The Erosion of Environmental Science: A Comprehensive Analysis of Trump Administration Cuts and Their Consequences

Executive Summary

This report provides a comprehensive overview of the significant and systematic reductions in environmental science and protection capabilities under the Trump administration. The analysis reveals a concerted effort to diminish the capacity of key federal agencies, reduce funding for critical research, and roll back environmental regulations. These actions have led to a substantial weakening of environmental quality safeguards and increased national vulnerability to environmental and climate-related threats. The underlying motivations appear to be rooted in an ideological commitment to deregulation and the promotion of fossil fuel industries, with profound long-term implications for U.S. environmental stewardship and its global scientific leadership. The consistent pattern of budget cuts, staff reductions, and programmatic terminations across multiple federal entities, including the Environmental Protection Agency (EPA), National Oceanic and Atmospheric Administration (NOAA), U.S. Geological Survey (USGS), U.S. Fish and Wildlife Service (USFWS), and National Park Service (NPS), indicates a deliberate, administration-wide strategy rather than isolated budgetary adjustments. This systematic dismantling of environmental protections and scientific capacity could establish lasting precedents for future administrations, severely impacting institutional knowledge, operational capacity, and the overall trajectory of environmental governance in the United States.

Introduction: Contextualizing the Shift in Environmental Policy

The United States has a long history of environmental policy development, with scientific research playing a foundational role in informing regulatory decisions and conservation strategies. Federal agencies have traditionally relied on robust scientific data to understand complex ecological systems, assess environmental risks, and develop effective protection measures. However, the Trump administration introduced a distinct shift in this approach, prioritizing an "American energy dominance" agenda and explicitly aiming to roll back environmental regulations. This report examines the actions taken under this administration, detailing their impact on environmental science and protection.

The ideological underpinnings of these policy objectives are evident in statements from administration officials. For instance, the head of the Environmental Protection Agency articulated an intent to put a "dagger through the heart of climate-change religion" , while the Energy Secretary dismissed national labs' climate research as "political science". These pronouncements, coupled with actions such as the removal of climate change sections from government websites and the prohibition of certain environmental terms in academic publications under threat of funding loss , suggest a deliberate effort to suppress or discredit scientific findings that challenged the administration's policy narrative. This politicization of science carries significant risks, including the erosion of public trust in scientific institutions and the hindrance of evidence-based policymaking. Such an approach establishes a concerning

precedent where scientific evidence may be disregarded or manipulated to align with political agendas, potentially leading to long-term detrimental effects on societal well-being and environmental health.

Systematic Undermining of Federal Environmental Agencies

This section details the specific budget reductions, staff cuts, and programmatic changes within key federal environmental agencies, illustrating a concerted effort to diminish their capacity and authority.

Environmental Protection Agency (EPA): Budget Reductions and Programmatic Impairment

