December 16, 2025

ISSUE BRIEF | RESPONSIBLE NUTRITION POLICY

TIME TO END THE BROAD-BASED CATEGORICAL ELIGIBILITY LOOPHOLE IN SNAP

Tate Bennett

TOPLINE POINTS

- Today, one in eight Americans receive SNAP benefits. Since 2019, SNAP enrollment has skyrocketed from nearly 36 million Americans to nearly 42 million Americans, and costs have ballooned from $60 billion to $100 billion annually.
- The broad-based categorical eligibility loophole has contributed to SNAP's explosion, as it has allowed millions of individuals to enroll without meeting SNAP's traditional financial eligibility requirements.
- Over the last decade, policymakers have made multiple good faith attempts to close this loophole. The 2025 government shutdown further thwarted SNAP's recent expansion into the national spotlight, underscoring the need to finally close this loophole and ensure that all applicants abide by traditional income and asset tests in federal law.

Overview

Today, one in eight Americans depend on the U.S. Department of Agriculture's (USDA) Food and Nutrition Service (FNS) Supplemental Nutrition Assistance Program (SNAP), formerly known as food stamps. When the national media focused on the implications of the recent 43-day government funding lapse for SNAP, it also exposed just how the bloated SNAP has become and how it has shifted away from supporting self-sufficiency towards fostering government dependency. While several lax policies have contributed to this problem, there is one that 44 states currently implement and that has allowed over 5 million individuals to access SNAP who otherwise would not financially qualify—broad-based categorical eligibility. This policy permits anyone receiving small, even noncash "benefits" from other welfare programs, such as the receipt of a pamphlet or a hotline referral, to gain automatic eligibility for SNAP. As the current administration prioritizes strengthening SNAP integrity ahead of 2026, federal and state policymakers have an opportunity to finally close this policy loophole and further eliminate waste and abuse in SNAP.

Background: The Supplemental Nutrition Assistance Program

SNAP is a means-tested federal entitlement program that provides monthly benefits through electronic benefit transfer (EBT) to low-income households to supplement their grocery budgets. SNAP is annually appropriated by Congress and is run by USDA FNS and state or local SNAP agencies. SNAP's origins trace back to the end of the Great Depression, where it began as a federal initiative to alleviate both hunger and surplus food production. Since the Food Stamp Act of 1964, SNAP has been periodically reauthorized, most recently through the Agriculture Improvement Act of 2018 (also known as the 2018 Farm Bill).

SNAP is the nation's largest nutrition assistance program in terms of costs. It accounts for $99.8 billion of USDA's $231 billion total budget outlays for fiscal year (FY) 2025. In FY 2024, SNAP served nearly 42 million individuals, and benefits averaged $187.20 per participant per month. While state SNAP agencies administer the program, SNAP benefits costs are 100% federally funded, and SNAP administrative costs are 50% federally funded. However, under new terms established by H.R. 1, states failing to contain SNAP error rates below 6% will be held responsible for a range of 5% to 15% of benefits costs, beginning in FY 2028. H.R. 1 also requires states to pay 75% of administrative costs (up from 50%), beginning in FY 2027.

For broader context, SNAP is among the nation's largest entitlement programs, only surpassed by Social Security, Medicare, and Medicaid in terms of total costs. Total SNAP spending exceeds the current enacted budgets of several federal agencies, including the U.S. Environmental Protection Agency (~$10 billion). Additionally, for further size context, SNAP's annual spending surpasses the entire gross domestic product (GDP) of more than 100 countries.

Despite its humble origins as a federal effort to combat hunger and surpluses on the heels of the Great Depression, SNAP has evolved from a program that provides temporary assistance into one that fosters long-term government dependency. Today, one in eight (12.3%) Americans rely on SNAP. Further, SNAP has expanded significantly since 2019:

- From serving nearly 36 million monthly to nearly 42 million people monthly.
- From costing $60 billion annually to nearly $100 billion annually.

Across the U.S., an alarming percentage of states' populations receive SNAP benefits. In FY 2024, four states (including Louisianna, New Mexico, Oklahoma, and Oregon) and the District of Columbia had over 16% of their populations enrolled in SNAP. Across 36 states, between 8% and 16% were enrolled.

Over the years, the federal government has allowed SNAP to continue to foster high dependency and balloon in size. Notably, since 2000, USDA has allowed states to exploit certain categorical eligibility loopholes to bypass traditional financial eligibility requirements. Further, in 2021, USDA provided significant benefit increases—to the tune of $256 billion over ten years—by arbitrarily updating the

Thrifty Food Plan methodology used to calculate SNAP benefit amounts. Such wasteful policies have further cemented SNAP as an outsized entitlement program.

