



The Trump–Republican Reconciliation Bill: a Threat to Food Assistance in Pennsylvania

922 N. 3rd Street, Harrisburg, PA 17102

• www.pennpolicy.org

• info@pennpolicy.org

By Marc Stier and Laura Beltrán Figueroa

October 11, 2025

The Trump–Republican budget reconciliation bill, also known as the One Big Beautiful Bill Act (OBBBA), calls for massive tax cuts for the rich paid for by deep cuts in safety net programs, including Medicaid and SNAP, the Supplement Nutrition Assistance Program formerly known as Food Stamps. In this paper we survey the impact of the OBBBA on food assistance in Pennsylvania.

The OBBBA reduces expenditures for SNAP nationally by \$186 billion over ten years.¹ After a review of the importance of SNAP for Pennsylvanians, we will look at how the provisions of the reconciliation bill affect Pennsylvanians.

The Importance of SNAP in Pennsylvania

Who Benefits from SNAP in Pennsylvania?

In Pennsylvania, SNAP benefits two million people or 15% of the state's population. Of those two million, 58% are families with children. Households with family members who are seniors or disabled make up 44% of all households who receive SNAP. More than 280,000 Pennsylvania SNAP recipients are over the age of 65, and of all Pennsylvania's young people under the age of 21, 765,000 receive SNAP.

SNAP benefits in Pennsylvania mostly go to families living in poverty: About 69% of the families receiving SNAP have an income that falls below the poverty line. The other 31% live just above it. By helping families afford food, SNAP enables them to pay for life's other necessities. On average, SNAP lifted 304,000 people, including 109,000 children, above the poverty line between 2015 and 2019.

SNAP benefits are not high to begin with. On average, each person in a household receiving SNAP receives only \$178 per month or \$5.85 per day.

Nevertheless, nationwide research shows that SNAP has a dramatic impact on food insecurity. About 15% of all U.S. households and 40% of near-poor households were food insecure in 2009. Those who receive SNAP benefits, are 30% less likely to be food insecure and another 20% less likely to be very food insecure.²

The OBBBA reduces federal spending on SNAP in three ways, each of which will undermine the program in Pennsylvania.

1. Congressional Budget Office, *Estimated Budgetary Effects of Public Law 119-21, to Provide for Reconciliation Pursuant to Title II of H. Con. Res. 14, Relative to CBO's January 2025 Baseline*, July 21, 2025, <https://www.cbo.gov/publication/61570>.

2. [Caroline Ratcliffe, Signe-Mary McKernan, Sisi Zhang](#), "How Much Does the Supplemental Nutrition Assistance Program Reduce Food Insecurity?" *American Journal of Agricultural Economics*, Vol. 93, Issue 4, July 2011, <https://doi.org/10.1093/ajae/aar026>.

SNAP and Grocery Stores

Cuts in SNAP don't just hurt those who are food-insecure—it has serious costs for our economy. According to the U.S. Department of Agriculture, every \$1 spent on the program generates \$1.54 in local economic activity because SNAP income is almost entirely spent in local food stores. Our analysis based on [National Grocers Association data](#) shows that SNAP was responsible for 18,790 jobs in grocery stores and other businesses and \$71.9 million dollars in state and local tax revenues.³ And a study by the [Center for American Progress](#) shows that 1,909 retailers all throughout Pennsylvania are especially reliant on SNAP payments. In Pennsylvania, SNAP pays for 8% of all grocery store purchases, and, of course, far more in low-income communities. In this notoriously low-margin business, an 8% reduction in purchases could threaten the survival of grocery stores. In many places in Pennsylvania, and especially Philadelphia, we have made major strides in reducing food deserts in recent years. This drastic cut to grocery store revenues would lead some of these stores to close. Low-income Pennsylvanians would be forced to buy food at small corner stores, which have higher prices and a much worse selection of high-quality, healthy foods than grocery stores.

