvement.

Columbia Law School Sabin Center for Climate Change Law. “Climate Deregulation Tracker.”  
Columbia Law School, 2020–2025.

<https://climate.law.columbia.edu/climate-deregulation-tracker>

This legal-technical resource meticulously documents all climate-related regulatory rollbacks pursued during Donald Trump’s first term (2017–2021). Maintained by the Sabin Center for Climate Change Law, the tracker catalogs over 200 actions aimed at weakening environmental protections, spanning air and water pollution standards, NEPA enforcement, public lands leasing rules, and more. Each entry includes legal citations, affected statutes, status updates, and policy memos, offering a granular view into the Trump administration’s strategy of dismantling institutional climate commitments. The database is especially valuable for understanding how regulatory reversals were framed as “energy dominance,” and how science-based governance—particularly at the EPA, NOAA, and BLM—was strategically suppressed or sidelined. For a reflection on Trump’s first term, this tracker is indispensable: it confirms the systematic nature of the environmental rollback effort and provides primary source material to substantiate claims of governance erosion and administrative sabotage. It also helps contextualize the continuity between Trump’s first and second terms.

## 2. Border Infrastructure – Ecological Fragmentation

Ploen, Stephanie, and Jesse Lasky. “The U.S.–Mexico Border Wall Is a Threat to Wildlife Connectivity and Biodiversity.” *Frontiers in Ecology and Evolution* 12 (2024)

<https://www.frontiersin.org/journals/ecology-and-evolution/articles/10.3389/fevo.2024.1487911/full>

Frontiers in Ecology & Evolution (2024): USA–Mexico border wall impedes wildlife movement. – A peer-reviewed study using wildlife cameras in border habitats shows severe fragmentation caused by Trump-era border walls. Large mammals like deer, mountain lions, and black bears were unable to pass through new 30-foot steel bollard barriers installed between 2017–2020 . Small wildlife gates were rare and failed to mitigate connectivity loss for many species. The findings validate widespread scientific warnings that Trump’s border infrastructure would block animal migrations, isolate populations, and threaten species survival in biodiverse borderlands

Trexler, Carolyn. “Trump’s Wall Would Harm Unique and Fragile Wildlife on the California Border.” Massive Science, March 20, 2018.

<https://massivesci.com/articles/border-wall-mexico-environment-california/#:~:text=In%20addition%20to%20human%20rights,dozens%20are%20threatened%20or%20endangered>

“Trump’s wall would harm unique and fragile wildlife on the California border.” – Written by a UC San Diego biologist, this article highlights local ecological impacts in the San Diego-Tijuana region. It notes that earlier border fencing lacked environmental review, resulting in damage to rare endemic plants like Shaw’s agave (nearly all local specimens were destroyed) and disruption of wildlife. Trump’s proposed wall (replacing existing fences with a taller, solid barrier) would “artificially fracture the area’s plant and animal populations” and halt natural flows of seeds, pollen, and small animals . The piece also documents California’s legal battles and advocacy against the administration’s waiver of dozens of environmental laws in its rush to build the wall , reflecting regional resistance to the wall’s ecological damage.

U.S. House Committee on Natural Resources (Democrats). “Government Watchdog: Trump’s Border Wall Damaged Environment, Hurt Wildlife, and Destroyed Indigenous Sacred Sites.” House Natural Resources Committee, March 6, 2023.

<https://democrats-naturalresources.house.gov/media/press-releases/government-watchdog-trumps-border-wall-damaged-environment-hurt-wildlife-and-destroyed-indigenous-sacred-sites#:~:text=The%20lack%20of%20sufficient%20environmental,erosion>

U.S. GAO Report Summary (2023) – House Natural Resources Committee: This oversight report (summarized by Rep. Raúl Grijalva) documents the irreparable environmental harm from Trump’s border wall construction . It found that between 2017–2021, 458 miles of new barriers were built, mostly on federal lands, after the administration waived dozens of laws (NEPA, Clean Water Act, Endangered Species Act, etc.) . As a result, wall construction drained scarce desert water sources, caused flooding and erosion, and permanently altered wildlife migration routes . The report notes that iconic species like the Peninsular bighorn sheep are now at greater risk, as barriers cut off access to water and mates. It underscores how emergency waivers and fast-tracking under Trump bypassed environmental oversight, fueling habitat fragmentation and mistrust among border communities and experts.

