

BGR STATE POLICY BRIEF

The Top 5 State Impacts from President Trump's First 100 Days

By Loren Monroe and William Crozer

April 30 marks President Trump's First 100 Days in office. Starting with the President's Day One Executive Orders, the monumental policy shift in the state-federal landscape is only just beginning. As the Trump Administration moves to return power to the states, Americans will watch their governors and legislators handle new challenges and seize new opportunities—likely deepening the Red vs. Blue State divide. Out of the gate, state Democratic leaders put immediate pressure on President Trump, even taking measures to “Trump proof” their states and bringing a laundry list of lawsuits to halt and delay his historic run of executive actions. On the other side of the aisle, Republicans are pushing much of Trump's agenda at the state level across a number of policy areas and promising to codify it in Congress.

This update identifies the Top 5 impacts to states from President Trump's First 100 days, setting the stage for the biggest issues to play out in the coming months across #1 Healthcare; #2 Education; #3 Infrastructure; #4 Technology and A.I.; and #5 Energy.

#1 HEALTHCARE

Following years of robust revenue growth, states are now facing weakening tax revenues, budget shortfalls, the end of COVID relief funds, and uncertainty in their long-term fiscal outlook. As a result, many are confronting difficult budget decisions. Medicaid, which comprises a large portion of most state budgets, is often central to these fiscal choices.

At the federal level, several options are under consideration in Congress to significantly reduce Medicaid spending in order to offset the cost of extending the Tax Cuts and Jobs Act (TCJA). The recently passed House budget resolution proposes up to \$880 billion in Medicaid cuts over the next decade. While Congress has yet to advance detailed proposals to achieve those reductions, any cut to federal Medicaid funding would leave states with tough choices: raise taxes, reduce other services such as education, or cut Medicaid itself. If states are unable to offset these reductions, cuts to Medicaid programs are likely.

One cost-saving strategy being explored is the implementation of Medicaid work requirements, which require federal waivers. Multiple states are pursuing waivers this year—Arizona, Arkansas, Idaho, Kentucky, Montana, Ohio, South Carolina, and South Dakota—with legislative authorization pending in Indiana, Iowa, Missouri, New Hampshire, and North Carolina. During the first Trump Administration, 13 states received approval for work requirement waivers; these were rescinded under President Biden.

With every state in session this year—and 46 states required to pass budgets before July 1—there's a possibility some may need to return for special sessions this fall or dip into reserves to address gaps resulting from potential federal Medicaid cuts. So far, Kansas, New Mexico, South Dakota, and West Virginia have completed their budgets.

Bracing for potential Medicaid Funding Cuts—*Bipartisan impact:*

With approximately one-third of state budgets federally funded, lawmakers across the nation warn of dire consequences if Congress makes drastic spending cuts. Depending on the state, the federal government pays for 50-90% of Medicaid programs, and on average, Medicaid accounts for 30% of state budgets—second only to education for state dollars, dropping to 19%. Since every state is in session this year (with many having or soon to reach their conclusion) and 46 states must pass budgets before their July 1 fiscal year, it is extremely likely that states would have to return for special session this fall—or dip into reserves—to fill the gap of potential large-scale federal cuts enacted by Congress later this year, specifically to Medicaid or other health programs. While President Trump repeatedly said he will not cut Social Security, Medicare, or Medicaid benefits, Congressional Republicans vowed to cut \$1.5 trillion in federal spending to pay for the Trump tax cut renewals. This year, 47 states will enact a new budget for FY26; 31 states will approve a one-year budget, and 16 states will enact a two-year budget for FY26-27. So far this year, budgets have been completed in KS, NM, SD, and WV.

Seeking Waivers for Medicaid Work Requirements—*Red State support:*

The first Trump Administration approved 13 states' Section 1115 Medicaid work requirement waivers, which were rescinded by Biden—leaving only Georgia with an operational waiver after surviving litigation. Arkansas implemented its waiver before Biden's rescission. Multiple states are in the process of pursuing waivers this year: AZ, AR, ID, KY, MT, OH, SC, and SD with legislative authorization pending in IN, IA, MO, NH, and NC. Republicans view work requirements as a way to enforce individual accountability as well as reduce Medicaid costs; Congressional Republicans are reportedly considering legislation to impose a minimum work requirement for certain Medicaid enrollees as a condition of coverage. Among other arguments, Republicans maintain Medicaid work requirements would bring much needed reforms to the system, boost productivity, and reduce overall federal Medicaid spending.