As SNAP has grown, program integrity has waned. According to the Government Accountability Office (GAO), 11.7% of SNAP benefits issued in FY 2023—*$10.5 billion*—were "improper," meaning the amounts were incorrect or the payments should not have been issued at all. This 2023 error rate roughly doubles error rates from 2018 (6.80%) and 2008 (5.01%). The program is clearly getting worse—more wasteful and less accountable—as time moves forward.

Further, such program growth has led to additional administrative complexities. Such additional administrative complexities include greater caseload volumes, increased staffing and training needs, and challenges with approving applications at scale. Each of these complexities is yet another invitation for SNAP payment errors, further squandering taxpayer dollars.

A broader national conversation concerning the program's need for reform surfaced when the government shutdown created a temporary pause in SNAP appropriations. Fortunately, the current administration has already begun taking bold action to restore SNAP accountability. Since January 2025, more than 800,000 SNAP recipients have moved off the program. Furthermore, H.R. 1 contained historic reforms to SNAP's work requirements, along with other program integrity measures. However, there is more that can be done to reform SNAP, including closing the broad-based categorical eligibility loophole.

Traditional, Categorical, and Broad-Based Categorical Eligibility

The Food and Nutrition Act of 2008 outlines SNAP financial eligibility through two main pathways: traditional and categorical eligibility.

- **Traditional eligibility,** per the Food and Nutrition Act of 2008, limits SNAP eligibility to households with gross monthly incomes equal to or lower than 130% of the Federal Poverty Level (FPL) and net income equal to or lower than 100% of the FPL. It also requires asset limits, which are currently $3,000 in countable resources (cash or bank account balance), or $4,500 in countable resources for those with an elderly or disabled household member.

- **Categorical eligibility,** per Section 5(a) of the Food and Nutrition Act of 2008, is where SNAP eligibility is automatically conveyed based on eligibility and/or participation in other means-tested programs, including the Temporary Assistance for Needy Families (TANF), Supplemental Security Income (SSI), or General Assistance (GA) benefits. The premise is that these households have already met financial eligibility determinations for similar programs and should therefore become automatically—categorically—eligible for SNAP, with an eye towards reducing unnecessary administrative burdens for state and local SNAP agencies and applicants alike. Once SNAP eligibility is confirmed via categorical eligibility, household benefit amounts are then calculated under the same rules as other households.

- Through **broad-based categorical eligibility (BBCE)**, states further expand categorical eligibility to more applicants who aren't actually receiving cash welfare benefits. SNAP eligibility under the BBCE policy is interpreted to be achieved by attaining eligibility for *either*

TANF-funded cash *or* **non-cash** benefits. Through BBCE, broadly defined TANF-funded non-cash "benefits" (such as receiving a brochure or a hotline referral) can also automatically convey eligibility for SNAP.

Notably, through BBCE, states can (and most do) use less stringent financial eligibility requirements than SNAP's traditional statutory requirements. Under BBCE, states may confer SNAP eligibility by:

- Bypassing asset tests altogether (which most BBCE states do), and
- Utilizing a higher gross income limit of a maximum 200% of the FPL (which most BBCE states also do) in lieu of SNAP's traditional financial eligibility of 130% of the FPL gross income limit.

Together, these policies comprise the BBCE "loophole," as they make obtaining SNAP eligibility possible for millions who otherwise would not traditionally qualify.

A Brief History of Categorical Eligibility & Broad-Based Categorical Eligibility in SNAP

Categorical eligibility was introduced in The Food Security Act of 1985, which made households that receive Aid to Families with Dependent Children (AFDC) or SSI, categorically eligible for SNAP. AFDC was intended to support needy families, was limited to cash benefits, and included federal income and asset tests.

The 1996 Personal Responsibility and Work Opportunity Reconciliation Act (PRWORA) welfare reform law replaced AFDC with TANF, a $16.6 billion annual block grant to states for a broad range of cash and non-cash benefits and activities. Like AFDC, TANF similarly supports needy families, but TANF also aims to achieve other goals where applicants' income and assets are less pertinent. Through TANF block grants, states choose what types of TANF cash and non-cash benefits and services are offered.