Guglielmi, Giorgia. “The Impact of the US–Mexico Border Wall on Biodiversity.” Knowable Magazine, February 15, 2024.

<https://knowablemagazine.org/content/article/food-environment/2024/the-impact-of-the-us-mexico-border-wall-on-biodiversity#:~:text=inches%20apart%20%E2%80%94%20in%20the,The%20rest%20were%20new%20barriers>

“The impact of the US–Mexico border wall on biodiversity.” – This article synthesizes scientific perspectives on the wall’s long-term ecological consequences. It reports that over 450 miles of new wall

were erected in Trump's term (mostly replacing lower vehicle barriers) , and recounts on-the-ground evidence of harm. For example, Mexican biologists have found dead wildlife, including bighorn sheep carcasses, near the wall – likely animals that died of thirst after the wall cut them off from the Quitobaquito Springs water source in the Sonoran Desert . The piece places Trump's border infrastructure in historical context, noting that scientists from both countries had warned of “rewriting biological history” by severing habitat connectivity. It is a robust overview useful for understanding the scale of bioregional fragmentation and the binational scientific consensus on the wall's ecological risks.

### 3. Tijuana River Sewage Crisis – Blue–Green Infrastructure

Rivard, Ry. “The Border Crisis Trump Doesn't Talk About.” Politico, March 5, 2024.

<https://www.politico.com/news/2024/03/05/border-crisis-sewage-tijuana-00104675>

An investigative report detailing how billions of gallons of sewage from Tijuana have polluted the San Diego coast, and how this transboundary crisis festered under multiple administrations. It catalogs severe impacts: beaches from Imperial Beach up to Coronado have been closed for months or years on end, coastal tourism and fisheries have declined, Navy SEAL training exercises were canceled due to contaminated water, and residents report health problems from noxious sewage gases. Despite these harms, Trump never acknowledged the issue publicly. The article notes that in the USMCA trade deal, Congress secured \$300 million for sewage treatment upgrades over Trump's initial opposition. Rivard's reporting underscores that under the Trump administration, federal action and funding were delayed or absent, leaving state and local officials (and eventually the Biden administration) to begin addressing the infrastructure backlog.

Elmer, MacKenzie. “Mexico Said River Border Wall Broke Treaties. The US Built It Anyway.” Voice of San Diego, January 10, 2025.

<https://voiceofsandiego.org/2025/01/10/mexico-border-wall-river-treaty-violation>

“Mexico Said River Border Wall Broke Treaties. The US Built it Anyway.” Voice of San Diego – This piece reveals how the Trump administration’s approach to border security compounded the sewage and flooding problems. In 2020, Customs and Border Protection constructed a new wall segment through the Tijuana River channel over Mexico’s objections, effectively creating a dam. Mexican officials warned this violated 1944 water treaties and could cause catastrophic flooding in Tijuana and San Diego’s San Ysidro community . The IBWC (International Boundary and Water Commission) – the binational body managing border waterways – was caught off guard and initially resisted the wall, but under political pressure from Trump’s DHS it “rolled over” its concerns . This case study exemplifies how Trump’s border infrastructure projects ignored environmental diplomacy: Mexico’s input was sidelined, and a sole focus on security infrastructure delayed collaborative solutions like green infrastructure for flood control and sewage treatment. It highlights the erosion of trust that made addressing the sewage crisis even more difficult during Trump’s tenure.

Haines, Sarah S., Margaret Wilder, Anne Browning-Aiken, and Andrea Gerlak. “Water Challenges at the U.S.–Mexico Border: Learning from Community and Expert Voices.” *Ecology and Society* 29, no. 4 (2024): Article 35.

