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Multiple government failures are implicated in both the staggering spread of Covid-19 throughout the United States and the devastating health and economic tolls that have followed. Some failures—like the failure to maintain the government’s strategic stockpile of medical supplies including protective gear and respirators, and the failure to ramp up nationwide testing capacity—have been documented by the press and analysts. Researchers are also starting to examine the federal government’s use of the Covid-19 pandemic as a reason to scale back enforcement of important regulatory protections—or to roll them back entirely—and how the health, environmental, and economic consequences of these new deregulatory efforts may mix dangerously with the risk factors for contracting and dying from the novel coronavirus.

But the failure of the federal government to adequately safeguard the health, environment, and economy of the United States with efficient regulatory protections is not a new phenomenon. For over three years now, the Trump administration has systematically delayed, undermined, and erased key regulations that protect our health, our environment, our workplaces, our living conditions, and our economy. The steady erosion of regulatory safeguards has severely compromised our baseline defenses against Covid-19.

For example, though the scientific understanding of the risk factors for Covid-19 continues to develop, there is growing evidence that pollution-related illnesses, such as many cardiovascular diseases and chronic lung conditions—and possibly the direct exposure to pollution itself—are strongly correlated with increased risk of contracting and dying from the novel coronavirus. Unfortunately, for over three years, the Trump administration has relentlessly increased exposure to pollution by rolling back and delaying dozens of protections. The resulting hundreds of thousands of tons of additional air pollution and myriad related health impacts have most likely exacerbated the Covid-19 outbreak in the United States.

Similarly, nursing homes were an early hotbed of Covid-19 outbreaks in the United States, and living or working in a nursing home continues to be a major risk factor for contracting the novel coronavirus. Unfortunately, for over three years, the Trump administration has repeatedly delayed and scaled back the enforcement of regulations designed to secure healthier living conditions in nursing homes, including a requirement to have a specialist in infection prevention on staff. Those deregulatory efforts have put a vulnerable population at even greater risk.

The list goes on and on: diabetes is a major risk factor for Covid-19, yet the Trump administration has rolled back nutrition standards; HIV and cancers are risk factors, yet the Trump administration has erected regulatory obstacles to accessing reproductive health care and other health care for under-insured populations; certain dangerous work sites (like meat-packing plants) have been hot spots for the pandemic, yet recent deregulation has made many workplaces more dangerous (like allowing plants to prioritize speed over safety, which could force employees to work in even closer quarters); and so on, with the Trump administration’s deregulatory efforts aggravating almost every major risk factor for Covid-19.

And it is no coincidence that, just as minority and low-income populations have been especially hard hit by Covid-19, minority and low-income populations have suffered disproportionately from the health, safety, and economic impacts caused by the Trump administration’s harmful regulatory and deregulatory actions. U.S. patient data shows that racial and ethnic minority groups have experienced worse health outcomes from Covid-19, which the Centers for Disease
Control and Prevention (CDC) reports may be due to disparate risk factors like underlying health conditions, work circumstances, living conditions, and lower access to care among these groups. President Trump’s deregulatory agenda has affected all those factors, and, therefore, the disproportionate racial and economic justice impacts of deregulation are now most likely compounding in deadly ways in the wake of the Covid-19 pandemic.

This report reviews the major categories of risk factors for Covid-19 and catalogues some of the most egregious regulatory decisions during the Trump administration that likely have already begun to exacerbate those risk factors. Even before the pandemic, those regulatory decisions collectively were already causing dire consequences for public health and safety, the environment, and economic conditions—but we now know that those regulatory decisions have likely also increased our collective susceptibility to Covid-19. In short, the rash of harmful deregulation that has broken out since the start of the Trump administration has been, in many ways, a likely harbinger of the U.S. outbreak of Covid-19.
I. Deregulation of Pollution Exacerbates Covid-19 Risk Factors

Some of the Trump Administration’s most prominent and destructive deregulatory attacks have targeted environmental protections. These environmental deregulations were already troubling because they will directly cause significant social harms. But they are now even more unfortunate, because pollution is most likely linked to multiple key risk factors for contracting and suffering more severe cases of Covid-19.

A. Pollution-Related Diseases and Exposures Are Linked to Covid-19 Risk Factors

Pollution may increase the risk of contracting, suffering from, and dying from Covid-19 through at least three different possible pathways. First, particles of pollution may help carry, and so transmit, the novel coronavirus itself. Many scientists have warned that the novel coronavirus is transmitted not just by large respiratory droplets, but rather is airborne as well. And there is some preliminary evidence, consistent with studies for other viruses, that the novel coronavirus can be found on molecules of particulate matter pollution in the air. Part of the motivation for studying this possible connection between pollution and Covid-19 is the hypothesis that “[a]n epidemic model based only on respiratory droplets and close contact could not fully explain the regional differences in the spreading” of Covid-19 in highly affected regions like Italy. If pollution is a vector for the novel coronavirus, then increased pollution levels could play a direct role in transmission.

Second, exposure to ambient levels of air pollution could affect the risk of infection, hospitalization, and mortality. Inflammation of the lungs is one possible pathway through which acute exposure to ambient pollution levels could increase susceptibility to catching the novel coronavirus. Though research is still preliminary, and though several important studies have not yet undergone full, external peer review, a growing number of epidemiological studies suggest links between the number of total Covid-19 cases, severe cases, or fatalities on the one hand, and on the other hand increased ambient pollution levels of particulate matter, nitrogen dioxide, ozone, or carbon monoxide, with somewhat more mixed evidence for sulfur dioxide. One recent economic analysis also found that “increased pollution nearly doubles the conditional daily COVID-19 death rate and case rate.” These studies vary in how many confounding variables (such as meteorology variables) they do or do not control for, and the studies do not yet verify a causal relationship. And at least one contrary economic study found no correlation between pollution and Covid-19 death rates. Nevertheless, the correlation suggested by numerous preliminary studies is compelling. Pollution’s effects on inflammation, immune defenses, underlying diseases, or other pathways are all possible explanations for the correlation suggested by this growing body of evidence.
Third, underlying health conditions related to pollution most likely increase the severity of Covid-19. Overall, hospitalization is six times likelier—and death is twelve times likelier—among Covid-19 patients with underlying health conditions. According to the CDC, the National Institute of Health, the World Health Organization, and multiple preliminary scientific studies, the underlying health conditions that likely increase the susceptibility to, severity of, or mortality from Covid-19 include:

- cardiovascular diseases (including those caused by hypertension);
- chronic respiratory disease (including chronic obstructive pulmonary disease (COPD) and moderate-to-severe asthma);
- diabetes;
- severe obesity;
- chronic kidney diseases (including those caused by hypertension);
- chronic liver diseases;
- cancers (with or without direct immunosuppression);
- and chronic neurological disorders (including dementia), among others.

All of the above underlying health conditions can most likely be caused or exacerbated by short-term or long-term exposure to pollution. For some pollutants, some health effects from short-term exposure can begin to emerge after even just a few minutes or hours of sharply increased pollution level; longer-term, steady exposure to more moderately increased pollution levels can begin to produce health effects after even just a month or more of exposure. Acute, short-term exposure to pollution can increase the risk of infection for many viruses through such effects as impaired lung function, increased permeability of the pulmonary epithelium, increased oxidative stress and the production of free radical, and a host of immune system impairments. And though some longer-term health effects, like cancers, may not fully develop until years after exposure, some long-term pollution-related illnesses may be presaged by or exacerbated by more immediate degradations in health, such as systemic inflammation, and those more immediate health degradations that precede longer-term impacts may still be relevant to Covid-19 risk factors.

Several air pollutants that have increased recently due to deregulation during the Trump administration are linked to those key underlying health conditions, with substantial evidence that either demonstrates causality or strongly suggests a correlation.