Notably, the replacement of AFDC with TANF had the effect of allowing *both* cash and non-cash benefits to confer categorical eligibility for SNAP, thus establishing the foundation for BBCE. USDA recognized this change and in November of 2000, issued rules attempting to limit the scope of the policy, setting a gross income limit of up to 200% of the FPL. However, the rules still permitted minimal TANF-funded non-cash benefits (like brochures and hotline referrals) to confer SNAP eligibility under BBCE. Most states then adopted BBCE over time, with limited and largely unsuccessful attempts to rein in the policy further.

In summary, states' continued flexibility in determining nominal TANF benefits, along with their ability to waive asset tests and adhere to higher gross income limits under BBCE, has allowed millions of otherwise ineligible individuals to become financially eligible for SNAP.

How many states are implementing BBCE?

While federal statute and regulations laid the groundwork for BBCE, states themselves have chosen to adopt BBCE policies. As of 2025, 44 state SNAP agencies, D.C., Guam, and the U.S. Virgin Islands use BBCE. Of these entities, 28 set gross income limits at the BBCE regulatory maximum of 200% of the

FPL, and only eight retain SNAP's traditional financial eligibility gross income limit of 130% of the FPL. Moreover, most states (all but four) do not require asset tests under BBCE.

What are the implications of BBCE?

Millions are enrolling in SNAP who otherwise would not qualify.

The Foundation for Government Accountability (FGA), among others, has estimated that over 5 million SNAP recipients enrolled through BBCE do not meet traditional financial eligibility requirements. Calculations by USDA in a 2019 rulemaking were likewise alarming: USDA found that 4.1% of SNAP households, or 1.4 million individuals, had resources above SNAP's traditional financial eligibility asset limits, and 4.9% of SNAP households, or 1.7 million individuals, had incomes above SNAP's traditional financial eligibility gross income limit of 130% of the FPL.

The FGA, also in 2018, found that among BBCE SNAP enrollees with assets over SNAP's traditional financial eligibility asset limits, most had over $20,000 in assets. Of this population, more than a third had at least $50,000 in assets. One in five had $100,000 or higher in assets. Again, the current SNAP traditional financial eligibility asset limit is $3,000 in countable resources.

For years, congressional committees and outside groups have studied the exploitation of BBCE to extend SNAP to those who otherwise would not qualify. They have similarly found that the list of BBCE SNAP beneficiaries can include the wealthy, and even lottery winners.

Much coverage was devoted in 2016 to Rob Undersander, a retired millionaire who sought to publicly expose SNAP's flaws by filling out a Minnesota SNAP application. Within weeks, he was approved for $278 per month in SNAP benefits, despite telling county officials about his assets. Such information was irrelevant because Minnesota waives asset tests through BBCE. Over 19 months, Undersander received $6,000 from SNAP (of which he later donated).

Leroy Fick won a $2 million lottery prize from Michigan's "Make Me Rich" lottery in 2010. He took a lump sum payment option of $850,000 after taxes. However, because Michigan waived asset tests at the time through BBCE, because he was unemployed, and because he was receiving SSI, he continued receiving SNAP benefits even after winning the lottery. Former Michigan Governor Rick Snyder later installed $5,000 asset limits in 2011, but this restriction was later repealed in 2023.

Higher state SNAP payment error rates and administrative costs.

A 2012 GAO report to Congress found that while BBCE may *appear* to improve program efficiency by eliminating eligibility reviews, BBCE actually contributes to higher SNAP error rates and administrative costs. Specifically, the 2012 GAO report found that SNAP recipients eligible under BBCE with incomes over SNAP's traditional financial eligibility income limits had higher payment errors than other households—17.2% compared to 6.7%—in FY 2010. This was because BBCE recipients were more likely to have earned income, and earned income is a frequent contributor to payment errors.

A more recent GAO report published in 2024 similarly confirmed that USDA continues to make improper SNAP payments. The GAO found that SNAP agencies do not always verify recipients' eligibility for the program, including their financial position and status (of which can also occur through BBCE).

It would be prudent for states to evaluate how BBCE is contributing to their SNAP error rates for the following reasons:

- Under H.R. 1, states with high SNAP error rates (i.e., 6% or greater) must begin shouldering a portion of SNAP benefits starting in federal FY 2028.
- BBCE may also lead to higher administrative costs. BBCE drives greater SNAP enrollment through complex verification requirements, thereby inviting increased caseloads for states to process, certify, and routinely administer.

Attempts to Eliminate and Reform BBCE

Congressional, Administration, and state leaders have proposed BBCE reforms over the years with limited success, but with the shared goal of better preserving SNAP for those truly in need.