<https://ecologyandsociety.org/vol29/iss4/art35/>

An academic study that includes the San Diego–Tijuana case as part of a broader assessment of border water issues. Through workshops and surveys, researchers found border communities emphasize water quality crises over water scarcity, noting that untreated sewage flows and trash in the Tijuana River pose immediate public health risks . The study criticizes the “grand institutional framework” for failing to address these urgent issues, citing gaps in binational coordination and social inequities on the Mexican side . This source underscores how the Trump administration’s retrenchment from binational programs aggravated longstanding infrastructure deficits. By documenting on-the-ground perspectives, it supports

the view that cuts to EPA and IBWC efforts under Trump left marginalized border neighborhoods with persistent exposure to pollution and little recourse but grassroots action.

## 4. Climate Adaptation and Disaster Resilience

Waldman, Scott, and Thomas Frank. “Trump Refused to Give California Wildfire Aid Until Told How Many People There Voted for Him.” Politico/E&E News, January 24, 2024.

<https://www.politico.com/news/2024/01/24/trump-california-wildfire-aid-00138256>.

This investigative article reveals the politicization of federal disaster aid during Trump’s first term. Drawing from insider accounts, it details how President Trump delayed FEMA wildfire disaster declarations for California based on perceived political loyalty. At one point, he reportedly asked staff to identify how many people in affected regions had voted for him before authorizing assistance. Beyond revealing Trump’s partisan impulse, the article underscores the broader pattern of undermining state-level climate adaptation capacity. This source is key for understanding how disaster resilience in climate-vulnerable states like California was weakened not just by budget cuts, but by executive indifference and hostility. It offers a disturbing illustration of how disaster governance was weaponized during the Trump administration.

Climate Action Tracker. “Project 2025 Tracker – NOAA and Climate Research Cuts.” Climate Action Tracker, 2025

<https://climateactiontracker.org/policies/trump-project-2025-noaa-cuts>.

This live tracker monitors Trump’s second-term policy efforts aligned with the Heritage Foundation’s Project 2025 blueprint. It includes a detailed account of proposed and enacted cuts to NOAA, particularly the elimination of climate research and ocean monitoring programs. The tracker also notes that during Trump’s first term, work on the National Climate Assessment was halted, delaying key scientific insight

into climate vulnerabilities nationwide. This data is critical for illustrating how climate adaptation at federal and regional levels, including in the San Diego–Tijuana bioregion, was impaired by cuts to research, forecasting, and data-sharing infrastructure. It validates broader arguments about institutional sabotage of climate readiness.

Surfrider Foundation. “Trump Administration’s Budget Calls for Drastic Cuts at NOAA and EPA.”

Surfrider Foundation, March 12, 2025.

<https://www.surfrider.org/coastal-blog/entry/trump-budget-cuts-noaa-epa-2025>.

This advocacy summary outlines the projected impacts of Trump’s proposed FY2026 budget on coastal resilience. The document details a 55% funding reduction to the EPA and major cuts to NOAA, including the elimination of programs vital for climate adaptation and coastal zone management. It highlights that the U.S.–Mexico Border Water Infrastructure Grant Program would be entirely cut, severely hindering stormwater upgrades in Tijuana and South San Diego. The report also connects these cuts to public health consequences, especially for underserved coastal communities. As a concise overview of the policy landscape, this source is indispensable for linking federal budgeting to regional adaptation vulnerabilities.

American Society of Civil Engineers. “FEMA Ends BRIC Program.” 2025 Report Card for America's Infrastructure, April 4, 2025.

<https://infrastructurereportcard.org/fema-ends-bric-program/>

This article documents FEMA’s announcement on April 4, 2025, that it would terminate the Building Resilient Infrastructure and Communities (BRIC) program. The decision followed guidance from the Trump–Vance administration to reduce federal climate adaptation spending, redirecting unallocated BRIC funds to general disaster relief accounts. BRIC had provided critical pre-disaster mitigation funding to state and local governments, including wildfire prevention and stormwater resilience projects. For climate-vulnerable regions like Southern California and the U.S.–Mexico border, the end of BRIC



represents a substantial loss of federal support for proactive resilience infrastructure. This source reinforces the pattern of deprioritizing climate adaptation during Trump’s second term and illustrates the policy shift from prevention to reactive crisis management.

## 5. Energy and Fossil Fuel Infrastructure

Povich, Elaine S. “Trump Has Canceled Environmental Justice Grants. Here’s What Communities Are Losing.” Stateline (Pew Charitable Trusts), April 14, 2025.