**Particulate Matter:** There is a scientific consensus that short-term exposure to fine particulate matter (PM) causes cardiovascular effects, including heart attacks and heart-related hospitalizations, as well as likely effects on arrhythmia, thrombosis, and decreased heart function. Longer-term exposure to fine particulate matter is associated with coronary heart disease, myocardial infarction, and stroke, as well as other heart diseases, including possibly hypertension.

There is also strong evidence of a relationship between short-term fine particulate matter exposure and exacerbation of chronic obstructive pulmonary disease (COPD) and asthma, as well as other severe respiratory diseases. Animal toxicological evidence demonstrates that short-term exposure is associated with “altered host defense, greater susceptibility to bacterial infection, [and] airway irritant effects.” Longer-term exposure to fine particulate matter likely alters lung development, increases asthma, decreases adult lung function, and causes pulmonary inflammation.
Long-term exposure to fine particulate matter also likely causes both cancer (possibly including lung cancer) as well as neurological effects (possibly including contributing to dementia). And there is a growing body of research suggestive of a link between both short-term and long-term exposure to fine particulate matter and various metabolic effects, including diabetes.

**Ozone:** Short-term exposure to ozone causes decreased lung function, decreased airway responsiveness, respiratory tract inflammation, asthma exacerbation, COPD exacerbation, and other respiratory effects and diseases, and is associated with increased risk of respiratory infection and impaired lung host defense. Long-term ozone exposure is likely related to the development of asthma and other respiratory conditions. Ozone is also linked to increased respiratory hospital admissions and “premature aging of lungs.”

Short-term ozone exposure also likely has a causal relationship with metabolic effects, including impaired glucose tolerance, “perturbations in glucose and insulin homeostasis,” and inflammation, and may also be associated with “obesity-relevant endpoints.” Such health effects may in turn be associated with diabetes. There is also at least suggestive evidence that short-term and long-term ozone exposures are associated with cardiovascular effects and nervous system effects.

Volatile organic compounds (VOCs) contribute to the formation of ozone, and also carry health risks on their own, including irritation of the nose and throat; damage to the liver, kidney, and central nervous system; and suspected causal connections to cancer. VOCs can also react to form particulate matter.

**Nitrogen Oxides:** Short-term exposure to nitrogen oxides (NO\textsubscript{x}) causes respiratory effects like inflammation and asthma attacks, as well as likely COPD, increased respiratory infections, and other effects, while long-term exposure likely causes asthma development. There is also suggestive evidence that both short-term and long-term exposure to nitrogen oxides could cause cardiovascular effects, diabetes, and cancer.

Importantly, NO\textsubscript{x} is a key precursor for both particulate matter and ozone.

**Occupational Pollutants:** Exposure to certain pollutants is much higher in particular occupations. Beryllium is a toxic air pollutant that causes pneumonia, lung lesions, a lung condition called chronic beryllium disease, and lung cancer, and exposures are more common for welders, machinists, and smelters, among other occupations. Silica is fine particulate matter that causes silicosis (an incurable lung disease), lung cancer, chronic obstructive pulmonary disease (COPD), and kidney disease, and exposures are more common for construction and maritime workers, as well as throughout general industry. Other industries, like mining, also face a unique mix of occupational air pollutants.

**Other Key Air Pollutants:** Short-term and long-term exposure to sulfur dioxide (SO\textsubscript{2}) exacerbates asthma, and may cause various other health effects, including “airway hyperresponsiveness and inflammation,” and decreased lung function. Sulfur oxides are also a precursor for particulate matter.

Exposure to carbon monoxide likely causes cardiovascular disease and may be associated with respiratory disease and central nervous system effects.

Toxic air emissions—such as mercury, arsenic, lead, and nickel—are associated with various links to cancer, decreased immune activity, cardiovascular disease, liver disease, kidney disease, respiratory effects, and neurological effects.
The Links Between Pollution and Covid-19 Risk Factors

A solid line indicates strong evidence of a causal or likely causal connection. A dotted line indicates that the weight of correlative and suggestive evidence makes a relationship likely.

VOCs, nitrogen oxides, sulfur dioxide, and ammonia can all form particulate matter. VOCs and nitrogen oxides react to form ozone.

*There is some mixed evidence on whether asthma is a risk factor; the CDC lists moderate-to-severe asthma as a risk factor.

**Some studies have found preliminary evidence of direct links between pollution levels and increased cases or severity of Covid-19; inflammation is one possible pathway to explain such links.
Environmental Justice Effects: The disproportionate effects of pollution on communities of color and low-income communities are both well established and widespread. In 2018, researchers from EPA’s National Center for Environmental Assessment found that Black Americans were exposed to particulate matter at 1.54 times the national average; the rate was 1.28 times higher for minorities overall, and 1.35 times higher for Americans in poverty. Similarly, the NAACP and the Clean Air Task Force found that Black Americans live disproportionately close to pollution sources like oil and gas facilities, and so face disproportionately elevated risks of cancers from toxic air emissions. Racial residential segregation in the United States is associated with increased particulate matter and ozone exposure for racial minority populations. Consequently, as other analysts have documented, minority communities have borne “the brunt of Trump’s anti-environmental agenda.”

The Commonwealth of Massachusetts has released data showing the unequal effects of Covid-19 on communities of color and—citing pollution studies—has suggested that the unequal effects might be due to differences in air quality in different communities. The Massachusetts report notes:

While these findings are preliminary and need to be confirmed through more in-depth research, it is clear that air pollution influences many of the diseases considered as vulnerability factors for COVID-19 (e.g., asthma and cardiovascular disease), so it is plausible that long-term exposure to air pollution would be associated with worse COVID-19 outcomes.

A recent report by the Rhodium Group similarly found “that while Black, Latino, and Indigenous communities have been disproportionately impacted by COVID-19, those that live in high environmental risk areas are experiencing even more significant impacts.” Though the report did not conclude that pre-existing environmental health risks led to higher Covid-19 death rates—and suggested perhaps some additional variable correlated with both environmental risks and Covid risks—the report “demonstrate[s] that the same communities that have borne the brunt of the impact of COVID-19 this year have borne the brunt of the impact of air, water, toxic, and hazardous waste pollution for decades prior.” The disparate health effects of air pollution on minorities is also pronounced among the elderly—exactly the population that has been most at risk during the coronavirus pandemic.

“Front-line communities are under attack from multiple emergencies happening at the same time. Black communities are dealing with the systemic racism that has infected the policing in our communities that is literally choking us to death. The rolling back of environmental rules and regulations has us gasping for air due to the cumulative public health impacts from the burning of fossil fuels in our communities. Covid-19 continues to devastate black, brown and indigenous communities both in infections and deaths. When we say, ‘I Can’t Breathe,’ we literally can’t breathe.”

Testimony of Mustafa Santiago Ali, Vice President of the National Wildlife Federation, during the U.S. House Committee on Energy & Commerce’s Hearing on “Pollution and Pandemics: Covid-19’s Disproportionate Impacts on Communities”
In short, the fact that communities of color and low-income communities have experienced disproportionate shares of both pollution and Covid-19 is likely not a coincidence.

B. The Trump Administration’s Deregulatory Efforts Have Increased Air Pollution

Nationwide, ambient concentrations of particulate matter pollution (with NO\(_x\) and SO\(_2\) as precursors) increased about 5.5% by 2018, from its low in 2016, and a decline in federal enforcement actions likely explains at least part of that increase since the start of the Trump administration.\(^68\) A myriad of deregulatory actions over the last three years have begun to increase pollution levels from where they otherwise would have been, and those pollution increases could already be exacerbating the health risks for Covid-19 in the United States.