The Agriculture Act of 2014, which was the House of Representatives' version of the 2014 Farm Bill, included provisions that would have eliminated BBCE, while retaining only categorical eligibility for recipients of cash benefits. The Congressional Budget Office (CBO) estimated that this approach would have yielded around $10 billion in federal taxpayer savings from 2015 to 2023. This provision was ultimately not included in the final bill signed into law.

The Agriculture and Nutrition Act of 2018, which was the House of Representatives' version of the 2018 Farm Bill, included provisions that, while not eliminating BBCE entirely, significantly limited its scale and scope to TANF cash and substantial and ongoing assistance, SSI, and GA cash benefits. The House draft also aligned BBCE gross income limits with SNAP traditional limits at or below 130% of the FLP, and households with elderly or disabled members at or below 200% of the FPL. CBO estimated that this approach would have yielded $5.04 billion in federal taxpayer savings over 10 years. These provisions were not included in the final bill signed into law.

In July 2019, USDA FNS initiated a proposed rulemaking to modestly reform BBCE by limiting it to those receiving substantial and ongoing assistance from TANF. Specifically, the proposed rule narrowed BBCE to those receiving TANF cash or non-cash benefits, the latter of which provide work supports valued at a minimum of $50 per month for at least six months. While the proposed rule would not have eliminated BBCE, it aligned its application with programs where stronger income and asset tests are more likely to occur. USDA estimated that under the proposed rule, 9% or 1.7 million SNAP households in FY 2020 would have been impacted. USDA also estimated that this approach would have resulted in $9.4 billion in federal taxpayer savings from 2019 to 2023. Due to shifting policy priorities, the proposed rule was not finalized, and the subsequent administration formally withdrew it in June of 2021. Notably, however, the Spring 2025 Unified Agenda of Regulatory and Deregulatory Actions (Reg Agenda) included a proposed rulemaking with a similar description.

In both 2023 and 2025, during the 118th and 119th Sessions of the U.S. House of Representatives, Rep. Ben Cline (R-VA) introduced standalone legislation, The No Welfare for the Wealthy Act. This legislation, if signed into law, would eliminate BBCE by requiring all SNAP households to meet SNAP's traditional financial eligibility requirements.

State governments have acted similarly. In April 2025, Indiana Governor Mike Braun issued Executive Order 25-53, "Increasing State Accountability Through Supplemental Nutrition Assistance Asset Verification." This order specifically directs the Indiana Family Social Services Administration to take all necessary steps to limit expanded categorical eligibility for SNAP to TANF-funded cash assistance, work supports, childcare assistance, or households participating in TANF-funded work, education, or training programs.

Further, the states of Arkansas, Texas, Idaho, and Indiana today retain asset tests for BBCE, while Michigan and Pennsylvania in past years reinstated asset limits for BBCE, although these limits were subsequently repealed.

Finally, Mississippi's state legislature barred BBCE in Section 12 of the enacted Medicaid and Human Services Transparency and Fraud Prevention Act of 2017. The state legislature specifically accomplished this by prohibiting categorical eligibility from applying to non-cash or in-kind benefits, and by tying BBCE gross income limits to SNAP's traditional 130% of FPL limit. In the midst of these efforts and of SNAP's recent years of bloat and abuse, indicate that for most states, it is time to revisit mandatory asset tests.

Policy Recommendations

Given the national attention brought to SNAP's bloat and abuse during the 2025 government shutdown, Congressional, Administration, and state policymakers should seize the moment and end, or significantly reform, BBCE. Doing so would yield considerable taxpayer savings.

Congress should eliminate BBCE

Congressional policymakers seeking to end BBCE should pursue legislation requiring all households participating in SNAP to meet the program's traditional financial eligibility income and asset requirements. Alternatively, Congressional policymakers could tighten states' uses of BBCE by only conferring categorical eligibility for those receiving cash or ongoing and substantial work-related assistance from cash TANF, SSI, and GA. Congress could also better align BBCE's gross income requirements with SNAP's traditional financial eligibility gross income requirements and eliminate the current 200% of the FPL maximum option under BBCE.

The Trump Administration should again undertake rulemaking to tighten BBCE

USDA FNS should pursue regulations to once again narrow BBCE to those receiving cash or ongoing and substantial work-related assistance from TANF. In doing so, USDA FNS should narrowly define non-cash benefits as those that are work-related. Further, the rulemaking should align BBCE's gross income requirement with SNAP's financial eligibility traditional gross income requirements and eliminate the current 200% of the FPL maximum option under BBCE.

