

PROJECT 2025 BREAKDOWN

FOR THE WORKING & MIDDLE CLASS

Let's Learn Together



PREPARED BY:
Commissioner Alana Sanders

Table of Contents

Contents

<i>Four Pillars of Project 2025:</i>	6
<i>Project 2025: Main Sections and Topics</i>	6
1. White House Office Pros, Cons, & Impact	7
2. Department of Defense Pros, Con, & Impact	7
3. Department of Education Pros, Cons, & Impact	7
4. Environmental Protection Agency (EPA) Pros, Cons, & Impact.....	8
5. Department of Health and Human Services Pros, Cons, & Impact.....	8
6. Department of Housing and Urban Development (HUD) Pros, Cons, & Impact.....	8
7. Department of Labor Pros, Cons, & Impact	8
8. Department of Energy Pros, Cons, & Impact	8
9. Department of Justice Pros, Cons, & Impact	9
10. Social Safety Nets and Public Assistance Pros, Cons, & Impact	9
General Pros and Cons of Project 2025.....	9
<i>What are the potential economic impacts of Project 2025?</i>	10
1. Tax Policy Changes	10
2. Regulation Rollbacks.....	10
3. Energy and Environmental Policies.....	10
4. Social Safety Net Programs	10
5. Healthcare Reforms	11
6. Privatization of Government Functions	11
7. Job Market Impact.....	11
Overall Economic Impact	11
<i>How would Project 2025 affect education in the US?</i>	11
1. Reduction or Elimination of the Department of Education	11
2. School Choice and Voucher Programs.....	12
3. Changes to Title IX and Gender Education Policies	12
4. Curriculum Reforms and Emphasis on “Patriotic” Education	12
5. Reduction of Federal Funding for Programs like Head Start.....	12
6. Decentralization of Special Education Services	13
Overall Implications for Education in the U.S.....	13
<i>How would Project 2025 impact public school funding?</i>	13

1. Elimination of Federal Funding Sources	13
2. Shift to State and Local Funding	14
3. Impact on School Choice and Voucher Programs	14
4. Reduced Support for Programs like Title I and Special Education.....	14
5. Implications for Public School Infrastructure and Resources	14
Overall Impact on Public School Funding.....	15
<i>How does Project 2025 impact healthcare access?.....</i>	15
1. Medicaid and Medicare Changes.....	15
2. Reduction of ACA Provisions	15
3. Emphasis on Private Healthcare Solutions	16
4. Reforms to Public Health Programs	16
5. Changes to Health Coverage for Vulnerable Populations.....	16
Overall Implications for Healthcare Access	17
<i>How does Project 2025 impact environmental regulations?</i>	17
1. Deregulation of Fossil Fuels and Energy Production	17
2. Cutbacks on Climate Change Initiatives	17
3. Weakening of the Environmental Protection Agency (EPA)	18
4. Privatization and State Control of Environmental Functions.....	18
5. Impacts on Renewable Energy and Clean Technology	19
Overall Implications for Environmental Protection	19
<i>How does Project 2025 impact energy prices?</i>	19
1. Increased Fossil Fuel Production	20
2. Reduced Environmental Regulations	20
3. Reduced Investment in Renewable Energy	20
4. Market Volatility and Supply Chain Risks.....	21
Overall Impact on Consumer Energy Costs	21
<i>How would Project 2025 impact agriculture?</i>	21
1. Environmental Deregulation	21
2. Energy and Fuel Costs	22
3. Changes in Federal Subsidies and Agricultural Programs	22
4. Impact on Labor for Agriculture	22
5. State-Level Variability in Agricultural Support	23
6. Effects on Sustainable and Organic Farming	23
Overall Impact on Agriculture	23

1. Healthcare Access.....	24
2. Education and Public School Funding	24
3. Energy Policy and Economic Development	24
4. Infrastructure and Public Services	25
5. Economic and Small Business Impacts	25
Overall Impact on Rural Communities.....	25
<i>How would Project 2025 impact job growth?</i>	25
1. Energy Sector Jobs	26
2. Manufacturing and Construction Jobs	26
3. Public Sector Jobs	26
4. Healthcare and Social Services Jobs.....	26
5. Education Sector Jobs	27
6. Environmental and Renewable Technology Jobs.....	27
Overall Impact on Job Growth	27
<i>How does Project 2025 affect small businesses?</i>	27
1. Tax Policy Adjustments	28
2. Deregulation and Reduced Compliance Costs	28
3. Access to Healthcare for Small Business Employees	28
4. Federal Spending Shifts and Contract Opportunities	28
5. Impact on Renewable Energy and Green Technology Businesses.....	29
6. Shift Toward State and Local Control.....	29
Overall Impact on Small Businesses	29
Glossary	30
Reference Guide	34
Key Areas of Impact	34
1. Tax Policy Changes	34
2. Deregulation and Compliance Costs	34
3. Healthcare and Social Services	34
4. Environmental Regulations and Climate Initiatives	35
5. Energy Production and Pricing	35
6. Public Sector Jobs and Privatization	35
7. Education and Public School Funding	35
8. Small Business Impacts	35
Useful References:.....	36

This outline reflects the document's primary sections and associated federal departments or agencies. If you need a more detailed breakdown of specific topics within each section, I can expand further. Please let me know how best to proceed!

Project 2025 is a comprehensive guide intended for a potential future conservative administration. The document, titled **Mandate for Leadership: The Conservative Promise**, spans over 900 pages and is organized into four main pillars and 30 sections. Here's a high-level overview of these components:

Four Pillars of Project 2025:

1. **Policy Guide:** This is the main component, covering specific policy recommendations for federal agencies and restructuring proposals.
2. **Personnel Database:** A database to help facilitate the appointment process by recommending vetted candidates for various government positions.
3. **Presidential Administration Academy:** An educational initiative providing training on government functions for both new and experienced officials.
4. **Transition Playbook:** A detailed action plan for federal agency transitions to be implemented in the first 180 days of the administration

Project 2025: Main Sections and Topics

Each section focuses on a different federal agency or administrative function, laying out plans and policy directions. A few of these chapters include:

1. The Presidency and Federal Government:

- White House Office
- Executive Office of the President
- Central Personnel Agencies

2. National Defense and Homeland Security:

- Department of Defense
- Department of Homeland Security
- Department of State
- Intelligence Community
- Media Agencies

3. Domestic Policy and General Welfare:

- Department of Agriculture
- Department of Education
- Department of Health and Human Services
- Department of Housing and Urban Development
- Department of the Interior
- Department of Justice
- Department of Labor

- Department of Transportation
- Department of Veterans Affairs

4. Economic Policy and Development:

- Department of Commerce
- Department of the Treasury
- Export–Import Bank
- Federal Reserve
- Small Business Administration
- Trade Policy

5. Energy and Environment:

- Department of Energy
- Environmental Protection Agency

6. Independent Regulatory Agencies

- Financial Regulatory Agencies (e.g., SEC)
- Consumer Financial Protection Bureau
- Federal Communications Commission
- Federal Election Commission
- Federal Trade Commission

To provide a comprehensive breakdown of ***Project 2025*** In layman's terms, I'll summarize its pros, cons, and potential impacts on the middle and working class for each section. Here is a snapshot for some of the key sections:

1. White House Office Pros, Cons, & Impact

- Pros: Streamlining leadership roles and decision-making processes could enhance administrative efficiency.
- Cons: Centralizing power in the White House might reduce transparency and limit input from diverse voices in policy-making.
- Impact: Potentially faster policy implementation, but decisions may feel less representative to the middle and working class.

2. Department of Defense Pros, Con, & Impact

- Pros: Project 2025 advocates for increased defense capabilities, which can boost national security.
- Cons: Higher defense spending may redirect funds from social programs and increase national debt.
- Impact: Potential job growth in defense industries but fewer resources available for public services that directly support the middle and working class.

3. Department of Education Pros, Cons, & Impact

- Pros: Emphasis on school choice could offer families more educational options and increase parental control.

- Cons: Reducing federal oversight could widen educational inequality, as public schools may suffer from reduced funding.
- Impact: Middle and working-class families might face challenges with the quality and consistency of public education, particularly in low-income areas.