The Environmental Protection Agency faced some of the most severe proposed cuts. The fiscal year 2026 budget proposal called for a **55% reduction** in funding , with the new EPA director announcing a **65% budget cut**. These proposed reductions were projected to eliminate **more than 1,000 science positions** and necessitate mass layoffs across the agency.
The administration's budget proposals explicitly aimed to cripple the EPA's core functions, including its ability to enforce air and water quality standards, manage toxic waste sites, and advance environmental justice initiatives. Specifically, EPA's Environmental Justice programs, designed to support communities disproportionately affected by pollution, were targeted for elimination. This decision was made despite the clear understanding that "pollution does not affect everyone equally". The elimination of these programs represents more than a general reduction in environmental protection; it is a targeted withdrawal of support from low-income and underserved communities that are already disproportionately burdened by environmental pollution. This is further compounded by the proposed **$2.46 billion cut** to the Clean Water and Drinking Water State Revolving Funds (SRFs) , which are foundational for modernizing aging infrastructure and preventing lead contamination. These cuts directly impact the health and safety of millions of Americans, particularly in vulnerable areas, actively exacerbating existing environmental inequities and health disparities. This demonstrates a disregard for the principle of environmental justice, effectively abandoning the federal government's responsibility to protect its most vulnerable citizens from pollution, potentially leading to increased public health crises and social injustice.
Furthermore, clean air and climate programs were eliminated , and the administration proposed scaling back numerous environmental regulations, including those governing emissions from cars and trucks. The administration's approach was criticized for consistently highlighting the costs of environmental rules while omitting their significant benefits and for halting enforcement of fundamental environmental laws. The proposed **$235 million (45%) cut** to EPA's Science Office (Office of Research and Development, ORD) and the elimination of environmental justice programs are not simply about reducing expenditure. The EPA's science office is described as the "backbone for protecting Americans from air and water pollution, toxic chemicals and emerging threats". Without robust scientific research and data, the agency's ability to develop, update, and legally defend environmental regulations based on the "best scientific and commercial data available" (a key requirement under the Endangered Species Act, 16 U.S.C. § 1533) is severely compromised. The administration's questioning of EPA's record in collecting fines as "legally dubious" further signals an intent to weaken enforcement. This creates a significant regulatory vacuum or weakens the efficacy of existing frameworks, potentially leading to increased pollution, accelerated degradation of natural resources, and long-term public health consequences. It also fundamentally challenges the legal and scientific integrity of future environmental policies, making them more susceptible to legal challenges and less effective in

practice.

National Oceanic and Atmospheric Administration (NOAA): Impacts on Climate and Ocean Science

The National Oceanic and Atmospheric Administration faced proposed cuts of **$1.7 billion** , accompanied by a plan to dramatically reorganize the agency and significantly reduce most of its climate research programs for fiscal year 2026. This plan included terminating funding for NOAA's cooperative institutes—a network comprising 16 science consortiums involving 80 universities and research institutions—and its 10 laboratories. These institutes are considered critical, reportedly accounting for "50 percent of everything we do in research" for NOAA.
The entire **Office of Oceanic and Atmospheric Research (OAR)**, explicitly referred to by conservative policy blueprints as the "source of much of NOAA's climate alarmism," was targeted for elimination. OAR oversees vital programs such as global ocean observing and monitoring, ocean acidification, and the Sea Grant program. Approximately **1,300 employees left NOAA** , directly weakening weather forecasting, hurricane tracking, and jeopardizing the development of next-generation climate models, early warning disaster systems, nautical mapping, and fishery sustainability.
Ongoing funding delays for cooperative institutes were already leading to potential layoffs and furloughs, threatening to disrupt long-term datasets and causing experienced staff to seek other employment. This was explicitly warned to cause "irrecoverable" damage to the agency's capacity. For example, the Cooperative Institute for Great Lakes Research's (CIGLR) toxic algae monitoring program in lakes Erie and Huron was at risk of halting , which would increase vulnerability to public health crises like the 2014 Toledo water crisis.
The proposed cuts to NOAA's OAR and cooperative institutes directly undermine the agency's ability to perform its core functions related to weather forecasting, hurricane tracking, and early warning systems. These are not abstract scientific endeavors but practical, life-saving tools. The American Meteorological Society warned that eliminating NOAA's research arm would have "unknown — yet almost certainly disastrous — consequences for public safety and economic health". The potential cessation of toxic algae monitoring has a direct, demonstrable link to public health crises, as exemplified by the 2014 Toledo water crisis. By systematically weakening NOAA's scientific and operational capabilities, the administration's policies, driven by an "energy dominance" agenda and climate skepticism, inadvertently jeopardize critical services that are fundamental for national security, disaster preparedness, and economic stability. This highlights a significant disconnect between ideological policy objectives and the practical requirements for effective governance and public welfare.

