

COMBATING WASTE, FRAUD,
AND ABUSE IN SNAP

HEARING

BEFORE THE

SUBCOMMITTEE ON DELIVERING ON
GOVERNMENT EFFICIENCY

OF THE

COMMITTEE ON OVERSIGHT AND
GOVERNMENT REFORM

U.S. HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

ONE HUNDRED NINETEENTH CONGRESS

SECOND SESSION

JUNE 25, 2026

Serial No. 119-67

Printed for the use of the Committee on Oversight and Government Reform



Available on: govinfo.gov, oversight.house.gov or docs.house.gov

U.S. GOVERNMENT PUBLISHING OFFICE

64-138 PDF

WASHINGTON : 2026

COMMITTEE ON OVERSIGHT AND GOVERNMENT REFORM

JAMES COMER, Kentucky, *Chairman*

JIM JORDAN, Ohio	ROBERT GARCIA, California, <i>Ranking Minority Member</i>
MIKE TURNER, Ohio	
PAUL GOSAR, Arizona	ELEANOR HOLMES NORTON, District of Columbia
VIRGINIA FOXX, North Carolina	STEPHEN F. LYNCH, Massachusetts
GLENN GROTHMAN, Wisconsin	RAJA KRISHNAMOORTHY, Illinois
MICHAEL CLOUD, Texas	RO KHANNA, California
GARY PALMER, Alabama	KWEISI MFUME, Maryland
CLAY HIGGINS, Louisiana	SHONTEL BROWN, Ohio
PETE SESSIONS, Texas	MELANIE STANSBURY, New Mexico
ANDY BIGGS, Arizona	MAXWELL FROST, Florida
NANCY MACE, South Carolina	GREG CASAR, Texas
PAT FALLON, Texas	JASMINE CROCKETT, Texas
BYRON DONALDS, Florida	EMILY RANDALL, Washington
SCOTT PERRY, Pennsylvania	SUHAS SUBRAMANYAM, Virginia
WILLIAM TIMMONS, South Carolina	YASSAMIN ANSARI, Arizona
TIM BURCHETT, Tennessee	WESLEY BELL, Missouri
LAUREN BOEBERT, Colorado	LATEEFAH SIMON, California
ANNA PAULINA LUNA, Florida	DAVE MIN, California
NICK LANGWORTHY, New York	JAMES WALKINSHAW, Virginia
ERIC BURLISON, Missouri	CHRISTIAN MENEFE, Texas
ELIJAH CRANE, Arizona	AYANNA PRESSLEY, Massachusetts
BRIAN JACK, Georgia	RASHIDA TLAIB, Michigan
JOHN MCGUIRE, Virginia	
BRANDON GILL, Texas	
RICHARD MCCORMICK, Georgia	

MARK MARIN, Staff Director
JAMES RUST, Deputy Staff Director
RYAN GIACHETTI, Chief Counsel
PETER WARREN, Senior Advisor
JACK FURLA, Counsel
LUKE MOLL, Research Assistant
MALLORY COGAR, Director of Operations and Chief Clerk
CONTACT NUMBER: 202-225-5074

ROBERT EDMONSON, Minority Staff Director
CONTACT NUMBER: 202-225-5051

SUBCOMMITTEE ON DELIVERING ON GOVERNMENT EFFICIENCY (DOGE)

TIM BURCHETT, Tennessee, *Chairman*

MICHAEL CLOUD, Texas	MELANIE STANSBURY, New Mexico, <i>Ranking Member</i>
NANCY MACE, South Carolina	
PAT FALLON, Texas	ELEANOR HOLMES NORTON, District of Columbia
WILLIAM TIMMONS, South Carolina	STEPHEN LYNCH, Massachusetts
LAUREN BOEBERT, Colorado	MAXWELL FROST, Florida
ANNA PAULINA LUNA, Florida	GREG CASAR, Texas
ERIC BURLISON, Missouri	JASMINE CROCKETT, Texas
BRIAN JACK, Georgia	SUHAS SUBRAMANYAM, Virginia
BRANDON GILL, Texas	JAMES WALKINSHAW, Virginia

C O N T E N T S

OPENING STATEMENTS

	Page
Hon. Tim Burchett, U.S. Representative, Chairman	1
Hon. Melanie Stansbury, U.S. Representative, Ranking Member	2

WITNESSES

Hon. John Walk, Inspector General, U.S. Department of Agriculture Oral Statement	5
Ms. Dawn Royal, Former President and Current Director, United Council on Welfare Fraud Oral Statement	7
Ms. Rachel Greszler, Senior Research Fellow, Advancing American Freedom Oral Statement	8
Ms. Gina Plata-Nino (Minority Witness), Director of SNAP Policy and Advoca- cacy, Food Research and Action Center Oral Statement	10

*Written opening statements and bios are available on the U.S. House of
Representatives Document Repository at: docs.house.gov.*