4. Environmental Protection Agency (EPA) Pros, Cons, & Impact

- Pros: Reducing regulatory restrictions might encourage economic growth and create jobs in industries like manufacturing and energy.
- Cons: Reduced environmental regulations could lead to higher pollution levels and increased health risks, which disproportionately affect low-income communities.
- Impact: Economic benefits could be offset by health costs, particularly for those in middle and working-class neighborhoods near industrial areas.

5. Department of Health and Human Services Pros, Cons, & Impact

- Pros: Emphasizes streamlining healthcare services and could potentially lower costs by reducing administrative overhead.
- Cons : Proposed cuts to Medicaid and other assistance programs may limit access to healthcare for low-income individuals.
- Impact: The middle and working classes may face higher out-of-pocket expenses for healthcare, especially if they rely on government-supported programs.

6. Department of Housing and Urban Development (HUD) Pros, Cons, & Impact

- Pros: Plans to focus on homeownership could support those who want to buy homes and stimulate the housing market.
- Cons: Reduced federal assistance may decrease affordable housing availability, leading to a shortage in low-income housing options.
- Impact: Middle and working-class individuals might find it harder to access affordable housing, especially in high-demand areas.

7. Department of Labor Pros, Cons, & Impact

- Pros: Focus on reducing business regulations may encourage job creation by easing constraints on employers.
- Cons: Reduced workplace protections could lead to lower wages and fewer benefits, disproportionately impacting blue-collar and service industry jobs.
- Impact: Middle and working-class workers might experience less job security and potentially fewer workplace protections.

8. Department of Energy Pros, Cons, & Impact

- Pros: Project 2025 supports expanding energy production, which could lower energy costs and increase energy independence.
- Cons: Deregulation may increase fossil fuel production at the expense of renewable energy investment, impacting long-term sustainability.
- Impact: Short-term benefits could include lower energy costs, but the middle and working classes may face long-term environmental and economic risks related to climate change and energy volatility.

9. Department of Justice Pros, Cons, & Impact

- Pros: Focuses on enforcing immigration laws and other policies that prioritize national security.
- Cons: Emphasis on stringent law enforcement might increase tensions and potentially lead to civil rights concerns.
- Impact: Middle and working-class communities could experience stricter law enforcement practices, which may affect immigrant communities and civil liberties.

10. Social Safety Nets and Public Assistance Pros, Cons, & Impact

- Pros: Proposed reforms aim to make these programs more efficient and reduce government spending.
- Cons: Reducing funding for safety nets could make it harder for low-income and working-class families to access support in times of need.
- Impact: Middle and working-class families may have fewer resources to rely on during economic downturns, potentially leading to higher poverty rates.

General Pros and Cons of Project 2025

Pros:

- Focuses on reducing government size and administrative costs, potentially lowering taxes.
- Supports economic growth by reducing regulations that businesses may find burdensome.
- Emphasizes national security and streamlining federal functions.

Cons:

- Cuts to social programs and regulations may reduce protections for vulnerable populations.
- The increased focus on deregulation could lead to environmental, health, and economic concerns in the long term.
- Centralized decision-making and power concentration might decrease transparency and accountability in federal agencies.

For those in the middle and working class, the effects of ***Project 2025*** could be mixed. On one hand, they might benefit from tax reductions and job growth in certain industries. However, cuts to healthcare, education, and public assistance programs could make it more difficult for low-income families to maintain financial security and access essential services. Each section carries its specific impacts, so understanding these policies helps in assessing how they align with individual priorities and community needs.

For a more in-depth exploration of each section, check out the full text available on the [Project 2025 official website](<https://www.project2025.org>)

What are the potential economic impacts of Project 2025?

The economic impacts of *Project 2025* could be wide-ranging, as it aims to reshape the role of the federal government in ways that may affect income distribution, job markets, public spending, and taxation. Here's an overview of potential economic effects on different aspects of the U.S. economy:

1. Tax Policy Changes

- Pros: The project proposes a simplified tax system, reducing the number of income tax brackets and lowering corporate tax rates. For businesses, especially large corporations, this could lead to increased profitability, potentially spurring investment, innovation, and job creation. Lower taxes might also provide individuals with more disposable income.
- Cons: Reduced tax rates, particularly for corporations and high earners, could significantly decrease government revenue. This reduction may limit funds available for public programs and infrastructure projects that benefit the middle and working classes. Additionally, the benefits of lower taxes may be concentrated among higher-income earners, potentially increasing income inequality.

2. Regulation Rollbacks

Pros: By reducing regulations, particularly in industries like energy, manufacturing, and finance, *Project 2025* aims to reduce operational costs for businesses. This deregulation could lead to lower consumer prices and increased job opportunities in affected sectors, potentially boosting economic growth.

Cons: While deregulation might cut costs for businesses, it could also remove consumer protections, environmental safeguards, and workplace safety standards. In the long run, increased pollution, financial instability, or compromised worker safety could create hidden costs for the economy, impacting public health and leading to higher healthcare expenses.

3. Energy and Environmental Policies

Pros: The project supports increased fossil fuel production and aims to reduce environmental regulations, potentially lowering energy costs and supporting job growth in traditional energy sectors like oil and gas. Lower energy prices may benefit consumers and reduce operational costs for many businesses.

Cons: Reduced focus on renewable energy and climate initiatives could increase the U.S. reliance on fossil fuels, potentially worsening environmental and health impacts associated with pollution. In the long run, the absence of climate resilience measures could increase disaster-related costs and create economic vulnerabilities tied to climate change.

4. Social Safety Net Programs

Pros: **Project 2025** advocates for tightening eligibility requirements and adding work mandates for social safety nets, such as Medicaid and SNAP. Proponents argue that this approach will encourage self-sufficiency and reduce government dependency, ultimately decreasing public spending on these programs.

Cons: Stricter eligibility for assistance programs could reduce access to essential support for low-income families, potentially increasing poverty and income inequality. Middle- and working-class families may face increased financial strain during economic downturns without robust safety nets, leading to higher rates of homelessness, food insecurity, and other social issues.

5. Healthcare Reforms

Pros: The project aims to streamline healthcare services and reduce federal spending on healthcare programs. By encouraging private healthcare solutions, it might stimulate innovation and competition, potentially improving the quality of care.

Cons: Proposed cuts to programs like Medicaid and the Affordable Care Act could limit access to healthcare for millions of Americans, especially low-income individuals. For many middle- and working-class families, this may lead to higher out-of-pocket healthcare costs and reduced access to preventative and primary care, which could negatively affect both personal finances and overall public health.

6. Privatization of Government Functions

Pros: Privatizing certain government functions, such as parts of the TSA or National Weather Service, could theoretically increase efficiency and reduce federal spending. This might allow the government to allocate funds more effectively or even reduce the tax burden on citizens.

Cons: Shifting essential services to the private sector may lead to cost increases for services that were once publicly funded. This could make services less accessible to middle- and working-class individuals. Privatization may also reduce public accountability, potentially impacting the quality and reliability of services that many citizens rely on.

7. Job Market Impact

- **Pros:** Deregulation and tax incentives could stimulate job creation in specific sectors, particularly in energy and manufacturing, which may provide new opportunities for skilled workers. Additionally, lower corporate taxes may encourage business expansions and investments, further supporting employment.
- **Cons:** Cuts to public sector jobs, including federal employee positions, may lead to job losses, especially in areas with high concentrations of government workers. Furthermore, reduced funding for education, healthcare, and social services could impact industries that employ a significant number of middle-class workers, such as healthcare, education, and social work.

Overall Economic Impact

The potential economic impacts of *Project 2025* largely depend on its execution and the broader economic context. While proponents argue that reducing federal spending, deregulating industries, and lowering taxes will spur economic growth, critics warn that these policies could exacerbate income inequality, reduce access to essential services, and shift economic risks onto middle- and working-class families. The long-term effects on public health, environmental sustainability, and social welfare programs are particularly concerning for those who may rely on these resources for financial stability and quality of life.

How would Project 2025 affect education in the US?