U.S. Geological Survey (USGS) & U.S. Fish and Wildlife Service (USFWS): Effects on Ecological Research and Conservation

The proposed budget sought to cut **$564 million from USGS's science and research programs**. Sources indicated that **1,000 employees in the USGS Ecosystems Mission Area were expected to be laid off**. This mission area is critical for wildlife research, including studies on migratory birds, game species, and endangered/threatened species. USGS grants to universities were frozen, directly impacting PhD students and their ongoing research. The budget proposed eliminating USGS programs that "focus on social agendas (e.g., climate change)". The U.S. Fish and Wildlife Service (USFWS) faced proposed cuts of **$170 million in conservation grants**.
Federal agencies like USFWS and USGS faced budgetary constraints that hindered their capacity to enforce protective statutes and conduct rigorous scientific monitoring. An interview

excerpt noted that "voluntary early retirement offer effectively eliminated positions," leading to "reduced productivity and the outsourcing of work". The cuts to the USGS Ecosystems Mission Area and USFWS conservation grants directly jeopardize the collection of fundamental, long-term ecological data. This includes crucial efforts such as identifying and mapping big game migrations, monitoring grizzly bear populations, and conducting annual migratory bird counts necessary for setting hunting limits. These are not isolated projects but continuous monitoring programs vital for understanding ecosystem health and managing wildlife populations. The concept of "irrecoverable" damage, previously noted for NOAA , is equally applicable here: once long-term datasets are disrupted or specialized expertise is lost due to layoffs , it becomes exceedingly difficult and time-consuming to rebuild that capacity and knowledge base. The Wisconsin wolf petition explicitly states that federal budget constraints directly impair USFWS and USGS's ability to conduct "rigorous scientific monitoring". This systematic undermining of data collection and scientific monitoring erodes the very foundation of adaptive wildlife management and conservation. Without accurate, continuous data, it becomes impossible to assess the effectiveness of conservation strategies, track species recovery or decline, or make informed, science-based decisions. This could lead to irreversible biodiversity loss, destabilization of ecosystems, and a diminished capacity to respond effectively to future ecological challenges.

National Park Service: Diminished Capacity for Public Lands Management

The budget proposed slashing **over $900 million from the National Park System** , an amount equivalent to closing 350 national park sites. The budget explicitly called for "transferring smaller, lesser visited parks to state and tribal governments". The Park Service had already lost at least **2,700 employees** through buyouts and deferred resignations , leading to concerns that further cuts would make it "impossible to open the parks to the public". These proposed changes would impact all federally owned public lands, including wildlife refuges. The proposed significant cuts to the National Park Service budget and the suggestion of transferring parks to state or tribal governments extend beyond mere environmental science. These actions directly threaten public access to national natural spaces and the preservation of culturally and ecologically significant sites. Reduced staffing, as evidenced by the loss of 2,700 employees , could lead to park closures, reduced operating hours, or a severe decline in visitor services and maintenance, making it "impossible to open the parks to the public". This represents a fundamental shift away from the federal government's long-standing role in stewarding national treasures for the benefit of all citizens. It risks creating a fragmented and potentially unequal system of public land management, where the level of access and protection is contingent upon varying state or tribal capacities and priorities, thereby undermining the very concept and integrity of a unified national park system.

Termination and Freezing of Critical Research Grants and Programs

This section delves into the direct impact on scientific research through the termination and freezing of federal grants, highlighting the specific areas affected and the broader consequences for the scientific community and national innovation.