States should eliminate BBCE

Given that BBCE is a state option, states have the greatest opportunity to eliminate and reform BBCE policy. Through executive orders, legislation, and simple agency action, states can reverse BBCE through narrowing their policies to individuals receiving substantial and ongoing cash and work-related assistance from TANF. Alternatively, states employing the BBCE maximum gross income limit of 200% of the FPL could instead align it with the traditional SNAP gross income limit of 130% of the FPL. More states could also collectively implement asset tests.

Conclusion

When nearly 42 million Americans saw their SNAP benefits at risk during the 2025 government shutdown, the rest of the country woke up to the fact that one in eight Americans rely on SNAP, and that the program is broken and corrupt. Fortunately, the current administration appears focused on such reforms. Therefore, there is no time like the present for federal and state policymakers to close the BBCE loophole through the above recommendations. Doing so would restore SNAP program integrity and preserve generous taxpayer dollars for those truly in need.

Supplemental Information

SNAP Payment Error Rates as of FY2024

State/Territory	Over Payment	Under Payment	Payment Error Rates
ALABAMA	7.32	0.99	8.32
ALASKA	22.50	2.16	24.66
ARIZONA	7.56	1.28	8.84
ARKANSAS	7.97	1.59	9.56
CALIFORNIA	9.01	1.98	10.98
COLORADO	7.91	2.06	9.97
CONNECTICUT	8.61	1.65	10.25
DELAWARE	10.49	1.88	12.37
DISTRICT OF COLUMBIA	13.62	3.76	17.38
FLORIDA	13.05	2.08	15.13
GEORGIA	13.59	2.06	15.65
GUAM	7.88	1.84	9.72
HAWAII	5.87	0.80	6.68
IDAHO	3.02	0.57	3.59
ILLINOIS	10.64	0.93	11.56
INDIANA	7.42	2.10	9.52
IOWA	5.30	0.84	6.14
KANSAS	9.43	0.55	9.98
KENTUCKY	8.23	0.88	9.11
LOUISIANA	5.14	1.48	6.62
MAINE	8.57	1.68	10.26
MARYLAND	8.85	4.79	13.64
MASSACHUSETTS	13.03	1.07	14.10
MICHIGAN	8.03	1.50	9.53
MINNESOTA	6.32	2.66	8.98
MISSISSIPPI	8.93	1.76	10.69
MISSOURI	8.16	1.26	9.42
MONTANA	6.47	2.41	8.89
NEBRASKA	4.64	0.86	5.50
NEVADA	5.63	0.32	5.94
NEW HAMPSHIRE	4.52	3.05	7.57
NEW JERSEY	12.11	2.22	14.33
NEW MEXICO	13.07	1.54	14.61
NEW YORK	12.65	1.44	14.09
NORTH CAROLINA	8.11	2.10	10.21
NORTH DAKOTA	5.72	2.19	7.91
OHIO	7.67	1.34	9.01
OKLAHOMA	9.63	1.25	10.87
OREGON	12.66	1.40	14.06
PENNSYLVANIA	9.49	1.27	10.76
RHODE ISLAND	10.61	1.68	12.29
SOUTH CAROLINA	7.89	1.36	9.25
SOUTH DAKOTA	2.43	0.85	3.28
TENNESSEE	8.43	1.04	9.47
TEXAS	5.77	2.55	8.32
UTAH	5.09	0.65	5.74
VERMONT	4.74	0.39	5.13
VIRGIN ISLANDS	3.00	0.54	3.54
VIRGINIA	9.54	1.96	11.50
WASHINGTON	5.79	0.26	6.06
WEST VIRGINIA	8.57	0.86	9.43
WISCONSIN	3.81	0.66	4.47
WYOMING	3.27	1.85	5.12