Work Reporting Requirements

One other way Republicans are proposing to reduce the cost of SNAP is to expand work reporting requirements for SNAP recipients. SNAP already has work requirements: Most non-elderly, non-disabled adults without children in their homes couldn't receive benefits for more than three months out of every three years if they didn't document that they were working at least 20 hours per week or prove they qualify for an exemption.

- The OBBBA expands this restriction to older adults aged 55–64 and to parents whose youngest child is at least 14 years old.
- The law also strips exemptions from the work requirement for veterans, people experiencing homelessness, and former foster youth.
- And it significantly limiting waivers for areas with poor economic conditions. Work reporting requirements will still be in place in communities with high unemployment rates.

Work reporting requirements for social safety net programs, in general, are neither necessary nor a good idea. They are unnecessary because most people who receive SNAP and are able to do work are employed. According to Census data, 82% of households with working-age adults who didn't live with minor children and did not receive disability benefits and reported receiving income at some point in 2023 **had earnings during the year**. The work rates are even higher among those living with children, with 92% of households reporting earnings during the year.⁴ And those who don't work are not able to, either because they have lost their job and are trying to find a new one, are ill or disabled, or have responsibilities taking care of children or elderly relatives. It is precisely those circumstances for which the safety net has been designed.

If most people who receive SNAP work, why do Republicans favor expanding work reporting requirements and why are we troubled by them? The answer is that Republicans want to use expanded work reporting requirements as a back door to cut SNAP spending. Work requirements only reduce

3. SNAP purchases are not subject to sales taxes, but grocery stores sales generated by SNAP purchases generate substantial economic activity that is taxed.

4. Center on Budget and Policy Priorities analysis of American Community Survey Data in: Katie Bergh, Catlin Nchako, and Luis Nunez, "Worsening SNAP's Harsh Work Requirement Would Take Food Assistance Away from Millions of Low-Income People," April 30, 2025, https://www.cbpp.org/research/food-assistance/worsening-snaps-harsh-work-requirement-would-take-food-assistance-away#_ftn8.

the costs of SNAP by creating red tape, which stops people who deserve social safety net benefits from receiving them. In particular, rigid work requirements do not take into account either economic circumstances or the erratic nature of low-income work.

Studies of the imposition of work requirements in 2013 show that the number of SNAP recipients declined substantially.⁵ But few additional SNAP recipients worked.⁶

The failure to generate additional work, especially among able-bodied adults without dependents, is largely due to a combination of the difficulties faced by SNAP recipients and chronic high unemployment levels in the distressed communities in which they often live. This was the point of creating waivers for work reporting requirements in communities with high unemployment rates. But the OBBBA limits them. SNAP recipients who lack skills or credentials required for jobs available in their communities, or who struggle with health and transportation limitations and, in some cases, criminal records, also have a hard time finding jobs. Indeed, homeless people are disproportionately found among those who lost SNAP benefits after the imposition of work requirements.⁷ The limited services—especially the lack of job search or job training services—provided to SNAP recipients make it difficult for low-income workers to find jobs, especially in distressed communities.

The uncertain nature of low-income work often makes it impossible for SNAP recipients to meet work requirements. All of us who have, at one time in our life, worked in the fast food industry know that schedules are unpredictable and can be reduced at any time when business is less than expected. We have been sent home early or are asked to come in late when business is slow. Thus, low wage workers through no fault of their own, sometimes can't meet the twenty hour per week requirement in one week, even though they work more than those hours in other weeks.

And finally low-income workers often have problems reporting their work hours or securing an exemption because they are disabled or caring for seniors or children. They may not have computers with which to file those reports online or cars to drive to local assistance offices to report their work.

Work reporting requirements may sound find in principle. We all believe that those who can work and meet their obligations to their family members should do so. But what makes sense in abstract principle often does not make sense given the difficulties of life for those with low incomes. It is short-sighted and unfair and a violation of the whole idea of a safety net to make stringent demands on those who must rely on SNAP.