Preparing for potential Behavioral and Public Health Funding Cuts—*Bipartisan impact:*

This month, President Trump's HHS proposed a sweeping 30% cut to eliminate dozens of programs and consolidate health agencies in addition to clawing back COVID-era grant funding. Depending on current negotiations, states may have to prepare for the fallout of federal funding and the impacts on service provision. At the community level, nonprofit and public grant recipients are already raising the alarm of having to close their doors or end their services if HHS slashes its budget. Programs reportedly at risk include drug abuse and mental health, chronic disease, autism, HIV/AIDS prevention, aging, food inspections, and more. In response, NY Governor Hochul estimated the rural areas of her state would lose \$300 million, and OH Governor DeWine shared that he would have to "await firm details before commenting" on the cuts.

MAKE AMERICA HEALTH AGAIN (MAHA)

From cancer warning labels to soda taxes, progressive states like California and New York have long led the way on legislation aimed at improving public health. Now, the Make America Healthy Again (MAHA) movement is gaining traction in more conservative states such as Arkansas, Texas, Florida, Oklahoma, and Utah, where lawmakers are introducing bills targeting chronic disease and other health concerns.

Eliminating Soda and Candy from SNAP—*Red State support:*

On February 13, President Trump issued an executive order creating the Make America Healthy Again Commission, directing federal health agencies to focus on reversing chronic disease—especially in children. The order includes a mandate to develop a "Make Our Children Healthy Again" strategy. With HHS Secretary Robert F. Kennedy Jr. (RFK) playing an increasingly prominent role, nutrition has taken center stage in health policy across the states. Red-state governors in Arkansas, Idaho, Indiana, and West Virginia have formally requested permission from the Trump Administration to eliminate soda and candy

from the Supplemental Nutrition Assistance Program (SNAP). Meanwhile, Republican legislators in Arizona, Kansas, Kentucky, Tennessee, Utah, and Wyoming have introduced similar proposals.

Banning Food Dyes and Preservatives—*Bipartisan support:*

Although Biden’s FDA banned red dye 3 in January 2025, RFK told Congressional lawmakers that he wants all artificial dyes removed from food products before he leaves office. Thanks to the momentum of the MAHA movement, Red States now have the political license to act where Blue States first led. Progressive states, like California and New York, first regulated ingredient labeling and ultra-processed in recent years—recall the CA “Skittle ban”. This spring, the TX and WV Governors signed bills banning the use of specific artificial dyes, e.g. red dye 3, and preservatives in school meals or other food sold in the state. Altogether, 11 states ban red dye 3, among other substances: IL, MD, MO, NJ, NY, PA, RI, SD, WA, and WV.

NOTE on banning Fluoride from Drinking Water: Although RFK is a vocal proponent for eliminating fluoride from drinking water, the Trump Administration have yet to act; Utah became the first state to enact a fluoride ban in March.

#2 EDUCATION

Unwinding the Department of Education—*Red State support vs. Blue State opposition:*

On March 20, President Trump issued an executive order designed to return power over education to the states by closing the Department of Education while making assurances that the federal government would continue the effective and uninterrupted delivery of services, programs, and benefits—specifically noting Pell Grants and Title I funding for students with disabilities and special needs. To note, Congress must ultimately pass legislation to eliminate the Department, and Republican Senators filed a bill. Naturally, Blue State leaders and lawmakers opposed and Red State leaders supported. In fact, 10 Republican governors attended Trump’s signing ceremony: FL, ID, IN, IA, LA, NE, OH, TN, TX, and VA.

Banning DEI in Schools—*Red State support vs. Blue State opposition:*

On April 3, President Trump’s Department of Education sent a Reminder and Request directive to schools to comply with Title VI non-discrimination policies, defining DEI as racially discriminatory, in order to receive federal funding. Because schools already certified Title VI compliance for the 2024-25 school year, the recertification request is a novel move garnering significant pushback from Democratic leaders. In fact, several Blue States sent letters asserting that the federal government had no authority to force schools to recertify: IL, MN, NY, OR, and WI. Meanwhile, Red States began either certifying compliance on behalf of every school: MO, MT, and VT; or directing schools to individually certify: NH and ID.