State BBCE Policies

States	TANF/MOE Program Description	Asset Limit of TANF/MOE Program	Gross Income Limit of TANF/MOE Program[1]
ALABAMA	All households are eligible (brochure)	No limit on assets	130%
ALASKA	All households are eligible (Support for You and Your Family notice)	No limit on assets	200%
ARIZONA	All households are eligible (referral on application)	No limit on assets	185%
ARKANSAS	All elderly or disabled households are eligible (brochure)	$5,500[2]	165%
ARKANSAS	All non-elderly or disabled households are eligible (brochure)	$5,500[2]	130%
CALIFORNIA	All households are eligible (pamphlet)	No limit on assets	200%
COLORADO	All households are eligible (notice on application)	No limit on assets	200%
CONNECTICUT	All households are eligible (Help for People in Need brochure)	No limit on assets	200%
DELAWARE	All households are eligible (application refers to pregnancy prevention hotline)	No limit on assets	200%
DISTRICT OF COLUMBIA	All households are eligible (brochure)	No limit on assets	200%
FLORIDA	All households are eligible (notice)	No limit on assets	200%
GEORGIA	All households are eligible (TANF Community Outreach Services brochure)	No limit on assets	130%
GUAM	All households are eligible (brochure)	No limit on assets	165%
HAWAII	All households are eligible (brochure)	No limit on assets	200%
IDAHO	All households are eligible (flyer about referral service)	$5,000	130%
ILLINOIS	All households are eligible (guide to services brochure)	No limit on assets	165%
INDIANA	All households are eligible (brochure)	$5,000	130%
IOWA	All households are eligible (notice of eligibility and brochure)	No limit on assets	160%
KENTUCKY	All households are eligible (resource guide)	No limit on assets	200%
LOUISIANA	All households are eligible (notice)	No limit on assets	200%
MAINE	All households are eligible (resource guide)	No limit on assets	200%
MARYLAND	All households are eligible (referral to services on application)	No limit on assets	200%
MASSACHUSETTS	All households are eligible (brochure)	No limit on assets	200%
MICHIGAN	All households are eligible (language on application and notice)	No limit on assets	200%
MINNESOTA	All households are eligible (domestic violence brochure)	No limit on assets	200%
MONTANA	All households are eligible (brochure)	No limit on assets	200%
NEBRASKA	All households are eligible (pamphlet, statement on notices and applications)	$25,000 for liquid assets	165%
NEVADA	All households are eligible (pregnancy prevention information on application)	No limit on assets	200%
NEW HAMPSHIRE	All households are eligible (brochure)	No limit on assets	200%
NEW JERSEY	All households are eligible (brochure)	No limit on assets	185%
NEW MEXICO	All households are eligible (brochure)	No limit on assets	200%
NEW YORK	Households with dependent care expenses are eligible ("Helping Hands" brochure mailed yearly)	No limit on assets	200%
NEW YORK	Households with earned income are eligible ("Helping Hands" brochure mailed yearly)	No limit on assets	150%
NORTH CAROLINA	All households are eligible (statement on application/recertification forms)	No limit on assets	200%
NORTH DAKOTA	All households are eligible (Statement on application/ recertification forms and pamphlet)	No limit on assets	200%
OHIO	All households are eligible (Ohio Benefit Bank info on approval notice)	No limit on assets	130%
OKLAHOMA	All households are eligible (2-1-1 number for information and referral to community services)	No limit on assets	130%
MONTANA	All households are eligible (brochure)	No limit on assets	200%
OREGON	All households are eligible (pamphlet)	No limit on assets	200%
PENNSYLVANIA	All households are eligible (pamphlet)	No limit on assets	200%
RHODE ISLAND	All households are eligible (publication)	No limit on assets	185%
SOUTH CAROLINA	All households are eligible (pamphlet)	No limit on assets	130%
TEXAS	All households are eligible (Info on various services provided on application)	Asset limit of $5,000 (excludes 1 vehicle up to $22,000 & includes excess vehicle value)	165%

States	TANF/MOE Program Description	Asset Limit of TANF/MOE Program	Gross Income Limit of TANF/MOE Program[1]
VERMONT	All households are eligible (notice with language on website for services)	No limit on assets	185%
VIRGIN ISLANDS	All households are eligible (brochure)	No limit on assets	175%
VIRGINIA	All households are eligible (brochure)	No limit on assets	200%
WASHINGTON	All households are eligible (Info & Referral Services provided on approval letter)	No limit on assets	200%
WEST VIRGINIA	All households are eligible (Information and Referral Services program brochure)	No limit on assets	200%
WISCONSIN	All households are eligible (Job Net Services language on approval and change notices)	No limit on assets	200%

1 All income limits are percentages of the Federal Poverty Guidelines (FPG).

2 Arkansas's $5,500 resource limit is permitted for a 12-month consecutive period and can only be granted every five years. After a 12-month consecutive period, a $4,500 resource limit applies to elderly or disabled households, and a $3,000 resource limit applies to non-elderly and disabled households.

The above was provided by the United States Department of Agriculture (USDA).