And it is why the evidence is clear that work reporting requirements don't lead to greater employment. Rather, what they do is to remove hundreds of thousands of people who have serious difficulties in

5. Leighton Ku, Erin Brantley, and Drishit Pillai, “The Effects of SNAP Work Requirements in Reducing Participation and Benefits From 2013 to 2017,” *American Journal of Public Health*, October 2019, 109(10):1446–1451, <https://ajph.aphapublications.org/doi/abs/10.2105/AJPH.2019.305232?journalCode=ajph>. They conclude that in 2017 about 600,000 adults lost SNAP benefits due to work requirements, including more than one-third of all able-bodied adults without dependents, and SNAP benefit spending was reduced by more than \$2.5 billion.

6. For example, see: Jeehoon Han, “The impact of SNAP work requirements on labor supply,” Social Science Research Network (SSRN), Elsevier, posted December 26, 2018, https://papers.ssrn.com/sol3/papers.cfm?abstract_id=3296402; Brian Stacy, Erik Scherpf, and Young Jo, “The impact of SNAP work requirements,” 2018, <https://www.aeaweb.org/conference/2019/preliminary/paper/Z8ZhzBZt>; Timothy F. Harris, “Do SNAP Work Requirements Work?” Upjohn Institute Working Paper, 19–297, http://research.upjohn.org/up_workingpapers/297.

7. Colin Gray, Adam Leive, Elena Prager, Kelsey B. Pukelis, and Mary Zaki, “Employed in a SNAP? The Impact of Work Requirements on Program Participation and Labor Supply,” National Bureau of Economic Research, Working Paper 28877, <http://www.nber.org/papers/w28877>.

supporting themselves from receiving SNAP benefits, generating and exacerbating hunger and distress among already vulnerable populations.

The OBBBA provision makes the difficulties created by the existing work reporting requirement program even worse.

At present, adults who are taking care of children, whether school age or below, or an incapacitated person are exempt from work requirements. The OBBBA, however, adds work reporting requirements for the parents of such children. **This would put 33,000 adults and, because entire families would lose SNAP, 26,000 children—a total of 59,000 people—at risk of losing food assistance Pennsylvania.**⁸ Moreover, to work full time—and avoid any lapse in hours worked that would knock them off SNAP—such parents would need child care. Good child care would cost more than the meagre SNAP benefits these parents receive. They would thus be forced to make a horrible choice: don't work and lose SNAP benefits or work and leave their children in sub-standard child care in order to keep their food assistance benefits.

Another new work requirements proposal in the OBBBA applies work requirements to people up to the age of 64 instead of, as is currently done, up to the age of 54. **This proposal would put 58,000 Pennsylvania adults and—again, since entire families would lose benefits—84,000 Pennsylvanians in total at risk of losing SNAP benefits.**⁹ In light of the employment difficulties described above, it makes no sense to require older people to secure a job in order to keep their SNAP benefits, especially because they are also nearing retirement age and are vulnerable to ageism in hiring. Raising the age limit would not lead to many more people working, but it would deny SNAP to people who are already in distress. Frankly, this idea is simply cruel.

Finally, there's the limitation of work requirement waivers in geographic areas with high unemployment. Waivers relieve some recipients of the requirement to work, and states can apply for geographic waivers of the work requirement for food stamp recipients in any area that has an unemployment rate above 10% or “does not have a sufficient number of jobs.” Eliminating waivers would be especially problematic during recessions when far fewer jobs are available than normal. But they are also important to economically distressed and declining areas. In Pennsylvania such areas are found not just in some of our urban areas but also quite frequently in rural areas of the state. Indeed, there are more waivers in the 15th congressional district of Pennsylvania, which is represented by the chairman of the Agriculture Committee, Glenn Thompson, than in any other congressional district. We estimate that the limiting of waivers will throw another 64,000 Pennsylvanians off SNAP.¹⁰

8. Joseph Llobrera, Dottie Rosenbaum, and Catlin Nchako, “Senate Agriculture Committee’s Revised Work Requirement Would Risk Taking Away Food Assistance From More Than 5 Million People: State Estimates,” Center on Budget and Policy Priorities, June 27, 2025, <https://www.cbpp.org/research/food-assistance/senate-agriculture-committees-revised-work-requirement-would-risk-taking>; and Katie Bergh, Catlin Nchako, and Luis Nunez, “Worsening SNAP’s Harsh Work Requirement Would Take Food Assistance Away from Millions of Low-Income People,” April 30, 2025, <https://www.cbpp.org/research/food-assistance/worsening-snaps-harsh-work-requirement-would-take-food-assistance-away>.