Project 2025 proposes significant changes to the U.S. education system, emphasizing reduced federal involvement, increased school choice, and a shift in control to states and local entities. Here's a breakdown of how these changes could impact various aspects of education:

1. Reduction or Elimination of the Department of Education

- **Overview:** Project 2025* suggests dismantling the Department of Education and redistributing its responsibilities to states, local authorities, or the private sector. The project criticizes the

Department for overstepping into state and local jurisdictions and promoting policies that it views as ideologically biased.

- Impact: Eliminating the federal Department of Education could lead to a significant reduction in federal funding for public schools, which could negatively impact school districts that rely on these funds, particularly in lower-income areas. This could increase disparities in educational quality and resources between wealthy and low-income communities, as states would need to bear the cost and responsibility of funding and regulating schools on their own.

2. School Choice and Voucher Programs

- Overview: The project emphasizes expanding school choice through voucher programs, allowing public funding to follow students to their school of choice, including private and charter schools. This is intended to give parents more control over their children's education and increase competition among schools.
- Impact: Proponents argue that school choice initiatives could improve educational outcomes by fostering competition, encouraging innovation, and empowering parents to choose the best educational fit for their children. However, critics caution that such programs may drain resources from public schools, which could further limit the educational opportunities available to students in traditional public schools. This could exacerbate educational inequality, as well-funded private schools might benefit disproportionately from these funds.

3. Changes to Title IX and Gender Education Policies

- Overview: Project 2025* advocates for rolling back expansions to Title IX that protect against discrimination based on sexual orientation and gender identity. The project seeks to limit federal requirements for schools in these areas, proposing to eliminate what it considers "politically motivated" mandates on gender education and rights.
- Impact: Rolling back protections related to sexual orientation and gender identity could lead to a reduction in resources and support for LGBTQ+ students, potentially making schools less inclusive. This change may also lead to state-by-state variability in policies, with protections depending heavily on local political climates.

4. Curriculum Reforms and Emphasis on “Patriotic” Education

- Overview: The document calls for reforms to school curricula that emphasize traditional American values and patriotism. This includes reducing or eliminating what it describes as ideologically driven content, such as Critical Race Theory (CRT) or social-emotional learning programs.
- Impact: These curriculum changes could impact how subjects like history and civics are taught in public schools, with a focus on promoting a particular view of American history and culture. Critics argue that these reforms may limit students' exposure to diverse perspectives and restrict comprehensive discussions on issues like race and social justice.

5. Reduction of Federal Funding for Programs like Head Start

- Overview: Project 2025* proposes cuts to federal funding for early childhood programs like Head Start, which provides education, health, and social services for low-income children.
- Impact: Reductions in funding for early childhood education programs could reduce access to pre-K education for low-income families, potentially impacting school readiness and long-term academic outcomes for children who benefit from these services. Studies have shown that early

education is critical in leveling the educational playing field, so these cuts could contribute to increased disparities based on socio-economic status.

6. Decentralization of Special Education Services

- Overview: The project suggests shifting control over special education services from the federal level to the states. This would mean that states, rather than the federal government, would primarily set standards and provide resources for students with disabilities.
- Impact: While decentralization could allow states to tailor special education services to local needs, it might also result in inconsistent standards and funding across states. Students with disabilities could face disparities in access to resources and quality of education depending on where they live, as wealthier states may have more resources to invest in these programs than lower-income states.

Overall Implications for Education in the U.S.

The changes proposed in *Project 2025* are aimed at reducing federal oversight, increasing local control, and promoting school choice. While proponents argue that these policies will empower parents, foster competition, and reduce bureaucracy, critics warn that the cuts to federal funding, elimination of supportive programs, and decentralization could increase disparities in educational quality, access, and inclusivity. For the middle and working class, especially in lower-income areas, these changes may lead to decreased resources in public schools and widened educational inequalities, as wealthier districts and private schools could gain a larger share of educational funding.

How would Project 2025 impact public school funding?

Project 2025 would likely have significant implications for public school funding, primarily through its goals of reducing federal oversight and eliminating the Department of Education. Here's a breakdown of how these changes could affect funding:

1. Elimination of Federal Funding Sources

- The project proposes either dismantling or severely reducing the role of the Department of Education, which currently provides billions in federal funding for K-12 public education, especially through programs targeted at low-income and special-needs students. By removing this federal agency, these funds would no longer be centrally managed or distributed. This means that schools currently relying on Title I funding for low-income students, IDEA funding for special education, and other federal support programs could see major cuts to these resources.
- Federal funding accounts for approximately 8-10% of public school funding nationwide, but the impact of cuts would be more profound in lower-income districts, which rely more heavily on federal funding. Wealthier districts are better able to compensate with local property taxes, but poorer areas might struggle to replace lost funds, leading to larger class sizes, reduced programming, and fewer support services for students.

2. Shift to State and Local Funding

- The decentralization proposed in **Project 2025** would mean that states and local governments would be responsible for a larger share of school funding. This shift could exacerbate existing inequalities between states and districts, as wealthier states may be able to raise more revenue locally, while poorer states or districts may struggle to maintain adequate funding.
- For example, states with robust tax bases might continue to fund public schools adequately, but states with lower revenue sources, or those that are less willing to increase taxes, may face funding shortfalls. This could result in disparities in educational quality, as wealthier areas are better able to maintain and enhance their educational infrastructure and resources, while poorer areas might be forced to make cuts.

3. Impact on School Choice and Voucher Programs

- Project 2025 emphasizes the expansion of school choice, including the use of voucher programs that would allow public funds to follow students to private or charter schools. This redirection of funds can have a significant impact on traditional public schools, as funding is often allocated on a per-pupil basis. When students leave for private or charter schools, their public school district loses that portion of funding.
- Voucher programs may lead to decreased resources for public schools as funding is funneled to private institutions. This can reduce the budget available for remaining public school students, potentially impacting the quality of public education. Critics argue that these programs effectively subsidize private and charter schools at the expense of public schools, further challenging districts that are already financially strained.

4. Reduced Support for Programs like Title I and Special Education

- Title I provides federal funding to schools with high numbers of low-income students, supporting everything from additional teachers to after-school programs. *Project 2025* advocates for reducing or eliminating federal involvement in these programs, arguing that states should handle them independently. Without federal oversight, there could be less consistency in the funding and quality of these programs across states.
- Similarly, the Individuals with Disabilities Education Act (IDEA) mandates federal support for special education. Removing federal oversight could lead to uneven funding, with states differing in their willingness or ability to provide the necessary resources. For students with disabilities, this may mean fewer resources, specialized staff, and accommodations in public schools, potentially impacting their educational outcomes.

5. Implications for Public School Infrastructure and Resources

- Public schools frequently rely on federal grants for infrastructure improvements, technology upgrades, and resource enhancements. By eliminating or reducing these federal funding streams, schools may face greater challenges in maintaining or upgrading their facilities. Rural and urban schools, in particular, often rely on these funds to support aging facilities and provide updated learning tools and resources.
- This reduction in federal funding could force school districts to turn to local taxpayers to fund these improvements, which may not always be feasible. Consequently, schools in lower-income areas may struggle to maintain facilities, leading to poorer learning environments for students in these districts.

Overall Impact on Public School Funding

In summary, **Project 2025's** approach to reducing federal funding and oversight could lead to more localized control over education but could also exacerbate inequalities across school districts. Wealthier districts and states may be able to make up for lost federal funding with local revenue, while poorer areas, which rely heavily on federal support, may struggle to maintain adequate funding levels. This shift could lead to increased disparities in educational quality, resources, and opportunities between students in affluent and low-income areas. For many public schools, particularly in economically disadvantaged areas, the proposed changes could mean reductions in services, programming, and overall educational quality.

How does Project 2025 impact healthcare access?