Regulating Sex and Gender in School Sports—*Red State support vs. Blue State opposition:*

On February 5, President Trump issued an executive order directing the Department of Justice to take legal action against states that do not protect sports on the basis of sex. Since then, Trump’s DOJ sued Maine, citing recent track and field and cross country meets, and threatened action against California and Minnesota among a list of other unnamed states. To date, 30 states—primarily Republican—enacted laws to protect sports on the basis of sex.

Requesting Block Grant Funding—*Red State support vs. Blue State opposition:*

On March 20, President Trump announced the closure of the Department of Education. Following, Republican Governors spoke out to advocate the benefits for block funding, asking President Trump to cut strings to federal education dollars: FL, IA, OK, and TN. Although most education funding is state and locally generated, the federal government provides approximately 13% of education funding nationally but varies state-to-state, such as 23% in Mississippi and 7% in New York. On the other side of the aisle, Democratic leaders argue that block grants remove accountability, lower quality, and disadvantage students most in need. It is not yet known what position Trump's Department of Education will take—however, Secretary Linda McMahon committed that federal aid for students with disabilities would not be consolidated with Title I money. During the first Trump Administration, then Education Secretary Betsy DeVos proposed a block grant that met bipartisan pushback.

Ending \$1 Billion in COVID-era Funding for Schools—*Blue State opposition:*

On March 28, President Trump's Department of Education notified states that extensions of time to spend COVID-era funds would be rescinded, pulling back hundreds of millions in grant funding previously authorized to states. A slew of Blue States joined suit to block the revocation of funds: AZ, CA, DE, HI, IL, ME, MA, MD, MI, MN, NJ, NM, NY, NV, OR, and PA as well as DC.

#3 INFRASTRUCTURE

Freezing IJJA and IRA Funding to States—*Blue State opposition:*

On his first day in office, President Trump froze all spending under the Infrastructure Investment and Jobs Act (IJJA) and the Inflation Reduction Act (IRA), which a federal judge overruled this month. Although yet to rule on the merits, the judge ordered federal agencies to resume Congressionally authorized disbursements to states and local governments: Departments of Energy, Agriculture, Interior, Housing and Urban Development, and the Environmental Protection Agency. President Trump's freeze was vehemently opposed by Blue States with 23 Democratic Attorneys General filing suit: AZ, CA, CO, CT, DE, DC, HI, IL, ME, MD, MA, MI, MN, NV, NJ, NM, NY, NC, OR, RI, VT, WA, and WI. On the other side of the aisle, most Republican Governors stayed silent on the Trump spending freeze and praised the federal government reviewing spending.

Navigating Changes to FEMA and Disaster Recovery—*Blue State opposition:*

On January 24, President Trump signed an executive order to assess and potentially abolish the Federal Emergency Management Agency (FEMA) following concerns that arose from FEMA's 2024 Hurricane Helene response. Later, on March 18, President Trump issued an executive order to empower states to more effectively prepare for cyberattacks and weather events. Disaster response has long been locally executed, state managed, and federally supported, so it is unknown whether the Trump Administration will phase out FEMA entirely, offer disaster block grants to states, or undertake other changes. Democratic leaders and lawmakers have strongly opposed abolishing FEMA. Most Republicans have been silent, though FL Governor DeSantis said that his state could handle disaster response without federal funding but would rather have block grants without the impediment of federal bureaucracy. Some states, like Louisiana, are pursuing their own reforms; there, Governor Landry moved the state's emergency preparedness office under the LA National Guard citing cost savings and other justifications. *Note that state models for emergency management vary widely: 16 states fall under the National Guard or military affairs; 13 states fall under public safety; 10 states are combined with homeland security; 9 states fall under the Governor's Office; and 3 states have other structures.*