EPA Actions: The Trump Administration’s Environmental Protection Agency (EPA) has been busy rolling back environmental protections. Though not every rollback completely repeals the previous environmental protection, and though many of the rollbacks may not survive litigation, the tons of additional pollution or the additional health effects potentially at stake because of the rollbacks can be characterized:

- **Clean Power Plan:** The first compliance deadline for the Obama Administration’s rule on reducing emissions from power plants was not slated until 2022, but EPA still anticipated important pre-compliance activity to begin by 2020 at least.\(^69\) By 2020, EPA anticipated 50,000-60,000 fewer tons of NO\(_x\) per year and 14,000-54,000 fewer tons of SO\(_2\) per year,\(^70\) and a wide array of health benefits from reducing particulate matter and ozone emissions, including at least 2,900-9,300 fewer cases of respiratory symptoms, 113,000-228,000 fewer restricted-activity days, and 23,000-27,000 fewer school health-related absences, among many other health benefits—\(^71\) and the benefits would only increase once the rule took full effect. Instead, after the rule was stayed by the Supreme Court, the Trump Administration left the rule in limbo for years, until finally repealing it and replacing it with a dramatically weaker version.\(^72\) Though the changing price of coal versus natural gas in recent years has produced important decreases in emissions as the electricity sector has moved away from coal, “those declines alone do not meet the Clean Power Plan’s mandates. Indeed, EPA’s own analysis of [the Trump Administration’s weaker replacement rule] finds that eighteen states are not on track to meet their Clean Power Plan targets without additional emission reductions beyond their current trajectory. As a result, the agency further admits, implementation of the Clean Power Plan would continue to result in substantial emission decreases—between 3.0 and 5.8 percent nationally by 2035 for carbon dioxide, sulfur dioxide, nitrogen oxides, and mercury.”\(^73\) Consequently, important health benefits that could have already started to occur under the Clean Power Plan have been lost due to the Trump Administration’s deregulatory plans.

- **Clean Cars Rule:** By March 2017, the Trump Administration’s EPA and Department of Transportation had already announced their intention to reconsider the greenhouse gas and fuel efficiency standards that the Obama Administration had set for passenger vehicles for model years 2022-2025.\(^74\) The Obama-era standards were designed to reduce not just greenhouse gas emissions, but particulate matter and other tailpipe emissions, with corresponding health benefits.\(^75\) By 2018, the Trump Administration had determined that it would weaken the Obama-era standards,\(^76\) and in April 2020, the Trump Administration did exactly that, finalizing a drastic weakening of fuel efficiency and emissions standards for passenger vehicles.\(^77\) Over the next three decades, this rollback will result in increased pollution from tailpipes and gasoline refineries that will contribute to 250,000
more asthma attacks, 350,000 more respiratory ailments, and one million lost workdays.78 But by announcing back in 2017 its intention to roll back these standards, the Trump Administration likely caused some increases in pollution that the United States is already experiencing today. Because vehicle design and rollout takes three to five years, California’s environmental regulators, for example, predicted that the Trump Administration’s announcements in 2017 and 2018 would begin affecting manufacturers’ decisions about vehicle emissions starting with model year 2020.79 Furthermore, because the Obama-era standards encouraged manufacturers to achieve emissions reductions in earlier model years and bank those compliance credits for the future, just by announcing that the future standards would be weakened, the Trump administration undermined the incentives for manufacturers to take early actions to reduce emissions.80 In short, some portion of the major health effects that will result from the rollback of the Obama Administration’s Clean Car Standards have likely already begun to occur.

- **Oil and Gas Facilities:** The Obama Administration issued standards for new oil and gas facilities that were anticipated to reduce 150,000 tons of VOCs and 1,900 tons of hazardous air pollutants by 2020, with emissions reductions increasing thereafter.81 The Obama Administration also issued standards for hazardous emissions from petroleum refineries, anticipated to reduce 49,000 tons per year of VOCs and 5,200 tons per year of hazardous air pollutants by at least 2018.82 The Trump Administration has attempted to undermine these rule, delaying compliance requirements,83 refusing to enforce parts of the rules,84 and ultimately proposing the repeal and replacement of the rule for new oil and gas facilities with a much weaker standard.85 EPA has also delayed the regulation of emissions from existing sources.86 And in 2018, EPA finalized revisions that allow new sources to skip leak repairs during unscheduled shutdowns.87 As a result of all the delay attempts, inadequate enforcement, failure to cover existing sources, and partial revisions that have occurred since 2017, at least some additional quantities of VOCs and hazardous air pollutants have been emitted from oil and gas facilities.

- **Hazardous Air Pollution:** In early 2018, the Trump Administration’s EPA issued a guidance document revising a longstanding policy toward major sources of hazardous air pollution.88 Under the new policy, nearly 2,000 sources of hazardous air pollution that had previously been classified as “major sources” and so subject to more stringent emissions controls would instead be able to reclassify as “area source” subject to laxer standards.89 In 2019, the Union of Concerned Scientists found that at least 21 states could see increased hazardous air pollution under the new policy, including increases in chlorine, hydrochloric acid, styrene, benzene, and naphthalene, among other toxic air emissions.90 Potential increases could occur, for example, from 42 industrial facilities in Louisiana’s “Cancer Alley,” from dozens of petrochemical facilities near Houston, Texas, and from up to 26 facilities near the New York City-Newark area.91 As those sources are reclassified, they can begin emitting more hazardous air pollution.

- **Effluent Standards:** In 2015, the Obama Administration finalized water quality standards for power plants that use water sources to produce the steam they need to generate electricity.92 By changing the operation of higher-polluting power plants, these water quality standards were also expected to decrease air emissions, including up to 14,500 fewer tons of NO\textsubscript{x} per year, 5,000 fewer tons of SO\textsubscript{2} per year,93 and associated reductions in particulate matter, ozone, and other harmful emissions.94 However, in 2017, the Trump Administration’s EPA delayed the rule,95 and that delay was upheld by the U.S. Court of Appeals for the Fifth Circuit.96 The Trump Administration’s EPA is currently considering a revised standard that would substantially weaken the rule.97 Consequently, the Obama Administration’s rule has not been enforced, and none of the associated air quality benefits have occurred.
• **Cross-State Air Pollution:** In 2016, the Obama Administration issued a rule requiring 22 states to implement NO\textsubscript{x} reductions by May 2017.\textsuperscript{98} EPA estimated that by 2017, the rule would reduce 75,000 tons of NO\textsubscript{x} per year, as well as producing health benefits from the associated reduction in particulate matter and ozone, such over 67,000 fewer annual exacerbations of childhood asthma and 177,500 fewer restricted-activity days for adults per year.\textsuperscript{99} But the Obama administration admitted that the rule did not go far enough to resolve downwind air quality problems,\textsuperscript{100} and the agency was still required to issue a rule that fully addressed upwind states’ obligations under the Clean Air Act.\textsuperscript{101} In 2018, the Trump Administration refused to do so, however, saying that upwind states had satisfied their obligations to reduce their ozone emissions into downwind states.\textsuperscript{102} The U.S. Court of Appeals for the District of Columbia Circuit vacated that decision and ordered the agency to return to the drawing board,\textsuperscript{103} but the agency still has not yet to issue a rule addressing the obligations of upwind states. Relatedly, the Trump Administration denied petitions from four states (Connecticut, Delaware, Maryland, and New York) seeking EPA to prevent upwind states from polluting excessively across their borders.\textsuperscript{104} The D.C. Circuit has ordered EPA to reconsider Maryland’s petition,\textsuperscript{105} but the delayed action has left downwind states to continue to suffer from excessive levels of pollution.