National Science Foundation (NSF) and EPA Research Grant Terminations

More than **$1.5 billion in federal grant money was terminated** by the Trump administration, including over **1,600 National Science Foundation (NSF) grants**. UMass Amherst's Energy Transition Institute, for example, had a **$6 million NSF grant and a $1 million EPA grant**

terminated , directly impacting their work on sustainable energy systems. Over half of the terminated NSF grants, specifically **54% and totaling $773 million**, were designated for **STEM education** , hindering efforts to recruit and retain diverse educators in critical STEM fields. Additionally, grants supporting cybersecurity programs and groundbreaking research on supporting students with chronic health conditions were also terminated. Researchers found themselves with "mountains of new information but no longer have the means to publish their findings or share their innovations with the public and the federal agencies that asked for them". The termination of federal research grants, particularly those supporting PhD students and early-career researchers , directly leads to job losses for research assistants and prematurely ends the career paths of aspiring scientists. This uncertainty and lack of funding cause individuals to question their career choices in vital fields like wildlife biology and potentially seek opportunities in other countries. This is not merely a temporary financial setback; it represents a significant loss of human capital, specialized expertise, and institutional knowledge that takes years, if not decades, to cultivate and replace. This phenomenon creates a "brain drain" within critical scientific disciplines, diminishing the U.S.'s long-term capacity for scientific innovation, global competitiveness, and its ability to effectively address complex future environmental, public health, and technological challenges. It also discourages future generations from pursuing careers in these essential areas, creating a lasting deficit in the national scientific workforce.

Impact on Climate Science, Public Health, and Workforce Development

Climate science was "particularly targeted" by the administration , threatening both domestic progress and international scientific and political cooperation on these issues. The removal of climate change sections from government websites and the banning of related terms from academic publications (under threat of losing funding) created "significant obstacles to the production and dissemination of knowledge". The cancellation of the **$4 billion contribution to the UN Green Climate Fund** and the dismantling of USAID further reduced U.S. climate financing and cooperation efforts abroad. The cuts were seen as undermining the scientific foundation of environmental policymaking and leaving the nation without the "scientific readiness and innovation needed to respond to today's threats, and tomorrow's".
The United States plays a disproportionately large role in global climate science, contributing to **23% of scientific studies on climate change** since 2020, and American equipment underpins **half of the global ocean observation network**. Therefore, cuts to climate science, withdrawal from the Paris Agreement , and the cancellation of significant climate financing abroad are not merely domestic policy decisions. They directly impact the collective global effort to combat climate change, reduce the U.S.'s influence and leadership in international scientific and environmental diplomacy, and potentially create a void that other nations may fill. This withdrawal from global climate action could lead to a less stable and predictable global climate future, increase geopolitical tensions over shared environmental challenges, and significantly diminish the U.S.'s standing as a scientific and environmental leader on the world stage. It risks ceding critical research and policy influence to other countries, with long-term consequences for global environmental governance.

Consequences for Environmental Protection and Public Health

This section synthesizes the direct and indirect consequences of the cuts, illustrating how reduced scientific capacity and regulatory enforcement translate into tangible risks for the environment and human well-being.

Weakened Regulatory Enforcement and Monitoring Capabilities

The EPA's enforcement of the Clean Air Act and Safe Drinking Water Act faced unspecified cuts, with the administration characterizing the agency's strong bipartisan record of collecting fines for pollution violations as "legally dubious". The **$1 billion reduction in Categorical Grants** for states removed essential resources that enable state and local governments to enforce clean air, safe drinking water, and hazardous waste regulations. This was described as an "abdication of responsibility" that would lead to "widespread backsliding". Federal agencies like USFWS and USGS faced budgetary constraints that directly hindered their capacity to enforce protective statutes and conduct rigorous scientific monitoring. The Wisconsin wolf case serves as a cautionary example: diminished federal oversight due to agency budget cuts led to "unstable population trends" and "unregulated hunting". When federal protections were lifted, illegal killings of wolves increased by **20-30%**.
The drastic federal cuts to state and community funding (an **88% cut** in some areas) and the significant reduction in categorical grants directly reduce the capacity of states to enforce environmental regulations. The Wisconsin wolf petition explicitly states that "Federal cuts and weakened enforcement can leave conservation efforts vulnerable, potentially leading to unchecked activities like unregulated hunting and poaching". This forces states to "act autonomously" to fill the void, but often without the necessary financial resources or expertise. This decentralization of environmental enforcement, driven by federal disengagement, creates a highly fragmented regulatory landscape. Environmental protection standards and their enforcement will vary significantly from state to state, potentially undermining national environmental goals and leading to a "race to the bottom" as states compete economically by relaxing environmental safeguards. This also shifts substantial financial and operational burdens onto state and local governments, many of which are ill-equipped to absorb such responsibilities.