9. Ibid.

10. This number is based on the national estimate of 1.6 million adjusted for Pennsylvania’s 4% share of total US population.

Raising the State Share of SNAP Costs

The OBBBA will undermine SNAP in Pennsylvania in a second way. It raises, possibly dramatically, the state cost of SNAP.

Administrative Costs

Historically, states have paid for half of the program’s administrative expenses, but all benefits were paid by the federal government. Under the OBBBA, the state share of administrative costs will increase to 75%. This would have cost Pennsylvania another \$113 million in the last fiscal year.

Benefit Costs

Even worse, the OBBBA requires states to pay a share of benefit costs based on their payment error rates. Beginning in fiscal year 2028, the federal share of benefit costs is reduced as a state’s error rate rises. If the error rate is under 6%, the federal government continues to cover all of the benefit costs, and the state share is 0%. If the error rate is between 6% and 8 % the state share will be 5%. For an error rate of 8%–10% the state share rises to 10%. And if the error rate is above 10% the state share is 15%.¹¹

Difficulties with the Proposal

Republicans are putting forward this proposal as a way for states to have “skin in the game.” But it is really just a way to hide a federal spending cut and force state officials to take the blame for cuts to the program. And it would put states like Pennsylvania in a difficult situation.

A 10% match last year (in the fiscal year that ended on June 30, 2025) would have cost the state \$427 million. This is the equivalent to 1.5 times what the state spends on community colleges and twice what it spends on environmental programs. At a time when state revenues do not even cover annual General Fund expenditures—with the gap of about \$3.5 billion being covered by the accumulated state surplus—it would be very difficult for Pennsylvania to come up with \$427 million for a 10% share of SNAP benefit cuts. A 20% state share—costing \$854 million—would be almost impossible for the state to meet.

If the state could only pay part of the cost, the result would be deep cuts in federal support for the program. And those cuts would require a reduction in the number of people who receive SNAP. For example, if the state can only put in half of the 10% match—or \$214 million—it would lose more than \$2.13 billion in federal funding or half of the current benefit level.

Pennsylvania could not cut benefits to reduce federal spending. There is no authority in the bills or in the underlying Food and Nutrition Act to provide a benefit to a family that is less than what is mandated by the federal benefit formula. For example, if the federal benefit formula says that a family qualifies for \$400 in SNAP benefits, the state cannot provide the family with \$375.

The OBBBA is also explicit that the federal government cannot pay more than its share of benefit cost. If, say, the state has to pay 10% of the cost of benefits, the federal share cannot exceed 90%. So, if a family’s benefit is \$400, the state must pay its share of that \$400.

Thus, if Pennsylvania can only pay \$214 million for its share of SNAP, the federal contribution will be \$2.13 billion. And the OBBBA says that if the state can’t meet its share and the federal government pays a larger share, the state would owe the federal government the difference between its share and what it pays. That could lead to the withholding of other forms of federal aid to the state.

11. For fiscal year 2028, a state may elect to use its fiscal year 2025 or 2026 error rate to calculate the state share of benefits. Starting in fiscal year 2029, the secretary of Agriculture will use the rate from three years earlier. States with extremely high fiscal year 2025 or 2026 error rates may delay implementation until fiscal year 2029 or 2030.

Since the state can't reduce benefits, it has to find a way to reduce the number of people on SNAP. It is possible that the state could reverse the decision made in 2022 that raised the income limit for eligibility for SNAP from 160% of the federal poverty line to 200%. But while that might reduce the SNAP caseload by 400,000 to 600,000 people, that would be only half of reduction that would be necessary if the PA General Assembly would only approve a \$213 million state share of SNAP.