<https://stateline.org/2025/04/14/trump-has-canceled-environmental-justice-grants-heres-what-communities-are-losing/>

This article outlines the Trump–Vance administration's early 2025 move to eliminate over 400 environmental justice (EJ) grants totaling \$1.7 billion. These grants supported air monitoring, clean water programs, and pollution mitigation in historically burdened communities, including those near the U.S.–Mexico border. The piece also documents the shutdown of the EPA Office of Environmental Justice and the Office of Climate Change and Health Equity. For border communities such as San Diego’s Barrio Logan or Tijuana’s industrial corridors, this meant the loss of vital support to mitigate the health impacts of fossil fuel infrastructure. This source directly supports arguments about the administration's alignment with fossil capital and its abandonment of community-scale climate resilience.

Project 2025, Energy Policy Section. Mandate for Leadership: The Conservative Promise. The Heritage Foundation, 2023.

<https://www.heritage.org/mandate>

This document serves as the blueprint for Trump’s second-term energy agenda. The section on energy policy promotes widespread fossil fuel extraction, deregulation of permitting processes, and dismantling

of climate-focused constraints on industry. It recommends curbing NEPA enforcement and streamlining cross-border energy infrastructure, such as pipelines and LNG terminals. Within the context of the San Diego–Tijuana region, this agenda accelerates transboundary energy projects with little environmental oversight. The blueprint is essential for understanding the ideological and operational logic behind Trump-era and Trump 2.0 deregulatory efforts. It also serves as a contrast to environmental justice or climate adaptation frameworks, prioritizing fossil energy at all costs.

Reese, April. “New Border Wall Sections Threaten Remaining Wildlife Corridors.” *Sierra Magazine*, May 18, 2025.

<https://www.sierraclub.org/sierra/new-border-wall-sections-threaten-remaining-wildlife-corridors>

While primarily focused on ecological fragmentation, this article highlights the Trump administration’s broader refusal to incorporate scientific expertise into infrastructure planning. It documents how federal biologists and ecologists were excluded from environmental reviews and how scientific objections were disregarded in both wall and energy project permitting. This ethos of suppressing science and accelerating industry reverberated in energy policy: EPA and BLM officials were similarly sidelined in oil and gas infrastructure approvals, especially on federal and tribal lands. The piece contextualizes the Trump administration’s environmental philosophy as one of deliberate antagonism to regulatory science and community protections, a pattern that carries over to fossil fuel expansion.

Reuters. “As Trump’s EPA Ends ‘Environmental Justice,’ Minority Communities Brace for Impact.”

Reuters, December 4, 2024. <https://www.reuters.com/sustainability/climate-energy/trumps-epa-ends-environmental-justice-minority-communities-may-pay-price-2025-04-23/>

This news report chronicles community reaction to the elimination of federal EJ programs late in Trump’s first term and continuing into his second. It includes testimony from San Diego residents and grassroots organizations who relied on federal funding for clean air and health initiatives, many of which were

discontinued or defunded. It also highlights the binational dimension, noting that Mexico's own energy policies under AMLO prioritized fossil fuels, and that environmental enforcement on both sides of the border was weak. Combined, these trends worsened cross-border air and water pollution. This source is valuable for illustrating how EJ defunding has both domestic and international environmental justice consequences in regions like the San Diego–Tijuana bioregion.

## 6. Binational Policy Tensions

Environmental Protection Network. "Fact Sheet: U.S.-Mexico Border Environmental Cooperation."

Environmental Protection Network, 2018.

<https://www.environmentalprotectionnetwork.org/wp-content/uploads/2018/06/U.S.-Mexico-Border-Fact-Sheet-519.pdf>

This fact sheet outlines the institutional architecture of binational environmental governance under the La Paz Agreement of 1983 and its successors (Border XXI, Border 2012, and Border 2020). It explains how these frameworks enabled collaborative action on air quality, wastewater treatment, and ecosystem conservation along the U.S.–Mexico border. The Trump administration's 2017–2018 budget proposals effectively withdrew funding from these programs, disrupting decades of joint efforts. This source offers essential historical context and helps situate the collapse of binational governance during Trump's first term within a broader rollback of multilateral environmental agreements.