Loss of Scientific Expertise and Disruption of Long-Term Data

The proposed cuts were described as "cutting meat and bone from the entire research enterprise" , with experts warning that "once a certain amount of damage is done, it's not recoverable". Long-term datasets, crucial for understanding environmental trends and informing policy, were disrupted. Experienced staff were expected to seek new jobs, taking their invaluable knowledge and experience with them. The uncertainty and layoffs caused by frozen grants and Reductions in Force (RIFs) were leading scientists, including PhD students, to question their career choices in environmental fields.
The widespread loss of experienced staff across federal agencies through buyouts, deferred resignations, and layoffs signifies more than just a numerical reduction in workforce. It represents a profound loss of institutional memory, specialized scientific and technical expertise, and established collaborative networks. The repeated warning of "irrecoverable damage" is critical here, as it implies that the knowledge and capabilities built over decades cannot simply be reinstated. This loss directly impacts the ability to maintain crucial long-term datasets, conduct complex interdisciplinary research, and provide expert advice for future environmental challenges. This "de-skilling" and intellectual erosion of federal environmental agencies and the broader scientific community creates a severe and enduring deficit in environmental governance. Even if future administrations prioritize reversing these trends, rebuilding the lost expertise, re-establishing disrupted long-term monitoring programs, and restoring the scientific infrastructure will be a monumental and protracted undertaking. This prolonged period of diminished capacity leaves the nation significantly more vulnerable to unforeseen environmental threats and hinders its ability to adapt to ongoing ecological changes.

Increased Vulnerability to Environmental Crises and Climate-Driven Risks

Eliminating clean air and climate programs leaves communities "more vulnerable when a wildfire starts, a hurricane strikes, or a bad-air day puts asthmatic kids in the hospital". Cuts to NOAA directly weaken weather forecasting and hurricane tracking capabilities. The Wisconsin wolf petition noted that climate change poses long-term challenges by altering prey availability and increasing disease prevalence. Research by Harvell et al. (2002) explicitly links climate warming to increased disease risks for terrestrial and marine biota. The cumulative effect of these cuts affects the nation's "scientific readiness and innovation needed to respond to today's threats, and tomorrow's".

The administration's significant cuts to climate research and environmental monitoring across agencies are occurring concurrently with, and in direct opposition to, the increasing frequency and intensity of climate-driven environmental risks. These risks include more severe wildfires, stronger hurricanes, and an increased prevalence of diseases, as highlighted by the wolf petition and the scientific literature. This creates a dangerous synergy: the nation's capacity to understand, predict, and mitigate environmental changes is actively diminished precisely as these changes are accelerating. By weakening the scientific infrastructure and regulatory mechanisms designed to address environmental challenges, the administration's policies effectively increase the nation's vulnerability to climate-driven disasters and public health crises. This represents a significant long-term cost to society, potentially far outweighing any short-term "savings" realized from budget cuts. The reduced ability to forecast and respond to these events will lead to greater economic damages, loss of life, and public health burdens.

Broader Policy Context: The "Energy Dominance" Agenda and Deregulation

The Trump administration's environmental policy was explicitly tied to an "American energy dominance" agenda , which prioritized and promoted the development and use of fossil fuels. This agenda included accelerating the exploitation of U.S. energy resources, easing environmental regulations for extraction, expediting permit approvals, and promoting liquefied natural gas exports. Conversely, financial support for renewable energy projects was withdrawn, and federal subsidies for electric vehicles were ended. Approvals for new renewable energy projects on public lands and new wind power projects were frozen. The administration's overall approach was described as putting "the interests of large polluters ahead of public health and the environment". The Government Accountability Office (GAO) reported that the Trump administration ignored watchdogs and was uncooperative in investigations into widespread funding freezes, including at the Office of Management and Budget (OMB) and EPA.