How could the state further reduce caseloads? By making it difficult for people to enroll in SNAP. It could force people to come into county assistance offices in person to apply; reduce the number of people who can take those applications, creating delays; require additional information to apply that's often difficult to secure; and other steps that make the process of applying for SNAP so difficult that it discourages people from doing so. The state would essentially be forced to carry out the federal effort to make the safety net inaccessible to people who are eligible for it—but do so on steroids. That is, the plan to require a state share of SNAP benefits would force the state to create roadblocks preventing people from getting the benefits they deserve according to federal and state law.

How Much Would the Pennsylvania Have to Pay for SNAP?

Up until the pandemic, Pennsylvania had a relatively low payment error rate. For year SNAP has had one of the best quality control systems of any government program.¹² Human error on the part of eligibility workers or applicants does lead to some overpayments, but the net overpayment rate—overpayments minus underpayments—was 7.01% in 2019, the last pre-pandemic year for which we have data; 6.51% in 2018; and 5.08% in 2017. It was under 5% for all the years for which we have data between 2011 and 2017.

While any error rate is regrettable, now federal benefit program (or for that matter private benefit program) is going to be free from some payment errors. SNAP errors are far less than the dollar amount of cuts proposed in the House budget resolution. And it is far less than the estimated gap of 15% between taxes owed and taxes paid.

But in the years since the pandemic, the state's error rate has been much higher. It was 14.33% in 2022, 16.61% in 2023, and 10.76% in 2024.

Having higher post-pandemic error rates doesn't mean that the state has become lax in monitoring SNAP recipients. Rather, there has been a change in how we determine whether an error has been made. Before the pandemic, payments were declared in error only if the household received more or less than the amount to which they were entitled. Since the pandemic, however, a payment was considered in error if the proper paperwork had not been filed, even if the quality control process found that it was accurate. Because people can now recertify for Medicaid and SNAP at the same time—which is a good thing—sometimes they are certified for SNAP even though there is no separate SNAP application on file. The lack of an application does not mean that the household is not eligible for SNAP.

To ensure that the state is not hit with covering even 5% of the costs of SNAP, the state is going to have to figure out how to get the payment error rate down below 5%. Reversing the recent changes and ensuring that proper documentation for all households on SNAP would help a great deal. But there is also a danger that an overly aggressive effort to reduce error rates could make it harder for people who are eligible for SNAP to receive it.

Reducing Benefits

12. Dottie Rosenbaum and Katie Bergh, "SNAP Includes Extensive Payment Accuracy System," Center for Budget and Policy Priorities, updated June 21, 2024, <https://www.cbpp.org/research/food-assistance/snap-includes-extensive-payment-accuracy-system>.

The OBBBA undermines SNAP in a final way by reducing benefits now and in the future. It does this in two ways.

SUA Shenanigans

First it eliminates an administrative simplification that allowed households that receive payments over \$20 from the Low Income Home Energy Assistance Program (LIHEAP) or other energy assistance to automatically qualify for SNAP's Standard Utility Allowance (SUA). Qualifying for an SUA can increase the SNAP allotment a household receives, reflecting that resources spent on utility costs are not available to the household to purchase food. The SUA is far easier for families and states to administer than verifying actual utility expenses, which can include bills for multiple utilities that vary across the year.

Under the new rules, only applicant households with an elderly or disabled member can qualify for this automatic SUA. All other households whose SUA is based on the receipt of energy assistance will have to provide documentation of their utility costs to the state no later than the next time they renew their benefits.

To ensure that they do not face reduced benefits, Pennsylvania will have to explain to impacted households the importance of providing this documentation. Households who do not produce it will see their SNAP benefits cut or, in some cases, lose eligibility entirely.