---

- **Other EPA Rollbacks:** Other actions by the Trump Administration have also likely had air quality impacts, including a slew of changes to the emissions reduction requirements for large new and modified sources of air pollution,\textsuperscript{106} delays in implementing new national standards for ambient levels of ozone,\textsuperscript{107} the delayed implementation of emissions standards for municipal landfills,\textsuperscript{108} changes to the toxic air pollutant standards for brick and tile facilities,\textsuperscript{109} revised guidelines on regional haze,\textsuperscript{110} changes to how states have to account for emissions when large pollution sources malfunction,\textsuperscript{111} and an exemption for farms and ranches for reporting harmful air emissions like ammonia and hydrogen sulfide,\textsuperscript{112} among others.

---

**Department of Energy Actions:** The Trump Administration’s Department of Energy (DOE) has delayed or failed to take action on several important energy efficiency standards for consumer and commercial appliances. The Obama Administration had produced five new energy efficiency standards in 2016. By reducing the demand for electricity, these standards deliver significant emissions reductions from power plants, including emissions of NO\textsubscript{x}, SO\textsubscript{2}, mercury, and other harmful pollutants. The standard for uninterruptible power supplies, for example, is expected to produce up to $17 million worth of annual health benefits from reducing NO\textsubscript{x} emissions alone.\textsuperscript{113} Cumulatively, the five standards were estimated to reduce emissions of NO\textsubscript{x}, SO\textsubscript{2}, and other harmful pollutants by hundreds of thousands of tons.\textsuperscript{114} Recall that NO\textsubscript{x} is a precursor for both particulate matter and ozone.\textsuperscript{115}

But the Trump Administration’s DOE refused to publish and enforce the final standards. Only after litigation did DOE at last finalize the standards in early 2020 and set compliance deadlines,\textsuperscript{116} after a seven-month delay for the standards on walk-in cooler and freezers,\textsuperscript{117} and over a three-year delay for the standards on portable air conditioners, commercial packaged boilers, air compressors, and uninterruptible power supplies.\textsuperscript{118} By delaying these standards for several years, the DOE delayed the onset of important public health improvements that could have helped protect against Covid-19 risk factors like lung and heart disease.

The Trump Administration’s DOE also delayed the test procedures for other energy efficiency standards,\textsuperscript{119} causing additional emissions. And the Trump Administration reversed course on standards for lightbulbs,\textsuperscript{120} declining to issue efficiency standards that would have produced lifetime emissions reductions of tens of thousands of tons of NO\textsubscript{x} and SO\textsubscript{2} and other harmful pollution.\textsuperscript{121} These actions all carried additional public health consequences.
**Department of Interior Actions:** The Trump administration has taken several steps that have increased pollution from the production of coal, oil, and gas on federal lands.

In 2016, the Obama Administration’s Bureau of Land Management finalized a rule to prevent oil and gas operations on federal lands from wastefully venting methane; the rule was to take effect by 2018.\(^{122}\) Besides the climate benefits, the rule was expected to reduce over 250,000 tons per year of VOCs and nearly 2,000 tons per year of hazardous air pollutants, with health benefits including reduced cardiovascular and pulmonary disorders from VOC-related ozone and particulate matter pollution, and reduced incidence of cancer from exposure to hazardous air pollutants.\(^ {123}\) The Trump Administration started delaying the rule in 2017,\(^ {124}\) and eventually almost fully rescinded the rule in 2018.\(^ {125}\) Both the Obama Administration’s rule and the Trump Administration’s rescission have been subject to litigation, which remains ongoing,\(^ {126}\) and though some early pre-compliance for the Obama rule might have occurred, it is very likely that most if not all of the emissions that the Obama rule would have already prevented are, instead, still occurring.

The Trump Administration has also continued to approve additional coal, oil, and gas development on federal lands. For example, in 2019, the Office of Surface Mining finalized its review of the San Juan Mine Deep Lease Extension, which will generate over 8,000 tons per year of NO\(_x\), nearly 3,500 tons per year of SO\(_x\), over 1,000 tons per year of particulate matter, over 18,000 tons per year of carbon monoxide, and hundreds of tons per year of VOCs and hazardous acid gases from the coal mine and associated electricity generating station.\(^ {127}\) This is just one of multiple such projects approved during the Trump Administration that will produce harmful emissions from the construction, operation, and downstream emissions from coal, oil, and gas developments on federal lands.

The Bureau of Ocean Energy Management (BOEM) also stopped work\(^ {128}\) on an Obama Administration proposal that would have reduced emissions from offshore oil and gas facilities and so by 2019 delivered up to $43 million per year worth in public health and environmental benefits from reducing NO\(_x\) and other pollutants,\(^ {129}\) including the particulate matter and ozone formed by NO\(_x\).\(^ {130}\) Instead, BOEM eventually finalized a rule that estimated “no change in [health] benefits compared to BOEM’s existing regulations.”\(^ {131}\)

**Department of Transportation Actions:** Starting in 2017, the Trump Administration delayed and then rolled back a congressionally-mandated adjustment of the civil penalties for manufacturers that violate the energy efficiency standards for motor vehicles.\(^ {132}\) The adjustment was meant to better account for the impacts of inflation. Modeling demonstrates that even a short-term delay to adjusting these penalties immediately began to increase the total consumption of gasoline, by tens or hundreds of millions of gallons of additional fuel per year.\(^ {133}\) All that additional gasoline emits particulate matter, NO\(_x\), VOCs, carbon monoxide, and other harmful pollution when combusted.

At the end of the Obama Administration, the Department of Transportation finalized a rule setting performance measures for the states when using federal highway funding, including measures to assess and improve congestion and related air quality.\(^ {134}\) The Department had estimated that the rule would reduce at least 2,000 tons per year of carbon monoxide, as well as reducing VOCs, NO\(_x\), and particulate matter.\(^ {135}\) In 2018, the Trump Administration revoked the rule.\(^ {136}\)

**Occupational Exposures:** The Trump administration has worsened workers’ exposure to occupational pollution. Toward the end of the Obama Administration, the Mine Safety and Health Administration (MSHA) finalized a rule on examining working conditions in metal and nonmetal mines,\(^ {137}\) in part to monitor and correct health risks and adverse conditions, including harmful respiratory irritants.\(^ {138}\) In 2017, the Trump Administration repeatedly delayed the rule’s effective date,\(^ {139}\) and in 2018, the Trump Administration repealed those protections and instead allowed inspections to
be performed after miners are already working and no longer required disclosure of all adverse conditions to miners. Though the Trump Administration’s revisions were vacated and the Obama-era rule restored in June 2019 by the U.S. Court of Appeals for the D.C. Circuit, for over two years, workers did not have the benefit of the more protective standards.

Toward the end of the Obama Administration, the Occupational Safety and Health Administration (OSHA) finalized standards on exposure to beryllium at construction sites and shipyards, reducing dozens of annual deaths from and new cases of chronic beryllium disease. The Trump Administration repeatedly delayed the compliance deadline, postponing it until September 2020, and OSHA has since proposed revoking and revising those protections. The Trump Administration also delayed for several months the enforcement of standards to reduce respirable crystalline silica at construction worksites. These delays have increased the occupational exposure of workers at risk for developing lung conditions that may in turn increase their risk of developing worse cases of Covid-19.