The consistent alignment of significant budget cuts to environmental agencies, the rollback of environmental regulations, and the aggressive promotion of fossil fuel interests strongly suggests a potential "regulatory capture." This phenomenon occurs when the interests of regulated industries disproportionately influence government policy and decision-making. The documented uncooperativeness with the Government Accountability Office (GAO) in investigations into funding freezes further indicates a deliberate lack of transparency and an avoidance of accountability for these actions. This undermines the fundamental democratic principles of checks and balances and public oversight, which are essential for maintaining the integrity of environmental governance. It raises serious concerns about whether public health and environmental protection are being subordinated to private economic interests. The long-term consequence could be a significant erosion of public trust in government institutions and a diminished capacity for independent oversight bodies to effectively hold the executive branch accountable for its environmental and scientific policies.

Tables

Table 1: Summary of Proposed Budget Cuts and Staff Reductions in Key Environmental Agencies (FY2026 Proposals)

Agency Name	Proposed Budget Cut (Amount/Percentage)	Impact on Staffing (Number/Description)	Key Programs/Functions Targeted
Environmental Protection Agency (EPA)	55% reduction (FY26 proposal), 65% budget cut announced by director	>1,000 science positions eliminated, mass layoffs	Environmental Justice programs, clean air/climate programs, enforcement of Clean Air Act/Safe Drinking Water Act
National Oceanic and Atmospheric Administration (NOAA)	$1.7 billion cut	~1,300 employees left, potential layoffs/furloughs	Office of Oceanic and Atmospheric Research (OAR), cooperative institutes, climate research programs, weather forecasting, hurricane tracking, ocean monitoring
U.S. Geological Survey (USGS)	$564 million cut from science and research programs	~1,000 Ecosystem Services layoffs, grants frozen	Ecosystem Services (wildlife research, big game migration, migratory bird counts), climate change-focused programs
U.S. Fish and Wildlife Service (USFWS)	$170 million cut in conservation grants	Positions eliminated via early retirement, diminished capacity	Enforcement of protective statutes, rigorous scientific monitoring, conservation grants
National Park Service (NPS)	>$900 million cut	~2,700 employees lost through buyouts/resignations	Park operations, public access, wildlife refuges, transferring smaller parks to states/tribes

Table 2: Examples of Terminated Federal Research Grants and Their Affected Areas

Granting Agency	Total Value of Terminated Grants	Specific Research Area Affected	Direct Impact/Consequence
National Science Foundation (NSF)	>$1.5 billion in federal grant money	STEM Education (54% of NSF cuts, $773 million), Cybersecurity, Student Health, Teacher Recruitment/Retention	Inability to publish findings, job losses for research assistants, halted progress on critical challenges, waste of taxpayer

Granting Agency	Total Value of Terminated Grants	Specific Research Area Affected	Direct Impact/Consequence
			investment, diminished workforce development
Environmental Protection Agency (EPA)	$1 million EPA grant (UMass Amherst)	Energy Transition (sustainable energy systems)	Halted work on sustainable energy systems, inability to share innovations

Conclusion: Long-Term Implications for U.S. Environmental Stewardship

The analysis demonstrates that the Trump administration's actions regarding environmental science and protection were not isolated budgetary adjustments but rather a fundamental and systematic shift in policy. The extensive cuts to federal agencies such as the EPA, NOAA, USGS, USFWS, and NPS, coupled with the termination and freezing of critical research grants, represent a deliberate devaluing and suppression of scientific inquiry and its role in public policy. This approach has created a corrosive and hostile environment for scientific pursuit, potentially leading to a less informed populace and a greater susceptibility to misinformation and anti-science narratives. The long-term consequence is a weakened scientific enterprise within the federal government and the nation as a whole, severely diminishing the country's capacity to address complex, evidence-based challenges, innovate, and maintain its global leadership in scientific advancement. The intellectual and institutional damage may persist long after the administration's tenure.