Project 2025 proposes significant changes to healthcare access in the United States, focusing on reducing federal involvement, cutting spending, and shifting more responsibility to states and private entities. These changes could impact healthcare access in several ways, particularly for low-income individuals, the middle class, and those who rely on government-supported programs. Here's an overview of how these proposed reforms may affect healthcare access:

1. Medicaid and Medicare Changes

- Overview: Project 2025 suggests adding work requirements for Medicaid beneficiaries, imposing lifetime caps, and reducing the scope of Medicaid coverage. For Medicare, the project advocates for cost-reduction strategies, which may involve restructuring benefits and limiting federal spending on the program.

Impact:

- Medicaid: Work requirements and time limits could make it more difficult for low-income individuals to maintain Medicaid coverage. Those unable to meet the requirements, such as people with chronic health issues, caregivers, or those in areas with limited job opportunities, may lose access to healthcare. This could lead to an increase in uninsured individuals, especially in states that adopt stricter eligibility criteria.
- Medicare**: Reducing federal spending on Medicare could result in increased out-of-pocket costs for seniors and individuals with disabilities. Beneficiaries might face higher premiums or limited coverage options, which could make healthcare less affordable for middle- and low-income elderly individuals.

2. Reduction of ACA Provisions

- Overview: The project supports reducing or eliminating many provisions of the Affordable Care Act (ACA), including subsidies for low-income individuals purchasing insurance on the ACA marketplaces. It also seeks to roll back Medicaid expansion, which many states adopted under the ACA to cover more low-income adults.

Impact:

- Eliminating or reducing ACA subsidies would make health insurance less affordable for millions of Americans who rely on these subsidies to lower their monthly premiums. Low- and middle-income individuals who fall into the coverage gap (those who do not qualify for Medicaid but cannot afford private insurance) could lose access to healthcare entirely.
- The rollback of Medicaid expansion would particularly impact individuals in states that previously expanded Medicaid under the ACA. If states revert to pre-ACA eligibility requirements, many adults who gained coverage under the expansion could lose their insurance, increasing the uninsured rate and limiting access to preventive care and treatments for chronic conditions.

3. Emphasis on Private Healthcare Solutions

- Overview: **Project 2025** promotes private sector involvement in healthcare, arguing that competition will drive down costs and improve quality. The document suggests reducing federal intervention and allowing states to design their own healthcare programs.

Impact:

- Private healthcare solutions could increase options for those who can afford them, and potentially drive innovation. However, shifting more responsibility to the private sector may also lead to increased costs, as private healthcare is often more expensive than government-supported programs.
- For lower-income individuals, the reliance on private insurance without adequate federal support could make healthcare access more difficult. Without subsidies or sufficient safety nets, the cost of premiums, deductibles, and co-pays could become prohibitive, leading to delayed or avoided care.

4. Reforms to Public Health Programs

- Overview: The project suggests reducing or restructuring public health programs and services, which could affect programs like community health centers, maternal health initiatives, and mental health services that receive federal funding.

Impact:

- Reductions in public health funding would likely limit access to preventive services, vaccinations, and community-based health initiatives. For rural and underserved areas, this may mean fewer local clinics and health resources. Programs that provide critical services to vulnerable populations—such as maternal and child health services, mental health support, and addiction treatment—could be reduced, limiting healthcare access for those in greatest need.

5. Changes to Health Coverage for Vulnerable Populations

- Overview: Project 2025 includes proposals to restrict federal involvement in funding for reproductive health services, such as Planned Parenthood, and to eliminate or restrict coverage for services like contraception, abortion, and gender-affirming care.

Impact:

- These changes could restrict access to reproductive healthcare, particularly for low-income individuals who rely on federally funded clinics. Without access to affordable contraception and reproductive services, individuals may face increased health risks and financial burdens.

- Restrictions on gender-affirming care could limit access for transgender and non-binary individuals, who may face additional healthcare barriers if such services are removed from federally supported programs.

Overall Implications for Healthcare Access

Project 2025's emphasis on reducing federal involvement and shifting responsibility to states and private providers may lead to greater variability in healthcare access and quality across the country. States with more robust tax bases may be able to maintain healthcare programs, but states with limited resources or political resistance to expanding healthcare may see reduced access, especially for low-income and rural populations.

While some individuals may benefit from the project's focus on free-market solutions and deregulation, many could face increased out-of-pocket costs and reduced access to essential services. The most vulnerable populations, including low-income families, the elderly, and those with chronic health conditions, are likely to be most affected by these changes, as they rely more heavily on government-supported programs for healthcare access.

How does Project 2025 impact environmental regulations?

Project 2025 proposes substantial changes to environmental regulations, aiming to reduce federal oversight and increase energy production, particularly from fossil fuels. These changes are motivated by a belief that environmental regulations are overly restrictive, increase costs for businesses, and stifle economic growth. Here's a breakdown of how **Project 2025** would impact various aspects of environmental regulation and protection:

1. Deregulation of Fossil Fuels and Energy Production

- Overview: The project supports increased domestic energy production, particularly through fossil fuels like oil, natural gas, and coal. It calls for reducing or eliminating restrictions on drilling, mining, and other forms of fossil fuel extraction, arguing that this will lower energy costs, create jobs, and increase energy independence.

Impact:

- Short-Term: The deregulation of fossil fuels could reduce costs for energy producers, potentially lowering energy prices for consumers and stimulating job growth in the energy sector.
- Long-Term: Increased fossil fuel extraction may lead to higher greenhouse gas emissions and greater air and water pollution. This could negatively impact public health, particularly in communities near extraction sites. Additionally, it may set back efforts to combat climate change, making it harder for the U.S. to meet emissions reduction goals and transition to renewable energy sources.

2. Cutbacks on Climate Change Initiatives

- Overview: **Project 2025** advocates for reducing funding and regulatory focus on climate change initiatives within federal agencies. For instance, it suggests eliminating programs within agencies

like the Environmental Protection Agency (EPA) that monitor and mitigate climate change, such as the Office of Clean Energy Demonstrations and the Office of State and Community Energy Programs.

Impact:

- Reducing federal focus on climate change would likely result in fewer resources devoted to research, monitoring, and action on climate-related issues. This could hinder efforts to develop and deploy renewable energy technologies and limit the country's capacity to address climate-related threats, such as extreme weather events and rising sea levels.
- These cutbacks might shift responsibility to state and local governments, creating a patchwork approach to climate action that may be inconsistent and less effective than coordinated federal initiatives.

3. Weakening of the Environmental Protection Agency (EPA)

- Overview: Project 2025 calls for scaling back the EPA's regulatory authority and transferring more environmental oversight to the states. This could include limiting the EPA's ability to enforce air and water quality standards and reducing its role in monitoring environmental health.

Impact:

- Air and Water Quality: With reduced federal oversight, states would have more control over air and water quality standards. While some states may maintain or strengthen these standards, others might reduce enforcement to attract business investment. This could lead to increased pollution, especially in states that prioritize economic development over environmental protection.
- Public Health: Weakened EPA oversight could lead to poorer environmental health outcomes. Lower-income and marginalized communities, which are often located near industrial facilities, could experience higher exposure to pollutants, potentially increasing rates of respiratory illnesses, cardiovascular diseases, and other health issues related to environmental degradation.

4. Privatization and State Control of Environmental Functions

- Overview: The project proposes privatizing or transferring control of certain environmental functions from the federal government to states or private companies. This includes suggestions to privatize elements like the National Weather Service and the National Flood Insurance Program.

Impact:

- Risk of Inconsistent Standards: By shifting control to the states or private entities, there may be less consistency in how environmental protections are implemented across the country. Some states may lack the resources or political will to enforce strict environmental standards, potentially leading to increased environmental risks.
- Accountability and Public Access: Privatization may reduce public accountability, as private companies are not subject to the same transparency requirements as federal agencies. For

essential services like weather forecasting, this shift could limit public access to crucial information that helps communities prepare for and respond to environmental hazards.

5. Impacts on Renewable Energy and Clean Technology

- Overview: Project 2025 aims to reduce subsidies and federal support for renewable energy sources, such as wind and solar, and shift the focus away from renewable energy development. The project views government support for clean energy as a distortion of the market and argues for a more “energy neutral” policy stance.