INDEX OF DOCUMENTS

- * Letter, to Newsom re SNAP data; submitted by Rep. Burchett.
- * Report, FGA, “Why Food Stamp Program Integrity is More Important
Now Than Ever”; submitted by Rep. Jack.
- * Letter, Dated May 6, 2026, to Commerce re NSO Group; submitted
by Rep. Stansbury.
- * Letter, Dated March 9, 2026, to DHS CISA re DOGE SSA OIG; sub-
mitted by Rep. Stansbury.
- * Letter, Dated October 6, 2025, to DHS re Spyware; submitted by Rep.
Stansbury.
- * Letter, Dated August 6, 2025, to Flock; submitted by Rep. Stansbury.
- * Letter, Dated February 6, 2025, from Dem Members, to IGs re Musk;
submitted by Rep. Stansbury.
- * Letter, Dated April 17, 2025, to SSA OIG re Master Data; submitted
by Rep. Stansbury.
- * Letter, Dated September 23, 2025, to SSA re Borges Disclosure; sub-
mitted by Rep. Stansbury.
- * Letter, Dated May 15, 2025, to TIGTA re IRS Tech; submitted by Rep.
Stansbury.
- * Letter, Dated February 25, 2025, to Trump; submitted by Rep.
Stansbury.

- * Letters, Dated March 12, 2025, to 24 Agencies re DOGE AI; submitted by Rep. Stansbury.
- * Staff Report, Committee Democrats, “Abandoning Americans to Disease”; submitted by Rep. Stansbury.
- * Letter, Dated April 17, 2026, to OPM OMB re FEHB PII Data; submitted by Rep. Stansbury.
- * Letter, Dated March 9, 2026, to SSA OIG re DOJ Court Update; submitted by Rep. Stansbury.
- * Statement for Record from Urban Institute; submitted by Rep. Stansbury.

The documents listed above are available at: docs.house.gov.

ADDITIONAL DOCUMENTS

- * Questions for the Record: Ms. Gina Plata-Nino; submitted by Rep. Stansbury.

These documents were submitted after the hearing, and may be available upon request.

COMBATING WASTE, FRAUD, AND ABUSE IN SNAP

THURSDAY, JUNE 25, 2026

U.S. HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES
COMMITTEE ON OVERSIGHT AND GOVERNMENT REFORM
SUBCOMMITTEE ON DELIVERING ON GOVERNMENT EFFICIENCY
Washington, D.C.

The Subcommittee met, pursuant to notice, at 10:01 a.m., Room 2154, Rayburn House Office Building, Hon. Tim Burchett, [Chairman of the Subcommittee] presiding.

Present: Representatives Burchett, Cloud, Fallon, Timmons, Luna, Burlison, Jack, Gill, Stansbury, and Walkinshaw.

Mr. BURCHETT. This hearing on the Subcommittee on Delivering on Government Efficiency will come to order. I want to welcome everyone. Without objection, the Chair may declare a recess at any time. And I recognize myself for the purpose of making an opening statement.

OPENING STATEMENT OF CHAIRMAN TIM BURCHETT REPRESENTATIVE FROM TENNESSEE

Good morning. I want to welcome everybody. We are here to examine waste, fraud, and abuse in one of the largest government welfare programs. The Supplemental Nutrition Assistance Program (SNAP), also known as food stamps, provides \$100 billion annually in Federal food assistance. Every dollar from this program is intended to help feed eligible individuals in need.

That is not where every dollar goes, not by a long shot. In one state, food stamp enrollees own more than 14,000 luxury vehicles, including Lamborghinis and Bentleys, due to an eligibility loophole. And in 2024, \$10 billion in food stamps benefits were improperly paid out by the states, which are charged with administering the program. The Government Accountability Office reports that these payment errors are mostly failures to verify recipients met all eligibility criteria such as being in the country legally.

Loopholes and incorrect payments are costly enough, but the tax dollars lost to outright fraud may be greater. For instance, the Government Accountability Office estimated that trafficking in food stamps is a \$5 billion annual industry. Trafficking occurs when a crooked store owner profits off taxpayers by turning benefits into cash. For example, a customer swipes the Electronic Benefits Transfer (EBT) card for \$200 in groceries. The clerk gives back

\$100 cash and pockets the difference. The customer then uses the cash to buy ineligible items such as alcohol or cigarettes.

To address fraud in Federal benefit programs, the President created, in March, the White House Task Force to Eliminate Fraud, led by Vice President Vance. Building on DOGE efforts, the task force is working to eliminate data silos that make it hard to access the data needed to verify recipient eligibility and to flag potential fraud. If food stamp recipients' data stays in state-specific databases, for instance, individuals may apply for and receive benefits from multiple states.

