

Grocery Affordability Refund Proposal

Union of Saints

No-Nonsense Grocery Affordability Refund Proposal

People need affordable food for their families, not grants to left-wing Democratic political groups that exploit taxpayer funds while taxpayers never see that money returned to their own households. This money belongs to the taxpayers, not political ideologies or organizations that go against their conscience. Taxpayer funds should prioritize tangible relief for American families, including grocery affordability refunds that help people put food on the table.

New Hampshire, Maine, and Vermont

1. Purpose

Develop a state-funded grocery affordability refund to help residents manage rising food costs while reviewing government spending for potential savings.

The proposal has two objectives:

1. Provide direct financial relief to eligible residents.
2. Identify sustainable funding through budget reviews, grant evaluations, and recurring revenue sources.

The refund would help households afford groceries. Separate policies would be needed to reduce the underlying cost of food.

2. Proposed Grocery Refund

A refundable grocery credit or direct payment could be administered annually.

Illustrative payment levels:

- \$100 per eligible resident annually.
- \$200 per eligible resident annually.
- \$300 per eligible resident annually.

Eligibility could be universal or based on household income and size. A refundable tax credit should include an alternative application process for eligible residents who do not file tax returns.

3. Estimated Annual Cost by State

Using approximate 2025 population estimates:

State	Population	\$100 per person	\$200 per person	\$300 per person
New Hampshire	1,415,342	\$141.5 million	\$283.1 million	\$424.6 million
Maine	1,414,874	\$141.5 million	\$283.0 million	\$424.5 million
Vermont	646,521	\$64.7 million	\$129.3 million	\$194.0 million
Combined	3,476,737	\$347.7 million	\$695.3 million	\$1.04 billion

These are illustrative calculations, not official budget forecasts. They assume every resident qualifies, including children, and exclude administrative expenses. Actual costs would depend on eligibility, participation, and the final program design.

4. Review of State Spending and Grant Programs

Each state could conduct a comprehensive review of discretionary grants, contracts, tax expenditures, and other programs to identify potential savings.

The review could include:

- Community and nonprofit grants.
- Immigrant and refugee support services.
- Hispanic and Latino community programs.
- Minority-owned business and workforce-development grants.
- LGBTQ+ community, health, youth, and outreach programs.
- Cultural, diversity, and inclusion initiatives.
- Economic-development and agricultural grants.
- Other discretionary grants and duplicative administrative programs.

The review should use consistent criteria for all programs, regardless of the communities they serve.

For every program, the state should document:

- Total annual expenditure.
- State, federal, and private funding shares.
- Administrative expenses.
- Contractual and statutory obligations.
- Number of people served.
- Measurable outcomes and public benefits.
- Potential savings from reducing, restructuring, or ending the program.

Private foundation grants are not state-government expenditures and should not be counted as potential taxpayer savings.

Federal grants generally cannot simply be redirected to state grocery refunds. Only legally available state funds and verified state savings should be counted.

5. Examples of Existing Programs to Examine

The following examples illustrate the types of programs and funding arrangements that should be distinguished during an audit.

New Hampshire

- Refugee support-services contracts, separating state funding from federal awards.
- State-funded nonprofit and community-service contracts.
- Discretionary workforce-development and economic-development programs.

Maine

- State-funded community and agricultural grants.
- Immigrant and refugee service contracts.
- Nonprofit, workforce-development, and economic-development appropriations.

Vermont

- State-funded minority business and workforce-development programs.
- Community-service and nonprofit contracts.
- Agricultural, food-system, and economic-development grants.

Specific programs should not be eliminated solely because of the population they serve. Decisions should follow documented fiscal analysis, program outcomes, applicable law, and contractual obligations.

6. Potential Funding Sources

Several funding approaches could be evaluated.

A. Verified recurring savings

Reduce or restructure programs that are demonstrably ineffective, duplicative, or no longer necessary, where legally permissible.

B. Existing revenue and tax expenditures

Review tax credits, incentives, exemptions, and other fiscal commitments. Any proposed changes should be assessed for their economic effects and distributional consequences.