The systematic dismantling of environmental protections and scientific capacity could establish lasting precedents for future administrations, severely impacting institutional knowledge, operational capacity, and the overall trajectory of environmental governance in the United States. Rebuilding the federal capacity and restoring scientific leadership in environmental stewardship will require monumental and protracted efforts to reverse the "brain drain," re-establish disrupted long-term monitoring programs, and restore the scientific infrastructure. This prolonged period of diminished capacity leaves the nation significantly more vulnerable to unforeseen environmental threats and hinders its ability to adapt to ongoing ecological changes, ultimately imposing significant long-term costs on society, public health, and the integrity of natural ecosystems.

Works cited

1. Schwarzenegger tells environmentalists dismayed by Trump to 'stop whining' and get to work, https://apnews.com/article/austria-schwarzenegger-trump-climate-pollution-45798a896438d934d1430016a49c318c 2. The attacks of the Trump II administration on climate, the ... - IRIS, https://www.iris-france.org/en/111410/ 3. Trump EPA rollbacks would weaken rules projected to save billions of dollars and thousands of lives, https://apnews.com/article/epa-zeldin-pollution-rules-analysis-savings-health-0a289aec2507ed38d386680afdd0ea45 4. 1. Views on Trump administration energy policies and priorities - Pew Research Center, https://www.pewresearch.org/science/2025/06/05/views-on-trump-administration-energy-policies-and-priorities/ 5. Science policy this week: June 9, 2025 - AIP.ORG, https://www.aip.org/fyi/the-week-of-june-9-2025 6. Facts: Trump FY26 EPA Skinny Budget Factsheet - Environmental Protection Network, https://www.environmentalprotectionnetwork.org/epafacts/fy26-budget-factsheet/ 7. Proposed

55% cut to EPA Is a Wrecking Ball that Endangers the Air ..., https://www.environmentalprotectionnetwork.org/20250502_budget-cuts/ 8. Trump Administration's 2026 Budget: Drastic Cuts at NOAA and the EPA, https://www.surfrider.org/news/trump-administrations-2026-budget-calls-for-drastic-cuts-at-noaa-and-the-epa 9. Trump cuts would cripple NOAA's wide-ranging science ... - E&E News, https://www.eenews.net/articles/trump-cuts-would-cripple-noaas-wide-ranging-science-partnerships/ 10. Trump asks Congress to cut at the heart of the West - High Country ..., https://www.hcn.org/articles/trump-asks-congress-to-cut-at-the-heart-of-the-west/ 11. USGS grants will freeze, layoffs planned - The Wildlife Society, https://wildlife.org/usgs-grants-frozen-layoffs-planned/ 12. Trump Cancels Federal Research Grants. What Are the ..., https://www.nea.org/nea-today/all-news-articles/trump-cancels-federal-research-grants-what-are-consequences 13. Climate Warming and Disease Risks for Terrestrial and Marine Biota - ResearchGate, https://www.researchgate.net/publication/11298420_Climate_Warming_and_Disease_Risks_for_Terrestrial_and_Marine_Biota 14. Climate warming and disease risks for terrestrial and marine biota - PubMed, https://pubmed.ncbi.nlm.nih.gov/12077394/ 15. Global climate change and the emergence/re-emergence of infectious diseases - Portal de Periódicos da CAPES, https://www.periodicos.capes.gov.br/index.php/acervo/buscador.html?task=detalhes&id=W2022035895 16. Trump administration ignores watchdogs amid 39 funding investigations, GAO says - Politico, https://www.politico.com/live-updates/2025/04/29/congress/trump-administration-ignores-watchdogs-amid-39-funding-investigations-gao-says-00315459