

Broad-Based Categorical Eligibility (BBCE) allows states to extend eligibility for the Supplemental Nutrition Assistance Program (SNAP) to people who receive a Temporary Assistance for Needy Families (TANF) noncash or a state Maintenance of Effort-funded benefit. BBCE lets SNAP align eligibility thresholds for income and assets with TANF's eligibility thresholds.

BBCE is a policy that streamlines SNAP by cutting red tape for both families and states, making it easier to access and easier to administer. It helps eligible people get food assistance with less delay, less paperwork, and fewer unnecessary barriers.

? WHY Is BBCE Important?

BBCE helps people receive much-needed federal nutrition assistance by streamlining application processes.

- ▶ **It allows working families to participate in SNAP** by permitting gross income up to 200 percent of the federal poverty level while keeping the net income eligibility standard at 100 percent, and by waiving the asset test in many states. This structure recognizes work-related costs, such as housing and child care, without changing SNAP's core eligibility rules.
- ▶ **It removes arbitrary participation barriers for eligible households**, especially those with high housing and dependent care costs.
- ▶ **It brings more federal resources into local economies**, strengthening communities, supporting local retailers, and reducing the financial burden on states and municipalities.
- ▶ **It improves administrative processes** by simplifying or decreasing the workloads of case workers.
- ▶ **It connects families with low incomes to free school meals and Summer EBT**, automatically enrolling children in SNAP households into meal programs to ensure proper nutrition.

? WHO Does BBCE Serve?

BBCE serves working families, children, veterans, and older adults who need food assistance. BBCE makes it easier for people to access benefit programs to support a healthy, economically stable, food-secure life.

BBCE means that:

- ▶ **Families who receive TANF** are also enrolled in SNAP without hassle.
- ▶ **An older adult with modest savings** does not have to spend down their emergency fund to receive food assistance.
- ▶ **A mom to a toddler** who receives SNAP does not have to wonder if she will qualify for Special Supplemental Nutrition Program for Women, Infants, and Children (WIC) when she takes time to complete the application.
- ▶ **Someone making \$15/hour** does not have to turn down a promotion out of worry that a boost to \$16/hour will make them ineligible for SNAP.

? WHAT Is Happening Now With BBCE?

Proponents of Project 2025 and other proposals to cut SNAP have targeted BBCE with misleading claims, using it as a vehicle to pursue broader efforts to reduce eligibility and restrict access to food assistance for working families.

Some states — like Kentucky and Alabama — are proposing legislation to stop using BBCE, which will kick thousands of people from households with low incomes off SNAP.^{1,2}

The Trump administration is planning to revive an attempt to eliminate BBCE through the rulemaking process, taking this policy option away from all states. They tried this in 2019 and failed, withdrawing the proposed rule after considering over 150,000 public comments.³

? WHY Would Eliminating BBCE Be Bad?

- ▶ The proposal sidesteps Congress, which considered eliminating BBCE during negotiations over the 2014 and 2018 Farm Bills and ultimately rejected this harmful idea.
- ▶ Millions of Americans with low incomes would lose SNAP, the first line of defense against hunger. The U.S. Department of Agriculture's (USDA) 2019 analysis predicted that 3 million people who are already struggling to make ends meet would no longer receive critical nutrition support.⁴
- ▶ Rates of hunger and food insecurity would spike across the entire nation, impacting children, older adults, people with disabilities, veterans, and others.
- ▶ When children lose SNAP they also lose access to free school meals and summer EBT, putting them at an increased risk of hunger and food insecurity.
- ▶ State SNAP agencies would have to spend more money on staff time and updating computer systems to verify assets.
- ▶ SNAP retailers would see less income from reduced food spending. With less income from SNAP purchases, some stores might close or leave the SNAP program, leaving everyone — SNAP participants and nonparticipants — with diminished access to healthy food.

HOW Can Advocates Help Support Those Who Participate in SNAP and Other Nutrition Supports?

START EDUCATING YOUR STATE LEGISLATORS AND MEMBERS OF CONGRESS NOW about the importance of BBCE. H.R.1 included massive cuts to SNAP that have directly led to millions of people losing SNAP.⁵ Eliminating BBCE would further restrict SNAP access and increase hunger.