The Obama Administration’s EPA had also issued a rule to protect pesticide applicators and farmworkers from exposure to fumes and residue, estimated to prevent over a hundred acute cases per year of low-severity illnesses like respiratory irritation, dozens of more moderate-to-severe acute cases like cardiac arrest and renal failure, and an unquantified reduction to risks of cancer, bronchitis, and asthma from reduced chronic exposures. The rule was supposed to take effect in 2017, but the Trump Administration repeatedly delayed the effective date. A federal district court finally vacated the delay efforts in 2018, but while enforcement was delayed, millions of farmworkers were exposed to dangerous levels of pesticide fumes and residue.
II. Deregulation of Consumption-Related Diseases and Behaviors Exacerbates Covid-19 Risk Factors

Deregulation of tobacco and nutrition policies has likely exacerbated the Covid-19 pandemic in the United States, because smoking, diabetes, obesity, and hypertension are all risk factors for Covid-19. Overall, hospitalization is six times likelier—and death is twelve times likelier—among patients with underlying health conditions.149


**Smoking:** Though research remains ongoing, recent work has found that smoking is most likely associated with worse Covid-19 outcomes.150 A large study of Covid-related hospital deaths in the United Kingdom found that smoking most likely increased the risk of death.151 A literature review concluded that “smoking is most likely associated with the negative progression and adverse outcomes of COVID-19.”152 And a recent meta-analysis “confirms that smoking is a risk factor for progression,” and that any apparent lower prevalence of smoking among total Covid-19 patients “may be due to under-assessment of smoking.”153 Moreover, smoking—as well as second-hand smoke exposure—is associated with many other health conditions that are also Covid-19 risk factors,154 including hypertension,155 cancer, heart disease, lung disease (including COPD), diabetes, general inflammation, and immune system problems.156

**Nutrition:** Nutrition is also associated with diabetes,157 obesity,158 heart disease,159 and hypertension160—all of which have been repeatedly identified in preliminary scientific studies as being more prevalent among Covid-19 cases; diabetes in particular has shown strong associations with more severe case progression.161

**Disparate Health Impacts:** Communities of color and low-income communities may be especially vulnerable to delayed and weakened regulation of tobacco and nutrition. Smoking is more prevalent among certain racial and ethnic groups, as well as in lower-income communities.162 For example, Alaska Natives and American Indians163 smoke at nearly twice the national rate,164 and the lowest income bracket households in the United States smoke at nearly three times the rate of the highest income households.165 And though Black Americans smoke fewer cigarettes than the national average, they are more likely to die from smoking-related diseases than white Americans, and “African American children and adults are more likely to be exposed to secondhand smoke than any other racial or ethnic group.”166

Racial disparities are pronounced for nutrition-related health risks as well. Black adults have the highest prevalence of obesity in the United States, followed by Hispanic adults, possibly due in part to higher levels of food insecurity, limited access to healthy food options, and poor access to health care.167 Black and Hispanic Americans have nearly 70% more cases of diabetes than white Americans; American Indian and Alaska Natives have nearly 100% more cases than white Americans; and disparities in diabetes also exist across socioeconomic status.168 Racial and ethnic disparities in the prevalence of hypertension are also well documented.169 Consequently, some recent deregulatory actions may have disparate health consequences for communities of color and low-income communities.
B. The Trump Administration Has Delayed and Weakened Tobacco and Nutrition Regulation

Blocking Immigrants’ Access to Better Nutrition: In August 2019, the Trump Administration’s Department of Homeland Security finalized the so-called “Public Charge” rule, which seeks to deny lawful permanent residency to immigrants who have participated in public assistance programs like the Supplemental Nutrition Assistance Program (SNAP). While the rule was quickly enjoined by federal district courts, a divided Supreme Court stayed the injunctions and allowed the rule to take effect nationwide as of February 24, 2020—just as the Covid-19 pandemic was ramping up in the United States. Though the Department of Homeland Security clarified in March 2020 that Covid-19-related benefits would not count under the rule, it remains exceedingly likely that hundreds of thousands, if not millions, of noncitizens enrolled in SNAP could disenroll in the near future for fear that their enrollment would block future permanent residency status for themselves or a family member. Because access to healthy food has great influence on underlying health conditions like obesity, hypertension, and diabetes, the Public Charge rule could have especially dangerous implications during the Covid-19 pandemic. Forcing immigrants to prioritize spending their constrained resources on food may also affect their housing security in ways that could further have implications for Covid-19, as discussed below.

Undermining Children’s Nutrition: The Trump Administration has undermined school nutrition policies. The Obama Administration’s Department of Agriculture issued a rule on school nutrition, setting minimum requirements for whole grains and vegetables, limiting sodium and flavored milks, and limiting which foods could count as a “snack.” The goal of the rule was to partly address the obesity crisis in children, with one of every three children ages 2-19 falling into the overweight or obese classifications. In 2017 and 2018, the Trump Administration first attempted to delay and scale back the rules on sodium, whole grains, and milk. A federal district court vacated that rollback in April 2020. But in the meantime, the Trump Administration has been working on a new proposed rule to roll back other elements of the original Obama regulation. The repeated attacks have left schools somewhat uncertain about applicable requirements during an already uncertain time, as schools struggle to continue providing meals to students during the pandemic. As a result, schools and students may increasingly turn back to low-cost, high-calorie, processed food options, which carry long-term risks for obesity, heart disease, and diabetes.

Delaying Calorie Disclosures: The Trump Administration has made it more difficult for consumers to make informed choices about their own nutrition. An Obama-era rule requiring the disclosure of calorie counts in restaurants was supposed to take effect by May 2017. The rule was anticipated to deliver over half a billion dollars per year in health benefits by helping consumers make choices to reduce their risk of obesity, diabetes, and death. The Trump Administration attempted to delay that rule by another year. The delay was quickly challenged, and the Food and Drug Administration (FDA) reversed course and put the rule into effect in August 2017. However, the FDA did not release its supplemental guidance on compliance until May 2018, and according to the National Restaurant Association, FDA enforcement of the rule did not begin before May 2019. And since April 2020, FDA has stopped enforcement of the rule during the Covid-19 pandemic. Though some restaurants are already complying with the original rule, the regulatory uncertainty and lack of enforcement has likely muted overall compliance, thereby delaying and decreasing the potential reductions in obesity and diabetes right at a time when the pandemic makes those conditions especially dangerous.
**Delaying Tobacco Rules:** The Trump Administration has hindered protections for smokers that would also benefit those exposed to second-hand smoke. In 2016, the Obama Administration’s FDA finalized the “Tobacco Deeming Rule,” which expanded FDA’s regulatory authority over e-cigarettes, vaporizers, cigars, hookahs, and pipe tobacco. In 2017, the Trump Administration delayed the compliance deadlines for this rule, ultimately extending the deadlines for FDA pre-market review and clearance of such products until 2021 (for combustive products like cigars) or 2022 (for non-combustive products like e-cigarettes). Though a federal district court found the delay unlawful in 2019, the court subsequently gave FDA until September 2020 to begin implementing its pre-market reviews, and FDA enforcement against any failures to comply would not begin until September 2021. The Trump Administration did announce quicker, prioritized enforcement against certain unauthorized flavored e-cigarette products, but large exemptions still persist for other flavors and products.

In addition to delaying pre-market reviews, in 2017, the Trump Administration also delayed all compliance deadlines under the Deeming Rule for three months, including requirements about ingredient and warning labels. Additionally, after a federal district court temporarily enjoined FDA from enforcing warning requirements for cigars and pipe tobacco, FDA voluntarily also delayed enforcement of other new labeling requirements for those products. During all of these delays, consumers would have a harder time making informed choices about smoking, likely increasing exposures to smoke and second-hand smoke—which we now know likely contributes to more severe cases of Covid-19.
III. Regulatory Failures to Protect Against Dangerous Living and Working Conditions Exacerbate Covid-19 Risk Factors

The Trump Administration has deregulated or failed to take action to protect living and working conditions in ways that have most likely exacerbated the outbreak of Covid-19 in some of the most persistent hotspots and other dangerous worksites.

A. Certain Living and Working Conditions Have Created Covid-19 Outbreak Hotspots

The novel coronavirus spreads more readily in close-contact living and working environments. As such, certain key hotspots have emerged.