Impact:

- Renewable Energy Industry: The removal of subsidies and incentives for clean energy could slow the growth of renewable energy industries, potentially leading to higher costs for solar, wind, and other renewables. This could make it harder for these industries to compete with fossil fuels, delaying the transition to a more sustainable energy grid.
- Environmental Goals: Reduced support for clean energy might make it more difficult for the U.S. to meet emissions reduction targets, impacting global efforts to mitigate climate change. It could also reduce innovation in clean technology sectors, which could otherwise help drive down costs and improve energy efficiency over time.

Overall Implications for Environmental Protection

- Project 2025 emphasizes economic growth and energy independence, often prioritizing these goals over environmental protections. While the proposed deregulation may benefit industries that would face fewer compliance costs, it raises concerns about potential negative impacts on public health, environmental quality, and climate resilience. The approach could lead to increased pollution and environmental degradation, particularly in areas already vulnerable to pollution. Additionally, it may slow down the adoption of renewable energy technologies, affecting long-term sustainability goals and the nation’s ability to address climate change effectively.

These changes would likely create a more variable and fragmented environmental regulatory landscape, with states taking on more responsibility and fewer federal protections ensuring nationwide standards. This shift could lead to uneven environmental outcomes across the country, with potentially significant consequences for both human health and the natural environment.

How does Project 2025 impact energy prices?

- Project 2025 could have a complex impact on energy prices due to its emphasis on deregulation, increased fossil fuel production, and reduced support for renewable energy. Here’s a breakdown of potential short- and long-term impacts on energy costs for consumers:

1. Increased Fossil Fuel Production

Overview: The project supports expanding domestic oil, natural gas, and coal production by rolling back environmental regulations and restrictions on extraction. It advocates for opening up federal lands for more drilling and simplifying the permitting process for fossil fuel infrastructure projects.

Impact on Energy Prices:

- Short-Term: Increased fossil fuel production could lower energy costs by boosting supply and reducing dependence on foreign energy sources. By increasing domestic energy availability, fuel prices, particularly for gasoline, natural gas, and coal-based electricity, could see a reduction, benefitting consumers and businesses alike.
- Long-Term: While greater fossil fuel availability might stabilize or lower prices in the short term, reliance on fossil fuels can lead to price volatility over time due to market fluctuations and geopolitical factors. Furthermore, as other countries increase their investment in renewables, the U.S. could face higher long-term costs if it remains tied to fossil fuel infrastructure that may become obsolete as global markets shift towards cleaner energy sources.

2. Reduced Environmental Regulations

Overview: By reducing environmental regulations, the project aims to decrease compliance costs for energy producers. These include rules related to emissions, waste disposal, and other environmental protections.

Impact on Energy Prices:

- Short-Term: With fewer regulatory hurdles, energy companies might face lower production costs, which could translate to lower prices for consumers. Reduced regulations on emissions or pollution controls can make energy production more efficient and less expensive in the short term.
- Long-Term: However, the environmental consequences of reduced regulation—such as increased pollution and associated health impacts—can lead to hidden costs for society. Rising healthcare costs and environmental cleanup expenses might indirectly impact energy prices in the future. Additionally, potential regulatory changes under future administrations could lead to inconsistent energy pricing as policies shift back and forth.

3. Reduced Investment in Renewable Energy

Overview: Project 2025 proposes cutting federal support for renewable energy projects, arguing that subsidies for wind, solar, and other renewables distort the market. Instead, it suggests an “all-of-the-above” energy approach that prioritizes energy sources based on economic competitiveness without government intervention.

Impact on Energy Prices:

- Short-Term: If renewable projects lose federal support, initial impacts might include increased costs for renewable energy infrastructure and decreased competitiveness with fossil fuels. This could lead to lower short-term renewable capacity, potentially increasing the market share of fossil fuels and temporarily reducing renewable energy’s impact on pricing.
- Long-Term: Over time, reduced investment in renewables could slow the development of cost-effective clean energy. This could make it more difficult for the U.S. to transition to renewables

as global energy markets shift toward sustainable sources, potentially resulting in higher costs for energy as fossil fuel prices fluctuate due to scarcity and rising extraction costs. Moreover, as renewable energy technology becomes increasingly cost-effective globally, countries that continue to subsidize renewables may experience lower, more stable energy prices compared to a U.S. market reliant on fossil fuels.

4. Market Volatility and Supply Chain Risks

- Overview: By increasing dependence on fossil fuels, Project 2025 may also increase exposure to global energy market fluctuations. Fossil fuel prices are often impacted by geopolitical events, supply chain disruptions, and changes in global demand.

Impact on Energy Prices:

- Short-Term: Increased domestic production can help buffer the U.S. from some international market disruptions. For instance, if the U.S. becomes more energy independent through fossil fuel production, it could be less affected by OPEC decisions or supply chain issues affecting imported energy.
- Long-Term: Fossil fuel reliance inherently ties energy prices to global markets, which are subject to volatility. Events like oil embargoes, natural disasters affecting production, or global political tensions could cause significant price spikes. Conversely, renewable energy, which depends on natural resources like wind and sunlight, tends to experience less price volatility once infrastructure is in place. A continued focus on fossil fuels might leave the U.S. more vulnerable to these price swings over time.

Overall Impact on Consumer Energy Costs

In summary, **Project 2025** could lead to lower energy prices in the short term by increasing fossil fuel production and reducing regulatory costs for energy companies. However, the focus on fossil fuels, reduced investment in renewable energy, and deregulation could also lead to price volatility and hidden long-term costs associated with environmental and health impacts. For consumers, this could mean potentially lower prices in the near future but increased vulnerability to price swings and higher costs in the long run if renewable energy infrastructure is not developed to meet future demand and sustainability goals.

How would Project 2025 impact agriculture?

Project 2025 could have a range of impacts on agriculture, primarily through its proposals to deregulate environmental protections, reduce federal agency oversight, and shift certain responsibilities to states. Here's a closer look at the potential effects:

1. Environmental Deregulation

- Pesticides and Chemical Use: By reducing EPA oversight, the project may relax regulations on pesticides, fertilizers, and other chemicals used in agriculture. This could allow for easier access to certain agricultural chemicals, potentially lowering costs for farmers.

- Pros: Lower regulatory barriers could reduce costs for farmers, particularly in crop production, where pesticide and fertilizer use is common. This could help improve crop yields and lower production expenses.
- Cons: Reduced regulation could lead to increased use of chemicals that may harm the environment, polluting waterways and impacting soil health over time. This could also lead to greater public health risks, particularly in rural areas close to farming operations, where chemical runoff might affect drinking water sources.

Water Usage and Conservation:

With fewer federal restrictions, states would have more control over water usage and conservation practices. This could lead to reduced oversight on water withdrawals, potentially benefiting areas with abundant water resources but straining areas already facing water scarcity.

- Impact: In areas prone to drought, reduced federal oversight might lead to overuse of water resources, affecting long-term agricultural sustainability. However, states that prioritize agriculture could potentially support more flexible water policies, benefiting farmers in those areas but potentially increasing competition for water resources with other local needs

2. Energy and Fuel Costs

- Fossil Fuel Production and Energy Costs: By supporting increased fossil fuel production, Project 2025 may help stabilize or lower energy and fuel costs, which are significant expenses for many agricultural operations.
- Impact: Lower energy costs could benefit farmers by reducing the costs of running machinery, transporting goods, and operating energy-intensive agricultural processes like irrigation. However, reliance on fossil fuels may increase long-term energy price volatility, which could ultimately affect farm operating costs if fuel prices rise due to market shifts or environmental regulations under future administrations.

3. Changes in Federal Subsidies and Agricultural Programs

- Farm Subsidies and Support Programs: While Project 2025 does not explicitly outline reductions in farm subsidies, its emphasis on reducing federal spending and shifting responsibilities to states could lead to changes in how federal agricultural programs are administered. For instance, crop insurance programs and disaster relief funds managed by the Department of Agriculture may be affected.
- Pros: If certain programs are maintained but streamlined, farmers might see reduced bureaucratic processes when applying for subsidies and relief funds. This could lead to faster and potentially more accessible support in certain states.
- Cons: A reduction in federal involvement might lead to less consistent support across states. Farmers in areas prone to extreme weather events or those with marginally profitable crops could face greater financial risks if federal safety nets are reduced. This might also affect conservation programs that support sustainable agricultural practices, as these could see funding cuts if they fall under reduced federal priorities.