Awaiting Changes to BEAD and Broadband Deployment Funding—*Bipartisan impact:*

On March 5, Trump Commerce Secretary Howard Lutnick launched a review of the \$42.45 billion Broadband Equity, Access, and Deployment (BEAD) program, part of the 2021 IJJA, and announced policy

changes to roll back the Biden Administration’s “woke mandates, favoritism toward certain technologies [fiber optic cable], and burdensome regulations,” claiming that BEAD has not connected even one single person to the internet. By cutting red tape on infrastructure construction and taking a tech-neutral approach [low-earth orbit satellite service providers, e.g. Starlink], proponents argue that states should be able to provide internet access for the lowest cost without delays and waste. In response, a bipartisan group of 115 legislators from 28 states expressed concerns about the proposed changes and asked that tech choices be optional, not mandatory. As the first state to receive BEAD funding, LA Governor Landry penned a letter asking to ditch the fiber preference and reclassify satellite and unlicensed fixed wireless as reliable broadband services—in line with positions of at least 13 Republican Senators when IIJA passed. Even Blue States, Maine and New Mexico, pushed for satellite terminals in rural areas where fiber connections would have been too costly. What’s more, Texas kicked off a \$30 million round of state-funded grants for satellite providers, strengthening a shift in broadband infrastructure development.

Rolling back Housing First and reforming Homelessness Policy—*Blue State opposition:*

On March 14, President Trump issued an executive order to reduce federal bureaucracy, which explicitly eliminated the U.S. Interagency Council on Homelessness, a \$4 million and 20-employee agency to coordinate federal homelessness response. In tandem, HUD Secretary Scott Turner outlined spending cuts and programmatic reviews under a DOGE Task Force, taking steps to fulfill President Trump’s campaign promises to end street camping. As part of President Trump’s spending freeze, HUD is sitting on a \$3.6 billion spending package for continuums of care, impacting more than 7,000 programs and nonprofit providers. In anticipation of grant delays or federal cuts, the Los Angeles Housing Authority stopped accepting new applications Section 8, which they claim will exacerbate homelessness. Note that the first Trump Administration attempted policy changes away from permanent housing toward mental treatment but were rebuffed. While Democrats oppose changes to HUD and Housing First policies, Republicans largely welcome various reforms.

#4 TECHNOLOGY & A.I.

Steering State Investments through changing EV Policy—*Bipartisan impact:*

On his first day in office, President Trump revoked a 2021 Biden-era executive order that set electric vehicle (EV) targets, mandates, and incentives. Industry analysts expect further federal actions, including ending EV tax credits and loosening emissions rules that previously encouraged EV production. This shift has raised concerns across the EV and battery manufacturing sector, especially in states with major investments in the industry. Georgia serves as a key example: the state has invested \$27 billion in EV manufacturing since 2018. While Governor Brian Kemp supports removing federal incentives that he views as market distortions, he also views EV and battery manufacturing as a national security imperative. Still, early signs of impact are emerging. According to Atlas Public Policy, more EV-related projects were canceled in Q1 of 2025 than in the previous two years combined. These include a \$1 billion thermal barrier factory and an EV component facility in Georgia, a \$1.2 billion lithium-ion battery factory in Arizona, and a transmission cable factory in Massachusetts. Total project cancellations in early 2025 reached \$8 billion, significantly up from \$1.6 billion in all of 2024.

Continuing a Patchwork of State Policy on A.I.—*Bipartisan impact:*

On January 23, President Trump issued an executive order promoting American leadership in AI, revoking a 2023 Biden directive that Trump deemed too restrictive. His administration is advancing a detailed action plan to enhance U.S. competitiveness in the AI space. In 2025 alone, at least 45 states and Puerto Rico have introduced more than 550 AI-related bills. Eight states have introduced comprehensive AI regulations, particularly targeting high-risk systems and algorithmic discrimination. In Virginia, a Democrat-led legislature passed the High-Risk AI Developer and Deployer Act, only to see it vetoed by the Republican

governor over concerns about burdensome regulations on small businesses. Texas, meanwhile, proposed the Texas Responsible Artificial Intelligence Governance Act—similar to other anti-discrimination frameworks but also including a regulatory sandbox for AI testing and workforce investment incentives. At least 19 states have proposed legislation to regulate algorithm-driven rental pricing. Other states are forming or enhancing AI task forces to examine issues ranging from cybersecurity to job impacts. Alabama’s Generative AI Task Force recently released a comprehensive framework for AI use in state agencies. Similar efforts are underway in Alaska, Illinois, Mississippi, and West Virginia.