Nursing Homes: Nursing home residents and workers were among the earliest and hardest hit population groups. As of July 1, 2020, The New York Times database reported Covid-19 cases in 12,000 nursing homes and long-term care facilities, totaling over 282,000 cases (10% of total U.S. cases) and 54,000 deaths (42% of total U.S. deaths).

Meat Processing Plants and Warehouses: Meat processing plants have been widely reported to be hotspots for Covid-19 transmission. As of May 2020, almost half (12 of 25) of the U.S. counties with the highest rate of new infections were associated with meat processing plants. As the Center for Progressive Reform has catalogued, by early May 2020, “167 meat and poultry plants had suffered COVID-19 outbreaks with 9,400 workers testing positive for the disease and 45 deaths. But the actual numbers were probably higher because many companies have been reluctant to allow testing.” Outbreaks have also occurred at Amazon warehouses and other workplaces.

Prisons, Jails, and Detention Centers: Prisons and jails have emerged as some of the most serious Covid-19 hotspots, in part due to crowded living conditions. As of July 1, 2020, at least 75,000 inmates or prison workers have been infected, with at least 6,400 cases in federal prisons—the Lompoc Federal Prison Complex alone has over 1,000 cases.

There has also been some reporting that federal immigration detention facilities are hotspots for transmission; however, because detention centers have not been testing detainees for Covid-19 at adequate rates, the analysis is somewhat incomplete and anecdotal. At least 2,500 immigrants in ICE detention have tested positive for Covid-19 as of June 2020. One concern about the limitations of the testing data is that coronavirus-positive detainees might be deported before they can be tested.

Homelessness: Homelessness is likely an independent risk factor for Covid-19, though the increased risk could also come in part from the fact that people who are homeless tend to be older and sicker than the general population. Even so, housing insecurity likely makes it harder for individuals to follow social distancing guidelines and access bathrooms to
wash their hands, which would be expected to increase the rate of infection.\textsuperscript{213} Homeless shelters are also a likely hotspot for transmission, though limited testing, asymptomatic spread, and other potential sources of exposure for homeless individuals can make it hard to determine the independent role that shelters play in transmission.\textsuperscript{214}

**Crowded, Dense Housing:** Crowded public housing likely leads to higher infection rates, though a lack of testing again makes the analysis more challenging.\textsuperscript{215} Urban density is likely a risk factor for higher infection rates, with New York City being an early epicenter of the pandemic in the United States.\textsuperscript{216} However, density alone is not the whole story: for example, denser but more affluent Manhattan, at least in parts, has seen a lower infection rate than less dense, less affluent, boroughs of New York City.\textsuperscript{217}

**Implications for Communities of Color:** The CDC has suggested that the disproportionate burden of Covid-19 illness and death among racial and ethnic minority groups—and especially the overrepresentation of Black Americans among hospitalized patients—may be due to various underlying factors, including work circumstances and living conditions.\textsuperscript{218} For example, Black and Hispanic Americans are more likely to be employed in essential industries, including healthcare and long-term care provision, agriculture, and the service industry—and as such have been unable to shelter at home or avoid exposures at work.\textsuperscript{219} Similarly, racial and ethnic minorities “may be more likely to live in densely populated areas because of institutional racism in the form of residential housing segregation,” and beyond the heightened risk of transmitting the novel coronavirus in crowded, dense living conditions, “racial housing segregation” itself has been linked with a variety of adverse health outcomes and underlying conditions—including diabetes—and these “underlying medical conditions . . . put people at increased risk of getting severely ill or dying from COVID-19.”\textsuperscript{220} In addition, “[r]acial and ethnic minority groups are over-represented in jails, prisons, homeless shelters, and detention centers,” which have specific risks due to congregated living, shared food service, and more.\textsuperscript{221} As such, regulatory policies that create more dangerous living and working conditions are likely to have racially disparate health impacts.

**B. The Trump Administration’s Regulatory Policies Have Created More Dangerous Living and Working Conditions**

**Scaling Back Nursing Home Protections:** The Trump Administration has undermined regulatory protections for nursing homes, which quickly emerged as Covid-19 hotspots in the United States. In 2016, the Obama Administration’s Centers for Medicare and Medicaid (CMS) finalized a rule for nursing homes that, among other mandates, would require a designated infection prevention officer, set standards for sufficiently competent nursing staff, and make other changes to improve the quality of care in nursing homes.\textsuperscript{222} The goals were

> “President Obama created regulations that we put through that were wholesale meant to address complete nursing home infection control, nursing home safety, overuse of antipsychotics, all these things. But sadly in 2017, the Trump administration got rid of those regulations and just said that they were not going to enforce them. That’s turned out to be, I think, the root of a lot of the challenge here.”

---

*Andy Slavitt, Former Administrator of the Centers for Medicare & Medicaid Services*\textsuperscript{228}
to reduce avoidable healthcare-associated infections, reduce avoidable hospital admissions, and improve the overall quality of care.\textsuperscript{223} The rule was to be implemented in phases, starting in November 2016, with full implementation by November 2018.\textsuperscript{224} In 2019, the Trump Administration proposed rescinding and revising much of the rule, including the requirement for an on-site infection prevention officer.\textsuperscript{225} Though the rescission has not been finalized, in the meantime, the Trump Administration’s CMS has steadily delayed implementation\textsuperscript{226} and reduced penalties for non-compliance of regulation of nursing homes in multiple ways,\textsuperscript{227} such that, most likely, significantly fewer nursing homes have infection preventionists on staff than they would have at this point under full enforcement of the Obama-era rule.

**Prioritizing Speed Over Safety at Meat Plants:** In October 2019, the Trump Administration’s Department of Agriculture finalized a rule to “modernize” swine slaughter inspections.\textsuperscript{229} The new program, which pig processing plants may opt into, reduces the number of food safety inspectors in plants and removes caps on pig slaughter line speeds.\textsuperscript{230} Several labor unions sued, arguing in part that eliminating the cap on line speeds would place workers at higher risk of harm, and a federal district court has allowed litigation on that claim to proceed, recognizing that “slaughterhouse workers, operating in close quarters and using sharp objects . . . will face higher rates of injury when working at faster speeds.”\textsuperscript{231} But beyond the risk of laceration injuries, “line speeds have an impact on how close the workers have to be,” which likely puts meat processing workers at greater risk for Covid-19.\textsuperscript{232}

**Increasing Health Risks for Truck Drivers:** The Trump Administration has increased the health risks for other essential workers like truck drivers as well. In 2011, the Obama Administration issued a rule regulating the “hours of service” for truck drivers.\textsuperscript{233} Though reducing fatigue-related crashes was one motivating factor for the rule, the Federal Motor Carrier Safety Administration also calculated up to $850 million in annual health benefits for truckers by reducing sleep deprivation and fatigue.\textsuperscript{234} Poor sleep is associated with multiple health conditions including obesity and cardiovascular illness, and insufficient breaks spent outside an idling truck also exposes drivers to extra vehicle exhaust, associated with lung disease.\textsuperscript{235} In September 2019, the Trump Administration finalized a repeal of certain provisions of the hours of service rule,\textsuperscript{236} and in June 2020 additional portions of the rule were repealed.\textsuperscript{237} This removes important health and safety protections for truck drivers—essential workers during the pandemic—and places them at higher risk of developing health conditions that are among the risk factors for Covid-19.

**Undermining Workplace Safety:** The Trump Administration has made worker safety less transparent and put employees at a disadvantage in negotiating for their own protections. At the end of the Obama Administration, the Occupational Safety and Health Administration (OSHA) issued a rule clarifying the ongoing duty of employers to keep accurate records about work-related injuries and illnesses and giving OSHA more time to complete enforcement actions against failures to maintain records.\textsuperscript{238} In 2017, President Trump signed a congressional resolution that rescinded that regulation.\textsuperscript{239} OSHA now is sharply time-limited in bringing certain enforcement actions against employers for improper tracking of workplace injuries.\textsuperscript{240} This in turn could create an incentive to hide the outbreak of Covid-19 cases at work and frustrate efforts to monitor outbreaks or develop responses to prevent and mitigate the spread of Covid-19.