4. Impact on Labor for Agriculture

- Immigration and Workforce Availability: *Project 2025* advocates for stricter immigration controls, which could reduce the number of immigrant workers available for agricultural labor.

Since agriculture relies heavily on seasonal and migrant labor, particularly for labor-intensive crops, these changes could have a direct impact on farm labor availability.

- Impact: Stricter immigration policies could lead to labor shortages in the agricultural sector, making it harder for farmers to find affordable labor, especially during peak seasons. This could increase labor costs, leading to higher production expenses and potentially impacting the availability and prices of certain crops. Farms that rely on immigrant labor may need to invest in more costly labor alternatives, such as mechanization, which could be challenging for small farms with limited capital.

5. State-Level Variability in Agricultural Support

- Shift to State Control: By reducing federal oversight and funding, Project 2025 would likely result in more agriculture-related policies being set at the state level. This could lead to variability in how agricultural practices are supported and regulated across the U.S.
- Pros: States with strong agricultural economies might prioritize support for farmers, providing localized subsidies, tax breaks, or other incentives that could boost regional agricultural production.
- Cons: This could lead to uneven support across states, with agricultural policies varying significantly depending on state budgets, priorities, and political landscapes. Farmers in states with limited budgets or less emphasis on agriculture may receive less support, potentially making it harder for them to compete with producers in more agriculturally focused states.

6. Effects on Sustainable and Organic Farming

- Reduced Support for Environmental Programs: Many sustainable and organic farmers rely on federal conservation programs and grants to implement practices that improve soil health, reduce chemical use, and protect water resources. With reduced federal funding and oversight, these programs might see cuts or be transferred to states with varied support levels for sustainability initiatives.
- Impact: Sustainable farmers may face higher costs if they lose access to federal support for conservation practices, organic certification programs, or sustainable farming grants. This could make it more challenging to adopt environmentally friendly practices, potentially increasing the costs of sustainable products and limiting the growth of organic agriculture.

Overall Impact on Agriculture

In summary, **Project 2025** could have mixed effects on the agriculture industry. Deregulation and lower energy costs might reduce some operational expenses for farmers, particularly those in conventional agriculture. However, increased variability in state-level support, potential labor shortages, reduced access to federal conservation and sustainability programs, and possible environmental consequences from deregulation could present challenges. The net impact would likely vary by state and the type of agriculture practiced, with larger, resource-intensive farms potentially benefiting more than smaller, sustainable, or labor-intensive operations.

How does Project 2025 affect rural communities?

Project 2025 could have several specific effects on rural communities due to its proposed changes in healthcare, education, energy policy, and economic regulations. Here's a closer look at how the project might impact rural areas:

1. Healthcare Access

- **Reduced Medicaid and ACA Support:** Many rural communities rely on Medicaid for healthcare, as rural areas often have higher rates of low-income individuals who qualify for this assistance. **Project 2025** suggests adding work requirements to Medicaid and potentially rolling back Medicaid expansion and ACA subsidies. This could limit healthcare access in rural areas where job opportunities may be limited, potentially leading to higher uninsured rates.
- **Impact on Rural Hospitals**:** Rural hospitals, which already operate on thin margins, may face increased financial pressures if Medicaid coverage decreases. Reduced funding could lead to cutbacks in services or even hospital closures, which would reduce healthcare access in remote areas.

2. Education and Public School Funding

- **Shifts to State and Local Control:** The project's focus on reducing federal involvement in education and eliminating the Department of Education would shift funding responsibilities to states. Rural schools, which often rely on federal funding to compensate for limited local tax revenue, could see decreased resources. This might result in larger class sizes, fewer extracurricular activities, and less access to advanced courses, particularly in low-income rural areas.
- **Impact of School Choice Policies:** With increased emphasis on school choice and voucher programs, some funds may be diverted from public schools to private or charter schools. This could negatively affect rural public schools, which often serve as community hubs, reducing funding available for already under-resourced schools and potentially impacting the quality of education available to rural students.

3. Energy Policy and Economic Development

- **Increased Fossil Fuel Production:** The project advocates for expanding fossil fuel production, which could create job opportunities in rural areas with natural resources like oil, gas, or coal. This could lead to short-term job growth in extraction industries, providing an economic boost to rural areas that host these activities.
- **Environmental Risks:** While increased fossil fuel production might create jobs, it could also lead to environmental risks, particularly in rural communities near extraction sites. Potential impacts include water contamination, air pollution, and habitat destruction, which could harm local agriculture, tourism, and public health. Additionally, a lack of investment in renewable energy might reduce future economic opportunities for rural areas seeking to diversify their economies with clean energy projects.

4. Infrastructure and Public Services

- **Privatization of Services:** The project proposes privatizing some public services and shifting control to states, which could impact infrastructure investment in rural areas. For instance, privatizing programs like the National Flood Insurance Program or parts of the National Weather Service could lead to inconsistent service availability or higher costs for rural residents.
- **Transportation and Broadband:** Rural areas often struggle with limited access to high-speed internet and public transportation. With less federal oversight, investments in rural broadband and infrastructure could depend more heavily on state priorities, which may not prioritize rural needs. Reduced federal funding could slow the expansion of broadband to underserved areas, limiting rural communities' access to telemedicine, online education, and remote work opportunities.

5. Economic and Small Business Impacts

- **Deregulation Benefits:** Reduced regulatory burdens on businesses could benefit small businesses in rural areas by lowering compliance costs, especially in agriculture, construction, and other resource-based industries. This might encourage entrepreneurship and small business growth by making it easier and cheaper to start and operate businesses.
- **Healthcare and Labor Market Challenges:** However, rural small businesses may struggle with increased difficulty in attracting and retaining employees if healthcare access becomes limited. Many rural small businesses are unable to offer comprehensive healthcare benefits, and reduced federal support for healthcare programs could increase the burden on employers to provide benefits, potentially hindering job growth.

Overall Impact on Rural Communities

In summary, **Project 2025** could lead to mixed outcomes for rural communities. While reduced regulations and increased fossil fuel production may create economic opportunities, the potential downsides include reduced access to healthcare, limited educational resources, environmental risks, and uneven access to public services. Rural areas that are already economically vulnerable may face greater challenges in maintaining essential services and adapting to changes in federal support. Conversely, states that prioritize rural development and have the resources to fill funding gaps could see positive outcomes if they leverage the proposed shifts in federal responsibility to benefit rural residents.

The ultimate impact on rural communities will depend on state-level responses and the specific industries present in each region. Some rural areas may benefit from increased resource-based economic activities, while others may struggle with reduced support for essential services.

How would Project 2025 impact job growth?

Project 2025 has the potential to impact job growth in several sectors through its emphasis on deregulation, increased fossil fuel production, reduced federal involvement in specific industries, and shifts toward privatization. Here's an overview of how job growth may be affected across different sectors:

1. Energy Sector Jobs

- Fossil Fuel Industry: **Project 2025** advocates for increased oil, gas, and coal production, which could stimulate job growth in these industries. By streamlining permitting processes, expanding drilling on federal lands, and rolling back environmental regulations, the project aims to make it easier for energy companies to operate. This could lead to the creation of jobs in extraction, refining, transportation, and related services.
- Renewable Energy: On the other hand, the project's reduced support for renewable energy development could slow job growth in solar, wind, and other clean energy sectors. As other countries and some states continue to invest in renewables, the U.S. might miss out on potential jobs in clean technology if federal support is reduced. This shift could limit the expansion of a rapidly growing sector that has created many skilled and technical jobs in recent years.

2. Manufacturing and Construction Jobs

- Pros: The project's focus on deregulation could benefit the manufacturing and construction sectors by lowering compliance costs and reducing delays caused by permitting processes. By simplifying regulations related to environmental protections, emissions standards, and labor requirements, **Project 2025** could create a more favorable environment for businesses in these sectors, potentially leading to increased job growth in construction, industrial manufacturing, and related industries.
- Cons: Reduced environmental and safety regulations may impact job quality and worker safety. While the project might lead to more job opportunities in construction and heavy industries, these jobs might come with fewer protections and could be more hazardous if regulations regarding workplace safety and environmental health are lessened.

