



SENATE RECONCILIATION PROPOSAL FOR SHIFTING SNAP COSTS TO STATES

The [Senate Agriculture Committee's reconciliation proposal](#) pares back some of the most significant cuts to SNAP passed by the House. Still, it would make sweeping cuts to SNAP by shifting an unprecedented share of its costs to the states. While states with the lowest payment error rates would not have to contribute to benefit costs under the Senate plan, most states — 43 based on FY 2023 payment error rates — would have to pay between 5-15% of benefit costs starting in FY 2028. This will dramatically increase their financial burden and put millions of individuals at risk of losing critical food assistance. The update made in response to the Parliamentarian would not lessen the financial burden and only provide some additional time to budget. States would also be forced to pay 75 percent of administrative costs, up from the current 50 percent, starting in FY 2027.

STATE BENEFIT COST RESPONSIBILITY BASED ON ERROR RATE

| If your state has this error rate... | ...you would be forced to pay this share of benefit costs |
|--------------------------------------|---|
| <6% | 0% |
| 6-8% | 5% |
| 8-10% | 10% |
| >10% | 15% |

In FY 2028, the food benefit cost sharing percentage would be based on FY 2025 or 2026 payment error rate data; thereafter, it would be based on the error rate from three fiscal years prior.

States already have skin in the game, covering half of the costs to administer the program plus penalties for quality control issues. Forcing them to absorb an even greater share of administrative costs and millions more in benefit costs would be unsustainable and inevitably lead to substantial cuts to benefits and eligibility, or the elimination of other vital state programs to make up the difference.

While less extreme than the House-passed version, this plan would still push under-resourced and overburdened state agencies beyond capacity and threaten the stability of food assistance for those who need it most. Adequate staffing, integrated eligibility systems, and other modern technology solutions are critical to bringing down error rates, yet states will have to pay an increased share of these administrative expenses under both the House and Senate proposals. This would put more states at risk of paying a higher share of benefit costs, creating a vicious cycle that would hurt the efficiency and integrity of the program rather than improve it. Staff cuts at USDA and other potential changes in reconciliation like expanded work requirements will also put states at greater risk of higher error rates.

The chart on the next page outlines the projected impact for each state, using current SNAP error rates (FY23), administrative costs (FY23) and benefit totals (FY24) to show the dramatic increase in cost burden to states. States indicated with an asterisk (*) administer SNAP at the county level; in all but North Dakota, the counties pay for some or all of the administrative cost share listed for the state.

This plan doesn't just shift costs—it fundamentally restructures SNAP, threatening the program's integrity and the well-being of millions of families who depend on it.

| State | FY23 Payment Error Rate (%) | State Share of Benefits (%) | Current Total State Responsibility (50% Admin Costs for FY23) (Millions) | Estimated FY28 Total State Responsibility (75% Admin Costs + Share of Benefits) (Millions) |
|----------------------|-----------------------------|-----------------------------|--|--|
| Alabama | 7.07% | 5% | \$65 | \$186 |
| Alaska | 60.37% | 15% | \$12 | \$56 |
| Arizona | 11.39% | 15% | \$70 | \$400 |
| Arkansas | 9.57% | 10% | \$43 | \$120 |
| California* | 13.4% | 15% | \$1,324 | \$3,771 |
| Colorado* | 8.61% | 10% | \$93 | \$267 |
| Connecticut | 8.91% | 10% | \$79 | \$207 |
| Delaware | 22.8% | 15% | \$22 | \$70 |
| District of Columbia | 20.26% | 15% | \$37 | \$102 |
| Florida | 12.6% | 15% | \$89 | \$1,121 |
| Georgia | 12.07% | 15% | \$110 | \$655 |
| Guam | 18.01% | 15% | \$2 | \$22 |
| Hawaii | 20.94% | 15% | \$31 | \$157 |
| Idaho | 3.42% | 0% | \$10 | \$14 |
| Illinois | 9.91% | 10% | \$167 | \$691 |
| Indiana | 10.46% | 15% | \$91 | \$352 |
| Iowa | 5.19% | 0% | \$26 | \$38 |
| Kansas | 12.07% | 15% | \$29 | \$104 |
| Kentucky | 7.27% | 5% | \$106 | \$213 |
| Louisiana | 6.65% | 5% | \$83 | \$221 |
| Maine | 13.48% | 15% | \$13 | \$75 |
| Maryland | 18.98% | 15% | \$105 | \$382 |
| Massachusetts | 9.86% | 10% | \$86 | \$389 |
| Michigan | 10.72% | 15% | \$192 | \$736 |
| Minnesota* | 6.4% | 5% | \$87 | \$172 |
| Mississippi | 10.15% | 15% | \$29 | \$168 |
| Missouri | 10.54% | 15% | \$56 | \$313 |
| Montana | 6.04% | 5% | \$14 | \$29 |
| Nebraska | 7.06% | 5% | \$24 | \$53 |
| Nevada | 6.71% | 5% | \$43 | \$103 |
| New Hampshire | 12.53% | 15% | \$12 | \$39 |
| New Jersey* | 35.7% | 15% | \$190 | \$569 |
| New Mexico | 14.4% | 15% | \$30 | \$198 |
| New York* | 12.68% | 15% | \$492 | \$1,827 |
| North Carolina* | 9.72% | 10% | \$136 | \$500 |
| North Dakota* | 9.51% | 10% | \$13 | \$30 |
| Ohio* | 7.01% | 5% | \$141 | \$366 |
| Oklahoma | 10.64% | 15% | \$55 | \$308 |
| Oregon | 16.76% | 15% | \$160 | \$476 |
| Pennsylvania | 16.61% | 15% | \$214 | \$964 |
| Rhode Island | 12.4% | 15% | \$25 | \$89 |
| South Carolina | 22.57% | 15% | \$33 | \$244 |
| South Dakota | 3.27% | 0% | \$9 | \$15 |
| Tennessee | 12.56% | 15% | \$125 | \$429 |
| Texas | 6.7% | 5% | \$170 | \$621 |
| Utah | 5.09% | 0% | \$26 | \$37 |
| Vermont | 3.45% | 0% | \$12 | \$18 |
| Virginia* | 9.86% | 10% | \$174 | \$439 |
| Virgin Islands | 10.29% | 15% | \$5 | \$18 |
| Washington | 6.74% | 5% | \$126 | \$284 |
| West Virginia | 10.98% | 15% | \$18 | \$113 |
| Wisconsin* | 5.15% | 0% | \$79 | \$121 |
| Wyoming | 5.19% | 0% | \$9 | \$13 |

* State where the county administers SNAP; in all but North Dakota, counties pay for some or all administrative costs.