Relatedly, the Obama Administration’s OSHA also issued a rule to improve the tracking and reporting of workplace-related injuries and illnesses.\textsuperscript{241} The Trump Administration repeatedly delayed the compliance deadlines under that rule,\textsuperscript{242} and then in 2019 replaced the Obama-era rule with a requirement to file only short summary reports on total numbers of incidents, rather than specific reports on each injury or illness.\textsuperscript{243} In April 2020, OSHA issued further guidance under the new, more limited reporting standard, clarifying that employers need record Covid-19 cases as work-related only if there is concrete evidence indicating transmission among workers.\textsuperscript{244} Consequently, while the Obama-era rule could have served as a useful tool to track the spread of Covid-19 through workplaces and design steps to mitigate and
prevent further spread, the Trump Administration has removed those protections and largely deferred to employers on the level of detail to track and report work-related illnesses.

In 2015, during the Obama Administration, the National Labor Relations Board (NLRB) ruled that certain franchisees in national chains were considered joint employers and liable for unfair labor practices, including any retaliation against protected employee activities. In early 2020, under a board of Trump-appointed members, the NLRB repealed that definition, thus possibly making it harder for employees of franchises to organize and make demands about safety.

Additionally, as the Center for Progressive Reform has summarized, “[t]he Obama Administration OSHA worked on a pathogen protection standard to protect health care workers in response to the H1N1 pandemic of 2009-2010, but the Trump administration put the project on hold indefinitely and has never gotten back to it.” If such a standard had been finalized, it might have helped to prevent some of the 90,000 Covid-19 cases among U.S. healthcare workers that have already occurred as of June 2020.

**Erecting Obstacles to Affordable, Fair Housing:** The Trump Administration has erected obstacles to safe, affordable, and fair housing. In 2015, the Obama Administration finalized a rule under the Fair Housing Act, called the Affirmatively Furthering Fair Housing Rule, to ensure that federal funding would help address racial segregation. In 2018, President Trump’s Department of Housing and Urban Development (HUD) suspended all reviews of local governments’ plans for furthering fair housing and withdrew the assessment tools to help local governments measure whether they were making progress in reducing racial segregation. In 2020, the Trump Administration proposed a new rule that would effectively repeal the Obama Administration’s Affirmatively Furthering Fair Housing Rule. As noted above, both racial residential segregation itself, as well as any associated disparately dense housing for vulnerable populations, carries health risks that may interact with the Covid-19 pandemic.

The “Public Charge” rule, discussed elsewhere in this report, also affects non-citizens’ access to Section 8 housing vouchers, and so could interfere with safe, affordable housing in ways that increase the incidence of homelessness or overcrowded living conditions. Furthermore, by forcing immigrants off of the Supplemental Nutrition Assistance Program, the Public Charge rule may force non-citizens to spend more of their own resources on food at the expense of housing, which could disrupt their housing security in ways that could put them at increased risk for Covid-19.

**Mass Incarceration and Detention Policies:** In 2017, President Trump’s first Attorney General, Jeff Sessions, rescinded the Obama Administration’s guidance “that directed prosecutors to seek lower sentences for lower-level drug offenders when appropriate, and instead instructed federal prosecutors to seek the most serious charge possible in every case.” The Brennan Center for Justice has identified this policy as an obstacle to reducing mass incarceration in federal prisons.

It is outrageous and shameful that, now of all times, the agency that exists to protect these workers’ rights is working overtime to make it harder for them to win basic safety protections from their employers.”

*Nicole Berner, General Counsel of the Service Employees International Union*
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At the end of the Obama Administration, then-Deputy Attorney General Sally Yates ordered to reduce—if not completely end—the federal government’s use of private prisons, citing “serious concerns about the safety of inmates and corrections officers. Sessions repealed the Yates directive almost immediately after his confirmation.” Consequently, instead of immediately reducing the federal government’s total private prison population to “less than 14,200 inmates by May 1, 2017,” the number of people in private federal custody remained 27,569 through 2017. Those prisoners likely remain subject to the poor health conditions that Yates had cited her in directive to phase out the use of private prisons, including the failure “to verify that inmates receive certain basic medical services,” and a lack of coordination and oversight of healthcare monitoring.

In August 2019, the Trump Administration’s Department of Homeland Security finalized the Family Detention Rule, which significantly expanded the agency’s ability to detain immigrant children upon entering the United States. Though the rule was quickly enjoined by federal district court (currently on appeal), U.S. Immigration and Customs Enforcement (ICE) continues to hold thousands of children and families in detention, and hundreds of ICE detainees—as well as dozens of detention center employees—have contracted Covid-19. It is well documented that detention centers typically have “unsanitary conditions with respect to the holding cells and bathroom facilities” and that migrants lack “access to clean bedding, and access to hygiene products”—all of which likely increases the risk of contracting Covid-19. Just days before the publication of this report, a federal judge ordered the release of migrant children held in family detention centers, citing the severity of the Covid-19 pandemic.

These policy decisions—by leading to more people incarcerated or detained in private facilities, and likely to more people incarcerated and detained overall—have contributed to the crowded, unhealthy conditions in prisons and detention facilities that have turned those locations into hot spots for Covid-19 outbreaks.

As many have noted, the Trump Administration’s recently renewed legal attacks on the Affordable Care Act come at a particularly troubling time during the coronavirus pandemic. But the Trump Administration has also repeatedly made regulatory decisions over the past three years that have undermined access to healthcare and so may have increased the risks of Covid-19.

A. Poor Access to Healthcare Increases the Risks of Covid-19

A decreased ability to manage a chronic health problem that might be a risk factor for Covid-19 can further exacerbate a person’s overall risk for contracting more severe cases of Covid-19. Difficulty in managing chronic health problems could be due to, for example, decreased access to primary care physicians or difficulty obtaining medications. A recent CDC review of data from Atlanta, for example, found that lack of insurance was associated with increased hospitalization rates for Covid-19.

Therefore, poor access to healthcare can be a Covid-19 risk factor, especially in conjunction with any of the following conditions:

- Any of the underlying conditions already mentioned above, such as cardiovascular diseases (including those caused by hypertension); chronic respiratory disease (including chronic obstructive pulmonary disease (COPD) or moderate-to-severe asthma); diabetes; severe obesity; chronic kidney disease (including those caused by hypertension); chronic liver disease; cancers (with or without direct immunosuppression); and chronic neurological disorders (including dementia);
- Immunocompromising conditions or treatments (including HIV);
- Any underlying medical condition that is “not well controlled”;
- And possibly pregnancy.

The disparities in access to healthcare by race, ethnicity, and socioeconomic status are well known. As the CDC has noted, Hispanic Americans are almost three times more likely to be uninsured than white Americans, and Black Americans are almost twice as likely. Disparities in access to healthcare are further driven by employment and financial disparities that make it difficult to take time off work to seek care, as well as implicit biases among health care professionals, language barriers, and other causes. The CDC has also found that Black and Hispanic pregnant women may be disproportionately at risk for Covid-19 infections. Consequently, regulatory policies that impede access to healthcare may have disparate consequences by race, ethnicity, and socioeconomic status, both for general health and specifically for Covid-19.
B. The Trump Administration’s Regulatory Policies Have Impeded Access to Healthcare

Discouraging Access by Vulnerable Populations: In August 2019, the Trump Administration’s Department of Homeland Security finalized the so-called “Public Charge” rule, which seeks to deny lawful permanent residency to immigrants who have participated in public assistance programs like Medicaid. Though the rule was quickly enjoined by federal district courts, a divided Supreme Court stayed the injunctions and allowed the rule to take effect in early 2020—just as the Covid-19 pandemic was ramping up in the United States. Though the Department of Homeland Security clarified in March 2020 that Covid-19-related benefits would not count under the rule, it remains exceedingly likely that upwards of 4.7 million Medicaid and Children’s Health Insurance Program (CHIP) enrollees could disenroll in the near future for fear that their enrollment would block future permanent residency status for themselves or a family member. Because lack of insurance is a risk factor for Covid-19, this rule could have especially dangerous consequences during the pandemic.