The CBO estimates that about 600,000 households will lose roughly \$100 per month on average due to this provision nationwide. That would mean about 28,000 households and roughly twice as many people will lose benefits in our state.¹³

Limiting Thrifty Food Plan Updates

The USDA uses a "Thrifty Food Plan" to set SNAP benefits. The Thrifty Food Plan (TFP) is formula that uses a basket of foods selected by the Department of Agriculture to provide a nutritious diet for a household of a particular size to determine SNAP benefits.¹⁴ The maximum SNAP benefit is determined by the cost of the TFP and the size of the household.

To keep pace with inflation, the USDA has from time to time updated the TFP and its costs. The next scheduled updates were set for 2027 and 2032. But under the OBBBA, these updates will not take place. According to the CBO, this will reduce the average monthly SNAP benefit by \$14. This difference is important for families living on the economic margins.¹⁵

Cuts to benefits for Immigrants

Finally, another terrible part of the OBBBA is that it reduces the availability of SNAP to legal and documented immigrants. (In Pennsylvania, SNAP has not been opened to undocumented immigrants.) Those who have refugee status or who are legally seeking asylum and certain other immigrants will no longer be eligible for SNAP under the new rules. Refugees, asylees, and other

13. For details see Katie Bergh and Dottie Rosenbaum, "Many Low-Income People Will Soon Begin to Lose Food Assistance Under Republican Megabill," Center on Budget and Policy Priorities, September 10, 2025, <https://www.cbpp.org/research/food-assistance/many-low-income-people-will-soon-begin-to-lose-food-assistance-under>; and Congressional Budget Office, *Estimated Effects of Public Law 119-21 on Participation and Benefits Under the Supplemental Nutrition Assistance Program*, August 11, 2025, <https://www.cbo.gov/system/files/2025-08/61367-SNAP.pdf>.

14. Details about the Thrifty Food Plan can be found at US Food and Nutrition Service, USDA Food Plans, <https://www.fns.usda.gov/research/cnpp/usda-food-plans>.

15. Congressional Budget Office, *Estimated Effects of Public Law 119-21 on Participation and Benefits Under the Supplemental Nutrition Assistance Program*.

immigrants who applied or renewed their SNAP benefits between July 4 and October 1, 2025, will receive notices that their SNAP benefits will end by October 31st. Remaining participants will lose SNAP when they renew, usually every 6 months.

Some immigrants are still eligible for SNAP, including: lawful permanent residents; those who hold Green Cards, after 5 years of residency; those who have a 10-year work history; those who are under 18; Cuban-Haitian Entrants (CHEs) regardless of pending asylum or parole status; and COFA Citizens, that is those from Micronesia, the Marshall Islands, and Palau.

SNAP Remains Very Popular

Recent polling data shows that all voters, no matter their political leanings, support SNAP. When asked whether SNAP is important in helping families pay for food when they are facing food insecurity, 95% of Democrats, 89% of independents and 74% of Republicans say it is “very or pretty important.” And 80% of Democrats, 63% of independents, and 53% of Republicans believe that SNAP benefits should be increased. And across the political spectrum, voters say that they would look less favorably on a member of Congress who votes to cut SNAP benefits. Even 52% of Republicans agree with this view.¹⁶

Information Is Available to Help Pennsylvania Families Secure SNAP

Community Legal Services of Philadelphia and Just Harvest of Pittsburgh held a very useful webinar about how to help PA families keep SNAP on August 26th. You can view it here: <https://clsphila.org/highlights/help-pa-families-keep-snap/>.

16. Hart Research and New Bridge Strategy, “Americans’ Views on SNAP and Nutrition Assistance: findings from a national survey conducted in spring 2023,” <https://savethechildrenactionnetwork.org/wp-content/uploads/2024/06/SNAP-Polling-Slides.pdf>.