When the federal government announces their plan to eliminate BBCE, they will be required to hold an open comment period so advocates can submit feedback on the dangers of this rule change. **FRAC will provide a comment template with suggestions of what to say.**

This table shows the states and territories that currently implement BBCE and how that affects their asset limit and gross income limit.

| State | Eligibility | Asset Limit | Gross Income Limit (% of FPL) |
|---------------|------------------------------------|----------------------|-------------------------------|
| Alabama | All households | No limit on assets | 130% |
| Alaska | All households | No limit on assets | 200% |
| Arizona | All households | No limit on assets | 185% |
| Arkansas | Elderly or disabled households | \$5,500 ² | 165% |
| Arkansas | Non-elderly or disabled households | \$5,500 ² | 130% |
| California | All households | No limit on assets | 200% |
| Colorado | All households | No limit on assets | 200% |
| Connecticut | All households | No limit on assets | 200% |
| Delaware | All households | No limit on assets | 200% |
| D.C. | All households | No limit on assets | 200% |
| Florida | All households | No limit on assets | 200% |
| Georgia | All households | No limit on assets | 130% |
| Guam | All households | No limit on assets | 165% |
| Hawaii | All households | No limit on assets | 200% |
| Idaho | All households | \$5,000 | 130% |
| Illinois | All households | No limit on assets | 165% |
| Indiana | All households | \$5,000 | 130% |
| Iowa | All households | No limit on assets | 160% |
| Kentucky | All households | No limit on assets | 200% |
| Louisiana | All households | No limit on assets | 200% |
| Maine | All households | No limit on assets | 200% |
| Maryland | All households | No limit on assets | 200% |
| Massachusetts | All households | No limit on assets | 200% |
| Michigan | All households | No limit on assets | 200% |
| Minnesota | All households | No limit on assets | 200% |

| State | Eligibility | Asset Limit | Gross Income Limit (% of FPL) |
|----------------|---|--|-------------------------------|
| Montana | All households | No limit on assets | 200% |
| Nebraska | All households | \$25,000 for liquid assets | 165% |
| Nevada | All households | No limit on assets | 200% |
| New Hampshire | All households | No limit on assets | 200% |
| New Jersey | All households | No limit on assets | 185% |
| New Mexico | All households | No limit on assets | 200% |
| New York | Households with dependent care expenses | No limit on assets | 200% |
| New York | Households with earned income | No limit on assets | 150% |
| North Carolina | All households | No limit on assets | 200% |
| North Dakota | All households | No limit on assets | 200% |
| Ohio | All households | No limit on assets | 130% |
| Oklahoma | All households | No limit on assets | 130% |
| Oregon | All households | No limit on assets | 200% |
| Pennsylvania | All households | No limit on assets | 200% |
| Rhode Island | All households | No limit on assets | 185% |
| South Carolina | All households | No limit on assets | 130% |
| Texas | All households | Asset limit of \$5,000 (excludes 1 vehicle up to \$22,000 & includes excess vehicle value) | 165% |
| Vermont | All households | No limit on assets | 185% |
| Virgin Islands | All households | No limit on assets | 175% |
| Virginia | All households | No limit on assets | 200% |
| Washington | All households | No limit on assets | 200% |
| West Virginia | All households | No limit on assets | 200% |
| Wisconsin | All households | No limit on assets | 200% |

Source: USDA, Broad-Based Categorical Eligibility. <https://www.fns.usda.gov/snap/broad-based-categorical-eligibility>. Accessed June 12, 2026

ENDNOTES: **1** Goodman, Sylvia. (March 17, 2026). *Kentucky bill would further restrict who can get food assistance*. Kentucky Public Radio. <https://www.lpm.org/news/2026-03-17/kentucky-bill-would-further-restrict-who-can-get-food-assistance>
2 Alabama State Bill 61. (January 13, 2026). <https://alison.legislature.state.al.us/files/pdf/SearchableInstruments/2026RS/SB61-int.pdf> **3** U.S. Department of Agriculture. (June 10, 2021). *Revision of categorical eligibility in the Supplemental Nutrition Assistance Program – Withdrawal*. <https://www.fns.usda.gov/snap/fr-061021> **4** U.S. Department of Agriculture. (July 2019). *Regulatory reform at a glance. Proposed rule: Revision of SNAP categorical eligibility*. https://www.usda.gov/sites/default/files/documents/BBCE_Fact_Sheet_%28FINAL%29_72219-PR.pdf **5** Food Research & Action Center. *SNAP participation, January 2025 to present*. <https://frac.org/snap-participation-data-january-2025-present>