Argus Media. "Mexico Reclaims Climate Role, Faces Challenges." Argus Media, December 2024.

<https://www.argusmedia.com/en/news-and-insights/latest-market-news/2640932-mexico-reclaims-climate-role-faces-challenges>

This policy report contrasts Mexico's centralized and extractive climate posture under President López Obrador with its attempts at reintegration into global climate frameworks following AMLO's departure. It details substantial budget cuts to SEMARNAT and PROFEPA and weak enforcement of anti-pollution laws. The article contextualizes Trump's disinterest in cross-border environmental governance alongside AMLO's domestic rollback of climate priorities, emphasizing a period of binational neglect. This resource supports arguments that the absence of strong federal leadership on both sides allowed illicit dumping, habitat destruction, and environmental crime to go unchecked.

National Academies. California-Mexico Border Relations Council Report. Sacramento: California Environmental Protection Agency, 2022.

<https://calepa.ca.gov/wp-content/uploads/2024/06/2022-CA-MX-BorderReport-Final.pdf>

This state-level report details California's efforts to maintain environmental coordination with Baja California despite the federal impasse under Trump. It highlights regional collaborations led by SANDAG, CalEPA, and local NGOs to maintain emergency communication systems and support infrastructure projects such as stormwater treatment. While limited in jurisdiction, these subnational networks represent a key site of resilience amid national dysfunction. The report supports analysis that informal governance and municipal diplomacy became de facto solutions when bilateral institutions were weakened or rendered politically inert.

Koslowski, Rey. "The U.S.–Mexico Relationship in the Trump 2.0 Era." Australian Institute of International Affairs – Australian Outlook, January 24, 2024.

Australian Institute of International Affairs – Australian Outlook.

<https://www.internationalaffairs.org.au/australianoutlook/the-us-mexico-relationship-in-the-trump-2-0-era>

This article analyzes the geopolitical and diplomatic challenges likely to emerge in a second Trump administration. Koslowski forecasts heightened unilateralism, further militarization of the border, and the collapse of binational environmental diplomacy—echoing failures seen in Trump’s first term. The author also identifies how Mexico’s federal leadership under AMLO (and its successors) may remain too centralized and reactive to address transboundary environmental degradation proactively. This source is especially valuable for your “Binational Policy Tensions” section and for situating San Diego–Tijuana within the larger framework of declining cross-border trust, institutional fragmentation, and ideological divergence on climate.

U.S. Environmental Protection Agency. “Border 2025: Goals and Objectives.” U.S. EPA, last modified October 24, 2023.

<https://www.epa.gov/usmexicoborder/border-2025-goals-and-objectives>

This official EPA page outlines the priorities of the Border 2025 program, which succeeds Border 2020 as the primary framework for binational environmental cooperation along the U.S.–Mexico border. It emphasizes air and water quality, waste management, emergency response, and climate resilience. The document is critical as a baseline: during the Trump administration, funding for this program was slashed, and EPA engagement diminished—undermining long-standing cooperative mechanisms. The Border 2025 document, while updated under Biden, still reflects the institutional memory of pre-Trump commitments and is valuable for understanding what was lost, stalled, or politically deprioritized during Trump’s first term. It supports arguments regarding the weakening of binational governance and the difficulty of rebuilding trust and coordination mechanisms.

## 7. Policy Resistance and Adaptation

Tabuchi, Hiroko, and Lisa Friedman. “Trump Threatens Climate Policies in the States.” The New York Times, April 9, 2025.

<https://www.nytimes.com/2025/04/09/climate/trump-threatens-climate-policies-in-the-states.html>

This investigative piece details Executive Order 14260 and its implications for state-level environmental autonomy. The article highlights how Trump’s second-term policy aims to override state climate regulations by claiming they conflict with federal energy independence goals. California is a central case: its zero-emission vehicle mandates, air quality laws, and renewable energy standards are all under threat. The article includes legal perspectives and state reactions, noting new lawsuits, legislative workarounds, and inter-state pacts being formed in resistance. This piece is essential for your “Policy Resistance” section and demonstrates how federalism is being weaponized to restrict local and state climate leadership.