Appendix A – Title I – Committee on Agriculture, Nutrition, and Forestry, Subtitle A – Nutrition

Section	Title	Summary	Potential Effects for Pennsylvania
Subtitle A. Nutrition			
10101	Re-evaluation of Thrifty Food Plan	Locks the SNAP benefit basis to the 2021 Thrifty Food Plan (TFP) and future CPI-U inflation updates only. Annual cost adjustments occur on October 1, 2025, and every October 1st thereafter. Allows a market-basket re-evaluation no earlier than October 1, 2027, but requires it to be cost-neutral (cannot raise the overall TFP cost). Sets fixed household-size adjustment ratios and keeps uniform allotments based on a 4-person household.	SNAP benefit growth is limited to inflation, with no real increases from a TFP re-evaluation. This will likely lower benefits versus prior law and reduces federal dollars flowing into Pennsylvania grocery economies. Given that households will see routine October benefit updates tied to CPI-U, low-income families may face greater pressure if food costs outpace CPI basket assumptions.
10102	Modifications to SNAP work requirements for able-bodied adults	Revises exemptions to the Able-Bodied Adult Without Dependents (ABAWD) SNAP time-limit rule. Prior law exempted individuals under 18; those over age 49; and those medically unfit, pregnant, or caring for a child under 18. The bill now exempts only individuals under 18 or over 65, the medically unfit, pregnant women, caregivers of a child under 14, those exempt under section 6(d)(2), and members of designated Indian/Urban Indian/California Indian groups. The provision also restricts states' ability to waive ABAWD work requirements. Previously, any state or locality with high unemployment could request a waiver. Now, only "noncontiguous States" (defined as Alaska and Hawaii, explicitly excluding Guam and the U.S. Virgin Islands) may seek a temporary exemption. Those states must submit detailed compliance plans, provide quarterly progress reports, and demonstrate good-faith efforts to meet the federal work-requirement rules. The temporary exemption cannot extend beyond December 31, 2028, and can be terminated earlier if reporting or compliance standards are not met. Effective on enactment unless otherwise specified;	More adults in Pennsylvania are likely to be subject to the ABAWD time limit because the child-caregiver exemption narrows to children under age 14 (previously under 18). In addition, counties' ability to use area waivers is effectively curtailed since the flexible pathway is targeted to noncontiguous states, not Pennsylvania. These changes will likely result in increased churn, larger administrative workloads for counties, and higher risk of food insecurity among very low-income adults not meeting work hours.

		the noncontiguous-state exemption expires December 31, 2028.	
10103	Availability of standard utility allowances based on receipt of energy assistance	Tightens eligibility for the Standard Utility Allowance (SUA) based on household composition. States may now automatically apply the SUA tied to receipt of federal energy assistance only to households with an elderly or disabled member. It also clarifies that third-party energy-assistance payments are treated differently depending on whether the household includes an elderly or disabled member. Previously, any household receiving federal energy assistance (such as LIHEAP) could generally qualify for the SUA when calculating the SNAP shelter deduction, regardless of household makeup. Effective immediately upon enactment of the One Big Beautiful Bill (July 4, 2025) unless the USDA sets a short administrative transition period.	Many non-elderly, non-disabled households may see smaller shelter deductions and thus lower SNAP benefits if they can no longer leverage energy-assistance-linked SUA the way they could before. Excluding internet fees from the cost of shelter costs will further reduce the SUA deduction. This will particularly affect working families and rural households that rely on higher-cost internet service. County assistance offices may see more recalculations and appeals during the rollout.
10104	Restrictions on internet expenses	Explicitly bars any internet connection service fee from being counted toward the excess shelter expense deduction when calculating SNAP benefits. Previously, households could include certain internet service fees as part of those shelter expenses to increase their deduction from gross income. Effective immediately upon enactment of the One Big Beautiful Bill (July 4, 2025).	Pennsylvania households that rely on higher-cost internet—especially rural families and remote workers—will no longer be able to use those expenses to raise their shelter deduction. This will slightly lower SNAP benefit amounts for households that previously included internet costs and will require updated guidance and training for County Assistance Offices.
10105	Matching funds requirements	Establishes a new state cost-sharing system for SNAP benefits tied to each state's official payment error rate . Beginning in FY2028, the federal share of benefit costs is reduced as a state's error rate rises: under 6% = 100% federal / 0% state; 6%–8% = 95% / 5%; 8%–10% = 90% / 10%; $\geq 10\%$ = 85% / 15%. For FY2028, a state may elect to use its FY2025 or FY2026 error rate; starting FY2029 the Secretary uses the rate from three years earlier. States with	Pennsylvania's FY2024 payment error rate is 10.76% (USDA, FY2024 QC report), ¹⁷ placing the state in the highest cost-share bracket if that rate persists. Unless the error rate is reduced below 10% before FY2028, Pennsylvania would need to contribute up to 15% of total SNAP benefit costs—a major new state expenditure. This creates strong incentives to improve eligibility verification, case management, and quality-

