

# Top 10 Risks in the "One Big Beautiful Bill Act" (H.R.1) and Their Implications

## 1. Medicaid Work Requirements Leading to Coverage Loss

The bill mandates 80 hours/month of "community engagement" for Medicaid recipients aged 19–64, with inadequate exemptions for caregivers and disabled individuals<sup>[1] [2]</sup>. While exemptions exist, the verification process burdens beneficiaries, risking coverage loss for 5.5–6.3 million people<sup>[1]</sup>. For example, undocumented immigrants face tightened proof-of-status requirements, potentially losing Medicaid even if eligible<sup>[3]</sup>. This violates due process by using vague "able-bodied" definitions without clear exemptions for caregiving or transportation barriers<sup>[1] [2]</sup>.

## 2. 5% Excise Tax on International Remittances

Section 112105 imposes a 5% tax on remittances sent from the U.S., disproportionately affecting immigrant communities<sup>[3] [4]</sup>. The tax directly targets low-income families relying on remittances to support relatives abroad, exacerbating financial strain. While U.S. citizens can claim exemptions, undocumented individuals lack this recourse, pushing them toward irregular financial channels<sup>[3]</sup>. This provision risks deepening poverty in immigrant households and violates equal protection principles by creating unequal financial burdens<sup>[3] [5]</sup>.

## 3. Restrictions on SNAP and Safety Net Programs

The bill shifts 75% of SNAP administrative costs to states and counties, forcing localities like Minnesota's Chippewa County to absorb \$310,000 annually<sup>[6]</sup>. Concurrently, it restricts work exemptions, limiting food assistance access for vulnerable populations. Reduced retroactive Medicaid/CHIP coverage from 90 to 30 days further strains families facing sudden income loss<sup>[2]</sup>. These changes contradict decades of federal-state partnership in safety net administration, risking service cuts for millions<sup>[6] [2]</sup>.

## 4. Preemption of State AI Regulations

Section 43201 prohibits states from regulating AI systems for 10 years, stifling local oversight of ethical AI use<sup>[7] [8]</sup>. By centralizing authority at the federal level, the bill prevents states from addressing AI biases, privacy violations, or algorithmic discrimination. For example, retroactive liability for AI developers (Title XIV) could shield corporations from accountability for harmful systems<sup>[7]</sup>. This undermines federalism and risks unchecked AI deployment in sensitive areas like healthcare and criminal justice<sup>[8] [4]</sup>.

## 5. Constitutional Violations (Nondelegation Doctrine)

The bill grants excessive authority to agencies like HHS to adjust SNAP eligibility without clear congressional guidelines, violating the nondelegation doctrine<sup>[9]</sup> <sup>[10]</sup>. Similar provisions in Title I-B (energy restrictions) conflict with *West Virginia v. EPA* (2022), which limits agency overreach<sup>[11]</sup>. By allowing the executive branch to define critical terms like "community engagement," the bill risks judicial invalidation for unconstitutional delegation<sup>[9]</sup> <sup>[12]</sup>.

## 6. Undermining Judicial Oversight

Section 70302 bars courts from enforcing injunctions unless plaintiffs post bonds, effectively allowing the executive to ignore rulings during appeals<sup>[11]</sup>. This weakens checks on presidential power, as seen in provisions delaying consequences for defying court orders. Legal experts warn this erodes the rule of law, enabling authoritarian governance patterns by neutralizing judicial accountability<sup>[11]</sup> <sup>[5]</sup>.

## 7. Increased Immigration Enforcement and Fees

The bill allocates \$100 million to repatriate unaccompanied minors and funds ICE's "Transportation and Removal Operations," accelerating deportations<sup>[5]</sup>. New visa fees (Sections 70008, 70015) and a \$2,500 Form I-94 fee increase costs for lawful immigration, pushing applicants toward irregular methods<sup>[3]</sup> <sup>[5]</sup>. Combined with stricter "public charge" interpretations, these measures marginalize immigrant communities and violate due process rights<sup>[3]</sup> <sup>[5]</sup>.

## 8. Reduced Healthcare Access for Marginalized Groups

Medicaid bans on gender-affirming care (Title I-A) and \$35 copays for low-income enrollees restrict access to essential services<sup>[2]</sup>. Reduced retroactive coverage disproportionately harms patients with sudden illnesses, while work requirements deter eligible individuals from enrolling<sup>[1]</sup> <sup>[2]</sup>. These changes contradict Medicaid's purpose of serving vulnerable populations, violating equal protection principles<sup>[2]</sup>.

## 9. Financial Burden on Local Governments

Shifting SNAP administrative costs to counties forces jurisdictions like Stearns County, MN, to cut services for 6,000 residents<sup>[6]</sup>. North Carolina counties face a 23% compliance cost increase for agricultural exporters, straining budgets<sup>[6]</sup> <sup>[12]</sup>. These unfunded mandates risk collapsing local safety nets, particularly in rural areas with limited tax bases<sup>[6]</sup>.

## 10. Broad "Public Charge" Definitions

While not explicitly defined, the bill's emphasis on "applicability of immigration laws" (Section 70001) hints at stricter "public charge" rules<sup>[3] [5]</sup>. This could deny green cards or visas to immigrants using public services like Medicaid, exacerbating poverty and deterring legal status applications. Such policies disproportionately harm low-income families and contradict America's historical commitment to immigrant integration<sup>[3] [5]</sup>.

## Conclusion

The "One Big Beautiful Bill Act" poses systemic risks to individual rights, corporate accountability, and constitutional governance. From eroding healthcare access to centralizing AI oversight, its provisions prioritize fiscal austerity and executive power over equitable policy. Legislative amendments are critical to address these risks, particularly in safeguarding judicial oversight, state autonomy, and vulnerable populations<sup>[11] [5] [12]</sup>.

✱

1. <https://news.bloomberglaw.com/health-law-and-business/medicaid-work-requirement-risks-tripping-up-caregivers-disabled>
2. <https://www.bhfs.com/insights/alerts-articles/2025/summary-of-health-care-provisions-in-the-one-big-beautiful-bill-act->
3. [https://lulac.org/impact\\_of\\_hr\\_1\\_one\\_big\\_beautiful\\_bill\\_act\\_on\\_immigrants\\_and\\_children\\_of\\_immigrants\\_who\\_are\\_us\\_citizens/](https://lulac.org/impact_of_hr_1_one_big_beautiful_bill_act_on_immigrants_and_children_of_immigrants_who_are_us_citizens/)
4. <https://www.congress.gov/bill/119th-congress/house-bill/1/text>
5. <https://immigrationforum.org/article/one-big-beautiful-bill-act-immigration-provisions/>
6. <https://www.naco.org/resource/federal-reforms-social-safety-net-programs-what-counties-should-know>
7. <https://www.congress.gov/bill/119th-congress/house-bill/1>
8. [https://www.linkedin.com/posts/oscarwijsman\\_the-us-congress-passed-hr1-one-big-beautiful-activity-7331748422892347393-udIU](https://www.linkedin.com/posts/oscarwijsman_the-us-congress-passed-hr1-one-big-beautiful-activity-7331748422892347393-udIU)
9. <https://reason.com/volokh/2025/05/31/checking-a-presidential-bully/>
10. <https://www.nrtc.coop/supreme-court-will-hear-universal-service-case-on-march-26/>
11. <https://robertjohnsen.com/fact-checking-claims-about-h-r-1-one-big-beautiful-bill-act-may-2025/>
12. <https://www.crfb.org/blogs/breaking-down-one-big-beautiful-bill>