C. Dedicated revenue

Consider whether a legally authorized recurring revenue source could support an ongoing refund.

D. One-time surplus funds

A verified, legally available surplus could potentially fund a one-time payment. It should not be treated as a permanent funding source for an annual benefit.

E. Federal support

Pursue federal funding for eligible food-access, agricultural, transportation, and distribution projects. Federal funds should be used only in accordance with program requirements.

7. Existing Surpluses and Budget Flexibility

A state's reported surplus does not necessarily represent unrestricted money available for new spending.

Before using surplus funds, lawmakers should determine:

- Whether the figure is final or a preliminary revenue estimate.
- Whether it represents recurring or one-time revenue.
- Whether transfers to reserves or other funds are required.
- Whether the funds have already been appropriated or legally committed.
- Whether using the money would affect future budget stability.

A permanent refund requires a sustainable funding source rather than reliance on temporary surpluses.

8. Additional Policies to Reduce Grocery Costs

A grocery refund addresses affordability, but additional reforms could target prices themselves.

Potential measures include:

- Strengthening enforcement against price-fixing and other anticompetitive conduct.
- Monitoring grocery prices through a standardized basket of staple foods.
- Supporting independent grocery stores in underserved communities.
- Investing in regional food distribution, refrigeration, and storage.
- Reducing food spoilage and unnecessary transportation costs.
- Helping eligible households access SNAP, WIC, and other existing nutrition benefits.
- Evaluating whether farm-to-school and local food purchasing programs provide measurable value.

These policies should be evaluated on whether they reduce costs, improve access, or provide demonstrable benefits relative to their expense.

9. Implementation Timeline

First 90 days

- Inventory state-funded grants, contracts, tax expenditures, and discretionary spending.
- Separate state, federal, and private funding.
- Estimate eligible recipients under alternative refund designs.
- Commission independent fiscal and legal reviews.

Months 4–6

- Introduce legislation establishing the refund and its funding requirements.

- Identify verified recurring revenue or savings.
- Establish eligibility, payment, and appeals procedures.
- Consider a pilot program if the fiscal outlook is uncertain.

Months 7–12

- Implement the program if legislation and funding are approved.
- Publish program costs and participation figures.
- Measure household affordability and grocery-price changes.
- Review results before expanding the benefit.

10. Performance Measures

The state should publish an annual report measuring:

- Total refund payments and administrative expenses.
- Number and percentage of eligible residents reached.
- Average payment per household.
- Verified recurring savings from spending reviews.
- Cost per person served by reviewed grant programs.
- Changes in comparable grocery-basket prices.
- Food insecurity and access to affordable grocery stores.

Refund payments should be distinguished from actual reductions in retail prices.

11. Conclusion

New Hampshire, Maine, and Vermont could evaluate a grocery affordability refund as part of a strong strategy to address household food costs.

The proposal should begin with a transparent fiscal review, a clearly defined eligibility structure, and a reliable funding plan. Reviewing discretionary grants and contracts may identify savings, but the amount available cannot be established without examining actual state appropriations and legal restrictions.

A universal refund would require hundreds of millions of dollars annually across the three states. An income-qualified refundable credit could reduce the total cost while targeting assistance toward households facing greater financial pressure.

The objective is to provide meaningful grocery relief while maintaining fiscal stability, evaluating public programs consistently, and directing taxpayer funds toward measurable public benefits.

Vermont, New Hampshire and Maine all have surplus funds at the end of each year.

Maine: \$148 Million

New Hampshire: 67.3 Million

Vermont: 17.6 Million

Plus, excess funds are spent on grants that have nothing to do with the general public and are often politically or ideologically based, or worse, exploit taxpayer money to pay for foreigners. These are often foreign PACS who openly target the American people in mass information campaigns and actively attempt to steal their political vote. *Let's get real.* No more nonsense. These three states may pay, on average, \$2,000–\$3,000 more per person each year than other states. We can do better by our valley states.

Maine, Janet Mills

New Hampshire, Kelly Ayotte

Vermont, Phil Scott