17. U.S. Department of Agriculture, Food and Nutrition Service, *Supplemental Nutrition Assistance Program: Payment Error Rates, Fiscal Year 2024* (Washington, DC: USDA, 2025), <https://fns-prod.azureedge.us/sites/default/files/resource-files/snap-fy24QC-PER.pdf>.

		extremely high FY2025 or FY2026 rates ($\geq 20\%$ when multiplied by 1.5) may delay implementation until FY2029 or FY2030. The law also caps federal payments at the applicable percentage and amends Section 13 to cover the required state share. Effective beginning FY2028 with the optional delays described.	control systems well before the FY2028 implementation date.
10106	Administrative cost sharing	Reduces the federal reimbursement rate for state SNAP administrative expenses. Previously, USDA reimbursed 50% of eligible administrative costs every year. The amendment keeps 50% reimbursement through FY2026, but beginning FY2027, the federal share falls to 25%, requiring states to cover the remaining 75% of administrative expenses.	Starting in FY2027, Pennsylvania will need to fund a much larger share of the costs of operating SNAP—staffing, technology, and eligibility systems—rising from 50% to 75% of total administrative expenses. This will significantly increase state budget needs and may force efficiency measures or additional appropriations to maintain service levels. Otherwise, the state risks service disruptions, longer processing times, and increased error rates that could further elevate its required cost share under the new quality control rules.
10107	National education and obesity prevention grant program	Ends the ongoing federal funding authorization for the SNAP Nutrition Education and Obesity Prevention Grant Program after FY2025. Prior law authorized grants for FY2016 and all subsequent years.	Unless Congress renews funding, Pennsylvania's SNAP-Ed program will lose federal support after FY2025, potentially reducing nutrition education services and forcing the state to seek alternative funding or scale back outreach. In the past, the program has delivered nutrition education in schools, supported school and community gardens, and run public campaigns promoting healthy eating, physical activity, and food safety.
10108	Alien SNAP eligibility	Narrows and codifies immigration status requirements for SNAP. Participation is limited to U.S. citizens or nationals and a restricted set of lawful residents: permanent residents, Cuban/Haitian entrants, and certain individuals covered by Compacts of Free Association. Other lawfully present non-citizens—such as many visa holders, temporary residents, or individuals with humanitarian parole not specifically listed—are excluded. States must count the income and resources of ineligible household members when determining eligibility and benefit amounts. Previously,	In Pennsylvania, many mixed-status households will lose partial benefits or face reduced allotments because the income of ineligible members must still be counted when calculating the household's SNAP benefit.

		federal law allowed broader state discretion to extend benefits to a wider range of lawfully present immigrants and certain humanitarian categories. Restrictions take effect immediately upon enactment (July 4, 2025).	
--	--	--	--

Appendix B – SNAP Loss Estimates: Pennsylvania

Table 1. Pennsylvanians at Risk of Losing SNAP coverage under OBBBA Provisions – By County

Table 2. Pennsylvanians at Risk of Losing SNAP coverage under OBBBA Provisions – By Congressional District

Table 3. Pennsylvanians at Risk of Losing SNAP coverage under OBBBA Provisions – By State Senate District

Table 4. Pennsylvanians at Risk of Losing SNAP coverage under OBBBA Provisions – By State House District