Handling High Energy Demands for Data Centers—*Bipartisan impact:*

On January 20, President Trump declared a national energy emergency, allowing fast-tracked approval of new power plants co-located with AI infrastructure. He simultaneously announced the “Stargate Project,” which includes construction of 20 new data centers—starting in Texas—as part of a strategic effort to compete with China on AI development. For years, states have wooed data centers with tax incentives and infrastructure support, viewing them as high-tech economic drivers. But the recent surge in AI-powered development is creating unprecedented demand for land, electricity, and water—raising alarms among community leaders, utility operators, and environmental advocates concerned about inflation and rising utility bills. In response to rising energy demands and a desire to diversify resources, TN Governor Lee successfully pushed for the creation of a Small Modular Reactor (SMR) Grant Fund to grow the state’s “nuclear energy ecosystem,” and Louisiana, Texas, and Utah joined a lawsuit seeking to overturn a federal licensing requirement (utilization facility rule) they argue stymie advanced energy solutions like SMRs. Co-location proposals using nuclear or renewable energy offer promise but face significant legal and permitting challenges. Meanwhile, right-of-first-refusal laws are igniting debates over utility monopolies, cost burdens, and climate goals.

Taking the Lead on Cybersecurity—*Bipartisan impact:*

On March 19, President Trump signed an executive order shifting more cybersecurity responsibilities to state and local governments, citing the need to modernize local infrastructure in the face of cybercrime at a time amid shrinking federal support. The State and Local Cybersecurity Grant Program, created under the 2021 IJA, awarded \$279 million to jurisdictions in FY24. An additional \$18 million went to tribes via the new Tribal Cybersecurity Grant Program, but with the program set to expire in September and no congressional renewal in sight, states may soon face resource shortfalls. Meanwhile, federal staffing reductions at the Department of Education and the Cybersecurity and Infrastructure Security Agency (CISA) may weaken K–12 schools’ ability to respond to cyberattacks. In response, states are taking the lead—several are centralizing IT functions, updating cybersecurity laws, and creating or reshuffling offices to manage threats. For example, Arkansas recently enacted legislation establishing a new state cybersecurity office tasked with monitoring networks and responding to threats. In Alabama, Rep. Mike Shaw (R) introduced legislation to give the Office of Information Technology central authority over cybersecurity needs across state departments.

Safeguarding Teens from Social Media and Cell Phones—*Bipartisan support:*

In March, First Lady Melania Trump supported the bipartisan passage of S.146/H.R.633, the Take it Down Act to make the internet a safer platform for young Americans in the digital age by empowering victims of revenge or A.I.-generated explicit imagery. At the state level, efforts to limit classroom phone use are gaining bipartisan momentum. Lawmakers across the ideological spectrum agree that smartphones are distractions and contribute to mental health issues in schools. So far, nine states have enacted statewide bans or restrictions, with others pursuing legislation or issuing executive orders for policy review. States such as Illinois, South Carolina, and Vermont have introduced age-appropriate design codes during the 2025–2026 session. These require businesses offering online products or services likely to be used by children to complete data protection impact assessments and adopt safety measures. Additional proposals include age verification and parental consent for minors on social media, as well as integrating digital and

media literacy into K–12 curricula. Utah’s newly adopted App Store Accountability Act requires age verification for app downloads, while South Carolina’s Social Media Regulation Act mandates parental consent for social media users under 18 and age verification by platforms.

#5 ENERGY

Targeting State Climate Laws—*Blue State opposition:*

On April 8, President Trump issued an executive order to unleash American energy from state overreach by directing the Department of Justice to take legal action against states with climate change laws; environmental, social, and governance (ESG) initiatives; and other carbon or greenhouse gas emissions penalties that burden domestic energy production or may be unconstitutional or otherwise preempted by federal law. Blue State governors pushed back and vowed to vigorously defend their state climate policies: CA, CO, NM, and NY. Prior to the Trump order, 22 Democratic and one Republican Governor penned a letter to the United Nations promising to continue America’s work to achieve the goals of the Paris Climate Agreement in spite of President Trump’s withdrawal.