California Department of Justice. “California Attorney General Bonta Announces Settlement in Trump Border Wall Lawsuit.” Office of the Attorney General, July 20, 2023.

<https://oag.ca.gov/news/press-releases/attorney-general-bonta-secures-settlement-regarding-unlawful-construction-trump>

This press release announces a multistate legal settlement in which the Trump administration agreed to cease additional border wall construction in California and restore funds previously diverted from military and infrastructure projects. The lawsuit, originally filed in 2019 and 2020, challenged Trump’s use of emergency powers to bypass congressional budget authority and environmental laws. The settlement also allocates funds for ecological restoration of impacted borderland habitats. This document is a key

example of California's legal resistance to federal environmental overreach and illustrates the role of state litigation in upholding environmental protections under adverse federal regimes.

University of California. "UC Climate Resilience Initiative: Science in the Face of Suppression."

University of California Office of the President, 2023.

[https://www.ucop.edu/uc-health/\\_files/uc-health-health-sector-climate-pledge-report.pdf](https://www.ucop.edu/uc-health/_files/uc-health-health-sector-climate-pledge-report.pdf)

This report documents how the UC system, including UC San Diego and UC Riverside, expanded climate science initiatives and resilience planning during the Trump administration. It includes examples of university-led air quality research in border communities, academic expert testimony in environmental litigation, and transdisciplinary studies on regional climate impacts. Notably, UC researchers organized independent climate assessments when federal versions were stalled or censored. The report is a vital source on academic resistance, showing how universities acted as both knowledge producers and political actors defending environmental integrity.

Castillo, Alexandra Rangel. "Kumeyaay Nation Protest Stops Construction of Border Wall." *KPBS*, July 17, 2020.

<https://www.kpbs.org/news/border-immigration/2020/07/17/kumeyaay-nation-protest-stops-construction-border>

This article chronicles how members of the Kumeyaay Nation physically blocked border wall construction in East San Diego County to protect sacred sites and burial grounds. Despite legal challenges and direct actions, the Trump administration continued construction, citing national security.

Nevertheless, the protest succeeded in elevating Indigenous concerns nationally and strengthening alliances with environmental and human rights groups. This source is crucial for understanding the intersection of cultural sovereignty and environmental resistance, particularly in contested border zones. It

also highlights how frontline communities assert place-based knowledge in defense of climate and ecological justice.

Environmental Health Coalition. “Community Science Fights Pollution at the Border.” Environmental Health Coalition, 2021.

<https://www.environmentalhealth.org/media-resources/in-the-news/>

This newsletter highlights community-led air monitoring efforts in San Diego’s border neighborhoods. In response to weakened EPA oversight during the Trump years, EHC and local residents used portable sensors and public data to document pollution from traffic, industry, and port operations. The results were shared with local officials and used in advocacy for improved zoning and enforcement. This case represents grassroots resilience in action: when federal mechanisms for environmental protection eroded, community organizations built their own scientific capacity to protect health and advocate for justice.

## 8. Broad / Other

**Columbia Law School Sabin Center for Climate Change Law.** “Climate Backtracker.” *Columbia Law School*, 2025.

<https://climate.law.columbia.edu/content/climate-backtracker>

This policy tracking tool from the Sabin Center for Climate Change Law provides an essential overview of the Trump–Vance administration’s second-term efforts to scale back or wholly eliminate federal climate mitigation and adaptation measures. Building on the original Deregulation Tracker, the Climate Backtracker documents specific actions aimed at dismantling regulatory safeguards around emissions standards, environmental review, coastal resilience, and climate science. It tracks federal agency rollbacks while also highlighting where resistance has emerged—through litigation, state-level policy pushback (such as California’s reestablishment of stricter vehicle emissions rules), and the defense of climate



assessments and planning frameworks. For my research, this resource is critical in mapping how Trump's renewed executive agenda is actively undermining institutional climate resilience. It helps substantiate the policy resistance section of my literature review, offering a clear contrast between federal retrenchment and the strategies being deployed to mitigate or reverse its effects. The Backtracker provides a living archive of the contest over climate governance in real time.