Erecting Barriers to Reproductive Care: Starting in 2017, the Trump Administration began creating religious and moral exemptions to the coverage of certain preventive medical services under the Affordable Care Act, including required contraceptive coverage. Complex litigation ensued, and in July 2020, the Supreme Court upheld the exemption. In 2019, the Trump Administration’s Department of Health and Human Services (HHS) also finalized a rule to allow healthcare providers to object to the provision of certain health services—like abortion, hormonal contraception, and treatments for HIV—on the basis of “conscience” or religious claims. A federal district court vacated that rule, but as of January 2020, HHS states that it “will continue to vigorously enforce the law under pre-existing authorities.” As a result of HHS’s ongoing approach under these rules, by the agency’s own estimates, tens or hundreds of thousands of women could potentially be at risk of losing coverage for contraception and related reproductive healthcare. Recall that pregnancy, HIV, and other conditions related to reproductive health are likely risk factors for Covid-19.

In March 2019, the Trump Administration finalized a rule requiring healthcare providers that receive federal funding under Title X for family planning services to physically and financially separate their abortion services from their other healthcare services, and to prevent such providers from giving clear information and referrals to their patients about abortions. The rule not only complicates the provision of abortion services, but also threatens the financial viability of clinics that provide a host of reproductive healthcare and general preventative healthcare services. Hundreds of clinics have already had to give up their Title X funding or shut down completely, disrupting the healthcare of over a million female patients. The result is likely not only an increase in otherwise-unwanted pregnancies—but with pregnancy being a likely risk factor for Covid-19—but also a decrease in the provision of reproductive and preventative healthcare services necessary to control sexually transmitted diseases like HIV, breast and cervical cancer, diabetes, and hypertension—all of which are also Covid-19 risk factors.

Allowing Discrimination in Healthcare: In 2016, the Obama Administration finalized a rule under the Affordable Care Act to bar discrimination in the provision of healthcare on the basis of gender identity and provide other protections. A federal district court stayed that rule in December 2016 with a preliminary injunction, and the Trump Administration made no effort to defend or reinstate the rule. In May 2019, the Department of Health and Human Services proposed a host of changes, including: removing protections to prevent discrimination in the provision of healthcare on the basis of gender identity, allowing health insurance companies to provide benefits packages that may discriminate against people with different conditions or statuses, and reducing the requirements to provide language translation services for patients
with limited English proficiency; allowing discrimination in the provision on healthcare has made it more difficult for a vulnerable population to access care and so to control any underlying health conditions that may be risk factors for Covid-19.

Setting Limits on Obamacare, Medicare, and Medicaid: In April 2017, the Trump Administration issued a rule shortening the 2017-2018 enrollment period for Obamacare to just six weeks. The shorter enrollment period—as well as the Trump Administration’s broader efforts to undermine Obamacare—may have led to more uninsured Americans. Similarly, in 2019, the Trump Administration issued a rule delaying by two years when U.S. territories would need to come into full compliance with the Affordable Care Act’s Medicare provisions, delaying important coverage for the residents of Puerto Rico, Guam, and other U.S. territories. In 2018, the Department of Health and Human Services finalized a rule giving insurance companies more flexibility to sell so-called “short-term” plans that do not have to comply with central requirements of the Affordable Care Act, such as the inclusion of essential benefits and bans on excluding patients with preexisting conditions. Though it is unclear how many people have bought such an alternate plan so far, those who have might be left with substantially lower insurance coverage and so poorer overall access to healthcare.

In 2018, the Centers for Medicare and Medicaid Services (CMS) began approving various states’ work requirements to qualify for Medicaid, threatening the insurance coverage for hundreds of thousands of low-income Americans. The potential drop in Medicaid enrollment also threatened the funding for the urban and rural hospitals that serve these lower-income patients. Though some of these state requirements have since been invalidated by the courts, other state programs could yet be implemented, and even the temporary loss of coverage in some states could be significant—particularly during a pandemic.
V. Conclusion: Inaction and Future Actions Create Additional Threats

Just as the Covid-19 pandemic has shown no signs of slowing down in recent weeks,\textsuperscript{304} the Trump Administration’s deregulatory efforts are showing no signs of slowing down. In April 2020, the Trump Administration finalized a drastic weakening of fuel efficiency and emissions standards for passenger vehicles.\textsuperscript{305} Over the next three decades, this rollback will result in 250,000 more asthma attacks, 350,000 more respiratory ailments, and one million lost workdays.\textsuperscript{306} Starting with the increased emissions from vehicles in model year 2021, the negative health effects from environmental rollbacks threaten to further exacerbate our collective risk for Covid-19 as the pandemic lingers.

Similarly, a new rule from the Department of Agriculture was scheduled to take effect in April 2020, setting more stringent work requirements for adults without children to qualify for the Supplemental Nutrition Assistance Program (SNAP).\textsuperscript{307} Once implemented, the rule will reduce SNAP benefit payments by over $1 billion per year,\textsuperscript{308} thus making it harder for Americans to afford nutritious food, and so contributing to malnutrition, nutrition-related illnesses like diabetes, and also homelessness as low-income Americans are forced to divert their limited resources toward food instead of housing. Though the Department of Agriculture temporarily stayed the new work requirements until after the Covid-19 national emergency has been lifted,\textsuperscript{309} and though the rule is also subject to a preliminary injunction from a federal district court,\textsuperscript{310} if circumstances change and the rule takes effect before the Covid-19 pandemic ends, the health and economic impacts could be devastating.

Moreover, every detrimental regulatory decision made over the last three years has also diverted federal agencies’ valuable time and resources away from other courses of action that could have improved our health, our environment, our living and working conditions, and our economy in ways that would have better prepared the United States to weather the Covid-19 pandemic. The costs of inaction have likely been tremendous. For example, after disbanding its own independent scientific advisory panel in 2018, EPA recently announced it would take no action to tighten national standards for exposure to particulate matter.\textsuperscript{311} Had EPA not only set more stringent standards consistent with scientific advice, but done so much sooner, the United States could already be moving toward cleaner air that could decrease the risk for a myriad of health effects, including potential susceptibility to Covid-19. Similarly, while the Obama Administration’s OSHA had been working on a pathogen protection standard to protect health care workers in response to pandemics, the Trump Administration never completed the work.\textsuperscript{312} By prioritizing deregulatory actions (like delaying standards to protect workers from exposure to beryllium) over new regulatory possibilities (like a pathogen protection standard for healthcare workers), agencies like OSHA have exacerbated the risks that Americans now face.
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From environmental deregulation to weakening nutrition standards, and from making living and working conditions more dangerous to decreasing access to healthcare, the Trump Administration’s regulatory decisions have not only directly and significantly decreased social welfare but have also exacerbated many of the major risk factors for contracting, suffering severe cases of, and dying from Covid-19. Many of these regulatory decisions fall particularly hard on minority and low-income populations and so have especially increased the risks faced by these communities during the Covid-19 pandemic. The outbreak of deregulatory actions over the last three years has in far too many ways weakened our defenses and so made the Covid-19 pandemic even more dangerous for Americans.
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