Reinvigorating Coal Production—*Red State support:*

On April 8, President Trump issued a proclamation to grant two years of Biden-era regulatory relief to coal-fired power plants, preventing closures to protect the nation’s power grid, which is 16% coal-generated. On the same day, President Trump issued an executive order (same as above) directing DOJ to identify and end unconstitutional state policies that target the coal industry. In addition, President Trump designated coal as a mineral, ended a current pause to coal leasing on federal lands, promoted coal and coal technology exports, and encouraged the use of coal to power A.I. initiatives, such as data center. President Trump’s support for the coal industry garnered strong support from 23 Republican Attorneys General and multiple Red State Governors: MT, ND, WV, and WY.

Modernizing Environmental Permitting—*Bipartisan support:*

On April 15, President Trump issued a memorandum to direct federal agencies to make the maximum use of technology in the environmental review and permitting processes for all kinds of infrastructure projects, including roads, bridges, mines, factories, power plants, and more. One purported justification is to improve timeliness for state and local decision-making by streamlining the overall process and speeding data gathering. In February, the National Governors Association pressed Congress to pass permitting reform legislation, citing the issue as one where both Republicans and Democrats recognize a problem and largely agree on solutions. At the state level, multiple Red and Blue States enacted legislation within the past year to streamline various aspects of the energy construction permitting process: CA MA, MD, NJ, PA, SD, TN, UT, and WV.

Note on DOGE

Differing Takes on DOGE—*Red State support* vs. *Blue State opposition:*

On his first day in office, President Trump issued an executive order to establish the Department of Government Efficiency (DOGE) as a temporary organization to modernize federal technology and software to maximize efficiency and productivity. As states across the country wrestle with budget shortfalls and pressures of managing growing fiscal deficits, policymakers are assessing a variety of strategies from cutting spending to raising taxes. Inspired by President Trump’s DOGE, many Republican states are pursuing measures to make government leaner and more efficient, including establishing their own state-level DOGEs: FL, IA, KY, MS, MO, NH, ND, OK, SC, and TX. Meanwhile in Blue States, Democratic

policymakers oppose President Trump's DOGE; for example, CA Governor Newsom sued DOGE over AmeriCorps cuts; NY Governor Hochul recruits federal workers laid off by DOGE; CT Governor Lamont called DOGE cuts a life-and-death situation; and CO Governor Polis referred to DOGE as a wrecking ball.

Dates of Adjournment
2025 State Legislative Sessions

February

22nd Virginia

March

6th Wyoming

7th Utah

21st Maine

22nd New Mexico

28th Kentucky

31st South Dakota

April

3rd Mississippi

4th Georgia, Idaho

7th Maryland

11th Kansas

12th West Virginia

16th Arkansas

24th Indiana

25th Tennessee

26th Arizona

27th Washington

May

2nd Florida, Hawaii, Iowa

3rd Montana

7th Colorado

8th South Carolina

9th North Dakota, Vermont

15th Alabama

16th Missouri

Cont. May

19th Minnesota

21st Alaska

30th Oklahoma

31st Illinois

16th Missouri

19th Minnesota

June

2nd Nevada, Texas

3rd New Hampshire

4th Connecticut

9th Nebraska

12th Louisiana, New York

29th Oregon

30th Delaware, Rhode Island

July

31st North Carolina

September

12th California

November

19th Massachusetts

December

31st Michigan, New Jersey, Ohio,
Pennsylvania, Wisconsin

LOREN MONROE is a Principal at BGR Group and leads the firm's bipartisan State & Local Advocacy Practice while serving on its Executive Board. He helps clients secure policy solutions and business opportunities through coordinated state and federal strategies, often managing complex, multi-state advocacy campaigns. Loren has led successful efforts across sectors such as energy, health, and technology, and previously worked on Capitol Hill and in national political organizations. Read more about Loren [here](#).

WILLIAM CROZER leads BGR Group's bipartisan State and Local Advocacy Practice, helping clients navigate policymaking and build strategic relationships across all levels of government. A former Special Assistant to the President and Deputy Director of Intergovernmental Affairs in the Trump Administration, William brings deep experience in federal, state, and local engagement. A Georgia native, he previously held roles at the White House, the RNC, and in Georgia state government. Read more about William [here](#).