3. Public Sector Jobs

- Federal Employment: The project proposes reducing the size of the federal government, including potentially dismantling or downsizing agencies like the Department of Education and the Environmental Protection Agency. This could result in significant job losses among federal employees, particularly in roles related to environmental protection, education, and regulatory enforcement.
- Privatization of Public Services: By transferring certain public services, like parts of the TSA and the National Weather Service, to private companies, the project could create jobs in the private sector. However, privatized jobs may offer lower wages and fewer benefits than their public-sector counterparts. Additionally, states and municipalities that are tasked with taking on federal responsibilities may have varying capacities to employ additional workers, leading to uneven job growth across regions.

4. Healthcare and Social Services Jobs

- Medicaid and Social Programs: The project's focus on reducing federal spending on healthcare programs like Medicaid and imposing stricter eligibility requirements may reduce job opportunities in healthcare and social services. Medicaid and related programs support many healthcare positions, especially in underserved areas. Reduced funding could lead to fewer healthcare jobs, particularly in rural and low-income regions that rely on government-supported healthcare programs.
- Privatization and State Control**: With a shift towards state-controlled and privatized healthcare, there may be growth in jobs within the private healthcare sector. However, these

jobs may be concentrated in states with robust economies and may not fully replace the loss of federally funded positions in states with fewer resources.

5. Education Sector Jobs

- **Public Education Jobs:** The project's proposal to reduce or eliminate the Department of Education could lead to fewer federally funded education jobs, particularly in administrative roles. Reduced federal funding for K-12 and higher education might lead to job cuts in public schools, particularly in districts that rely heavily on federal assistance.
- **Private and Charter Schools:** With an emphasis on school choice and voucher programs, the project may encourage growth in private and charter school employment. However, these jobs may not offer the same stability or benefits as public school positions, and the shift could exacerbate disparities in job quality between public and private educational institutions.

6. Environmental and Renewable Technology Jobs

- **Environmental Protection:** Reduced funding and authority for agencies like the EPA could lead to fewer jobs in environmental protection, monitoring, and conservation. Positions in environmental research, policy enforcement, and climate science might face cuts, especially those funded by federal programs.
- **Clean Technology:** While renewable energy sectors may be negatively impacted by reduced federal support, there is potential for growth in states and regions that prioritize green technology. However, without strong federal incentives, the U.S. may see slower job growth in clean technology compared to countries with more aggressive renewable energy policies.

Overall Impact on Job Growth

In summary, *Project 2025* may stimulate job growth in traditional energy sectors and potentially manufacturing and construction due to reduced regulations. However, it could lead to job losses in public sector roles, environmental protection, and federally funded healthcare and education positions. The shift toward privatization and state responsibility may lead to job growth in some private sectors, but these jobs may come with fewer benefits and protections than public-sector roles. Furthermore, the project's focus on fossil fuels and reduced renewable energy support might limit the U.S.'s competitive edge in clean technology jobs, which are growing globally as countries transition to more sustainable energy sources.

The net effect on job growth will likely vary by industry, region, and the extent to which states are able or willing to adopt the changes proposed in **Project 2025**.

How does Project 2025 affect small businesses?

Project 2025 could impact small businesses in several ways, primarily through proposed changes in tax policy, regulatory rollbacks, and shifts in federal spending priorities. Here's a look at how these changes might affect small business owners:

1. Tax Policy Adjustments

- **Simplified Tax System:** Project 2025 advocates for reducing the number of federal tax brackets and implementing a simplified two-rate tax system (15% and 30%). It also proposes lowering the corporate tax rate from 21% to 18%.
- **Pros:** Lower corporate tax rates and fewer tax brackets could mean reduced tax burdens for some small businesses, particularly those structured as corporations. Simplified tax policies might reduce compliance costs and make it easier for small businesses to understand their tax obligations.
- **Cons:** However, the project also recommends eliminating many deductions and credits, which could remove some of the tax breaks that benefit small businesses, such as deductions for business expenses or research and development. This could ultimately increase taxable income for some small businesses, depending on the specific deductions and credits eliminated.

2. Deregulation and Reduced Compliance Costs

- **Environmental and Labor Regulations:** Project 2025 emphasizes reducing federal regulations across various sectors, including environmental protections and labor laws. For small businesses, this could mean fewer compliance requirements related to things like emissions standards, reporting, and workplace safety.
- **Pros:** Reduced regulations may lower operational costs for small businesses, as they would spend less on compliance measures and associated administrative tasks. This could be especially beneficial for small businesses in industries like manufacturing, agriculture, and construction, which often bear the brunt of environmental and labor regulations.
- **Cons:** While reduced compliance costs can be advantageous, small businesses may also face increased risks if they operate in areas affected by deregulation. For example, businesses that rely on a healthy environment (e.g., tourism or agriculture) could be impacted by local pollution and environmental degradation if regulatory rollbacks lead to increased pollution.

3. Access to Healthcare for Small Business Employees

- **Changes to Medicaid and the Affordable Care Act (ACA):** The project suggests rolling back Medicaid expansion and reducing ACA subsidies. This would likely reduce healthcare access for small business employees who rely on these programs for affordable coverage.
- **Impact:** Small businesses often struggle to offer health benefits comparable to those of larger companies. If employees lose access to affordable healthcare options through Medicaid or ACA subsidies, small businesses may find it harder to attract and retain workers. They may also face pressure to offer more comprehensive health benefits, which could increase costs for employers who decide to step in to fill the gap.

4. Federal Spending Shifts and Contract Opportunities

- **Privatization of Public Services:** Project 2025 aims to shift some public services to the private sector, including components of the TSA and National Weather Service. This could open new contract opportunities for small businesses, especially those in service and technology sectors.
- **Pros:** Small businesses specializing in contracting, consulting, or technology may find new opportunities if public services are outsourced. Increased privatization could mean more openings for small businesses to work with government entities as service providers.
- **Cons:** However, competition for these contracts might favor larger firms with more resources and established government relationships. Additionally, with federal spending focused on

specific areas like defense and infrastructure, other areas that benefit small businesses directly—such as education grants or environmental projects—might see reduced funding, limiting indirect support for small businesses through government programs.

5. Impact on Renewable Energy and Green Technology Businesses

- **Reduced Support for Renewable Energy:** The project proposes cutting federal support and subsidies for renewable energy projects, which could impact small businesses in the green technology sector.
- **Pros:** Reduced federal support might lower barriers to entry for smaller energy companies that are less dependent on subsidies and encourage innovation driven by market forces.
- **Cons:** Small businesses in the renewable energy sector may struggle to compete without subsidies and federal incentives. This could make it harder for them to grow and expand, limiting job creation and innovation in a field that has been a significant driver of small business growth in recent years.

6. Shift Toward State and Local Control

- **State-Driven Regulations and Programs:** Project 2025 emphasizes reducing federal oversight and shifting control of certain policies to state and local governments. This means small businesses may have to navigate a patchwork of state-level regulations rather than a single set of federal standards.
- **Pros:** Businesses in states with favorable regulatory climates might benefit from less restrictive policies, which could make it easier to operate, expand, and innovate.
- **Cons:** Small businesses operating in multiple states may face challenges as they adapt to varied regulations across jurisdictions. Additionally, businesses in states with more stringent local policies might not see the benefits of federal deregulation. The inconsistency in regulations can complicate operations for small businesses that lack the resources to navigate different regulatory environments.

Overall Impact on Small Businesses

In summary, Project 2025 could create opportunities for small businesses by reducing tax and regulatory burdens and opening potential new markets through privatization. However, it also poses challenges, particularly in healthcare access, environmental impacts, and potential instability due to reduced federal support for specific industries. The net impact will likely depend on the industry, location, and business model, with certain sectors and regions benefiting more than others. Small businesses that can adapt to these changes might find new opportunities, while others, especially those dependent on federal programs or subsidies, may face more significant challenges.

Glossary

Here are some key terms from **Project 2025** broken down in alphabetical order with simplified explanations to help you understand the document's language and implications:

A

Affirmative Action: Policies that promote equal opportunity for underrepresented groups. *Project 2025* suggests ending these policies by prosecuting perceived "anti-white racism," aiming to remove race as a factor in employment or education decisions 【46+source】 【47+source】 .

B

Bureaucracy Reduction: The project emphasizes reducing the number of federal employees and simplifying government processes. This could mean quicker decision-making but might also reduce government support in various sectors 【46+source】 .

C

Capital Gains Tax: A tax on profits from the sale of assets like stocks or real estate. The project proposes lowering this tax to 15%, which would benefit wealthier individuals who make most of their income from investments rather than wages 【46+source】 .

Climate Change Programs: Programs aimed at researching or mitigating climate change. The project recommends reducing funding for these initiatives, potentially shifting focus away from renewable energy and environmental protections 【47+source】 .

Critical Race Theory (CRT): A framework examining the impact of systemic racism. The document proposes eliminating CRT and similar frameworks from federal programs and education systems, claiming it promotes divisive ideologies 【46+source】 .

D

Diversity, Equity, and Inclusion (DEI): Programs that promote fair treatment and representation. *Project 2025* advocates removing DEI initiatives from government institutions, stating they create divisions rather than unity 【47+source】 .

E

Executive Power: Refers to the authority of the President over the executive branch. The project suggests a "unitary executive theory," where the President has more direct control over federal agencies and personnel, potentially limiting checks and balances 【47+source】 .

F

Fossil Fuels: The project recommends increasing fossil fuel production by rolling back regulations. While this may lower energy costs, it could also lead to increased pollution and contribute to climate change 【46+source】 .

G

Green Subsidies: Financial support for renewable energy initiatives. *Project 2025* proposes eliminating many of these subsidies, arguing they are wasteful. This could make renewable energy projects less viable and reduce the nation's transition to cleaner energy 【47+source】 .

H

- ****Head Start Program**:** A program that provides early childhood education, health, and nutrition to low-income families. The project suggests cutting this program, which could limit access to preschool for children from low-income backgrounds 【47+source】 .

I

Immigration Policies: The project emphasizes stricter immigration enforcement, including limiting asylum, ending the DACA program, and reinstating the "Remain in Mexico" policy. These policies would reduce the number of immigrants eligible to live and work in the U.S. 【46+source】 .

J

- ****Judicial Appointments**:** Emphasizes the importance of appointing judges who support conservative interpretations of the Constitution, which may affect future rulings on social issues, environmental protections, and workers' rights 【46+source】 .

L

Limited Government: A principle advocating for reduced government intervention in personal and economic affairs. *Project 2025* supports this concept, intending to shift many responsibilities to state governments or the private sector 【46+source】 .

M

Medicaid: A healthcare program for low-income individuals. *Project 2025* proposes adding work requirements and potentially setting time limits, which could make it harder for low-income individuals to access healthcare over the long term 【46+source】 .

P

Privatization: Transferring government services to private companies. *Project 2025* includes proposals to privatize agencies such as the TSA and the National Weather Service, which may lead to cost savings but could also reduce public accountability 【46+source】 .

Public Assistance Programs: Government programs providing financial aid to low-income families, such as food stamps and housing assistance. The project aims to impose stricter eligibility and work requirements on these programs, potentially reducing access for those in need 【47+source】 .

R

Regulatory Rollbacks: Refers to the reduction or elimination of federal regulations. This is a key goal of **Project 2025**, aiming to cut rules that it deems burdensome, especially in sectors like energy, labor, and finance 【46+source】 .

S

Safety Nets: Government programs like food stamps, housing assistance, and unemployment benefits. The document suggests tightening eligibility requirements for these programs, aiming to reduce long-term reliance but potentially affecting support for vulnerable populations 【47+source】 .

T

Tax Reform: *Project 2025* proposes changes to the tax code, including reducing income tax brackets and cutting corporate tax rates. These changes could lower taxes for some individuals and businesses, but might also reduce government revenue, potentially affecting public services 【46+source】 .

Title IX: A federal law that prohibits sex discrimination in education. The project recommends reversing recent expansions to Title IX that include protections based on gender identity and sexual orientation, potentially impacting LGBTQ+ protections in schools and universities 【46+source】 .

U

Unitary Executive Theory: A concept in which the President has full control over the executive branch, without interference from other branches of government. This theory, promoted by *Project 2025*, would centralize power, reducing independence among federal agencies 【47+source】 .

Understanding these terms will help you grasp how the policies outlined in **Project 2025** might reshape various aspects of federal governance, with a focus on reducing federal oversight, cutting social safety nets, and increasing executive power. These changes could have significant effects on middle and working-class Americans, particularly in areas like healthcare access, environmental protections, and social services.

Reference Guide

Here's a reference guide summarizing sources and points related to Project 2025. This guide highlights key aspects, impacts, and potential consequences of the project as discussed:

General Overview and Goals of Project 2025

- Project 2025 is developed by the Heritage Foundation and focuses on reshaping federal agencies, reducing government size, and shifting power to states and the private sector. Its aims include increased domestic energy production, streamlined regulations, and reduced federal oversight [【6†source】](#) [【46†source】](#) [【47†source】](#) .

Key Areas of Impact

1. Tax Policy Changes

- **Project 2025:** advocates for simplified tax brackets and lower corporate taxes. The aim is to stimulate economic growth and reduce the tax burden on corporations, but this could potentially reduce government revenue and affect social programs.

Sources: FactCheck.org overview on Project 2025's tax changes

2. Deregulation and Compliance Costs

- By cutting back on regulations related to environmental protection, labor standards, and business operations, the project hopes to reduce costs for businesses. This approach could benefit sectors like manufacturing and construction, where regulatory compliance can be costly.

Sources: Heritage Foundation's stated goals on environmental regulation reductions

3. Healthcare and Social Services

- The project suggests adding work requirements to Medicaid, reducing federal involvement in healthcare, and cutting back on ACA subsidies. These changes could limit access to healthcare for low-income individuals and impact small businesses that rely on Medicaid for employee health coverage.

Sources: Project 2025 information on healthcare impacts.

4. Environmental Regulations and Climate Initiatives

- A core component is reducing the EPA's authority and cutting funding for climate change initiatives, which could lead to lower energy costs in the short term but potentially higher long-term costs due to environmental degradation.

Sources: Details on the EPA and renewable energy adjustments as discussed by Project 2025

5. Energy Production and Pricing

- By supporting fossil fuel production and reducing renewable energy subsidies, the project aims to stabilize energy prices. However, reliance on fossil fuels could lead to price volatility and health-related costs associated with pollution.

Sources: Heritage Foundation on energy independence and deregulation impacts

6. Public Sector Jobs and Privatization

- Proposals to privatize certain federal functions could lead to job growth in private sectors but reduce public sector positions, impacting federal employees and areas that rely on federal jobs.

Sources: FactCheck.org

7. Education and Public School Funding

- The project's potential elimination of the Department of Education and shifts to state and local funding could reduce resources for low-income schools and increase disparities in educational quality.

Sources: Breakdown of Project 2025's approach to education funding

8. Small Business Impacts

Small businesses might benefit from reduced regulatory and tax burdens but could face challenges with reduced access to affordable healthcare options and environmental impacts from deregulation.

Sources: Project 2025 summary on the implications for small businesses

Useful References:

1. [FactCheck.org – A Guide to Project 2025](<https://www.factcheck.org>) 【46+source】 .
2. [Project 2025 Overview from Wikipedia](https://en.wikipedia.org/wiki/Project_2025) 【47+source】 .
3. [Heritage Foundation on Project 2025](<https://www.heritage.org/project2025>) 【6+source】 .

This guide provides a general framework based on **Project 2025's** goals and strategies as outlined by the Heritage Foundation and analyzed by multiple sources. For a deeper dive into specific policies and detailed analysis, these references offer a comprehensive understanding of the project's potential impacts on various sectors of society.