That is why Agricultural Secretary Brooke Rollins requested food stamp beneficiary and transaction data for the past five years from all 50 states and Washington, D.C. Data came in from 29 states, nearly all under Republican governance, including my own State of Tennessee. With the data received, the Agriculture Department reports identifying \$3 billion in potential fraud and waste, including benefits being sent to 186,000 dead people, to 442,000 applicants with fraudulent Social Security numbers, and to hundreds of thousands of individuals who got duplicate benefits by submitting applications to multiple jurisdictions.

But we do not know the full extent of the problems because many states, including some of those with the most food stamp beneficiaries like California, refused to comply with Agriculture Department's data request. And that is very disappointing. The fight against fraud should not be a partisan issue.

That is why yesterday I sent request letters to the noncompliant states with the highest number of food stamp beneficiaries. My letter demands to know why they refuse to release data about Federal taxpayer-funded spending. It also demands their communication and correspondence about the Administration's data request. Federal taxpayers deserve to know what Governor Newsom and his counterparts in other states are trying to hide and at what cost. Congress must provide safeguards and oversight on these programs.

With that, I yield to my co-chair, Ms. Stansbury, for her opening remarks, otherwise known as Ranking Member.

**OPENING STATEMENT OF RANKING MEMBER
MELANIE STANSBURY, REPRESENTATIVE FROM NEW MEXICO**

Ms. STANSBURY. All right. Well, good morning, everyone. Thank you, Mr. Chairman. Thank you to our witnesses for being here today.

And it is great to finally have a formal hearing again and be on the record, as this Subcommittee has had a long absence from formal hearings. In fact, by our count, it has been eight months since this Committee has been on the record, and so I want to congratulate the Chairman on his first official hearing, and I am eager to get into this conversation.

And certainly, there are lots of bipartisan efforts that can be identified to address waste, fraud, and abuse in Federal programming and to root out improper payments and fraud in Federal support programs. And we can prove it. House Democrats and Republicans worked together to pass over eight oversight bills this month aimed at rooting out financial fraud and improper payments. But

we remain skeptical and strongly opposed to efforts to use this as a front to try to further gut public assistance programs. In fact, we have seen over the last year and a half as this Administration and this Majority has used waste, fraud, and abuse as a front to try to gut basic programs that feed our children.

I think that all of us can agree that in one of the wealthiest countries on planet Earth, there should not be hungry children. But over the last year and a half, we have seen one of the most dramatic increases in hunger in modern time. In fact, recent reports have revealed that the United States is experiencing the highest rates of hunger since before the pandemic. One in five children right now are currently going without meals, one in five children in the United States.

And because of the Big Ugly Bill that was passed last year on July 4 and signed into law, a report this week in *ProPublica* revealed that over 770,000 American children are going without meals because of the Big Ugly Bill that Donald Trump pushed through with the support of this Majority on the backs of the American people, which we know has also affected 3.5 million Americans' access to food assistance. This is a moral failure. This is not just a policy argument. This is a moral failure in one of the richest countries on planet Earth.

What we have seen, not just through the Big Ugly Bill, but through the sustained attacks on the SNAP, Special Supplemental Nutrition Program for Women, Infants, and Children (WIC), and other food assistance programs that have happened during this Congress and this Administration, is that it has chipped away at the ability of families to access these programs. While these supposed work requirements and other paperwork requirements are intended, supposedly, to address waste, fraud, and abuse, they have instead created barriers that are significant enough to cause millions of families to lose access to basic food. This is a public health crisis. Food is not just essential to life, but access to healthy food is also essential for children's development, for their health, for their ability to thrive.

And so, while President Trump is taking away food from hungry kids, we have also seen economic policies that have caused the cost of food to skyrocket. The price of food and vegetables has increased by six percent since May of last year. Energy costs have increased by 23 percent since last year. And when you couple that with cuts in access to healthcare, cuts in access to food assistance, cuts in access to educational assistance, and the fact that yesterday the President of the United States failed to show up to sign a housing bill that was bipartisan, that would have helped millions of families across the United States access housing assistance, we have never seen in, I believe, modern times, an administration that is so anti-family and so anti-working family as we have seen over the last several months. It is hurting our children. It is on the backs of our people.

Meanwhile, we are back to this DOGE Subcommittee. DOGE has effectively been killed within the Administration because of the significant breaking of the law that has happened over the last year and a half of laying off workers, gutting programs, and doing so without congressional consent. Court orders have ordered them to

rehire, to rebuild, and yet this Administration continues to ignore the law.

And here we are, once again, attacking a fundamental program that supports our families. If we were actually serious about rooting out waste, fraud, and abuse, we would be investigating the 21 Inspectors General who were fired by this Administration. We would be investigating the thousands of investigators in these Federal programs who were laid off by DOGE, who are actually the people who look into waste, fraud, and abuse. If we were serious about rooting out waste, fraud, and abuse, we would be investigating the millions of dollars that this Administration just wasted on remodeling the Reflecting Pool, and which is now disintegrating before our eyes. We would be investigating what is happening with the illegal demolition of the East Wing. We would be investigating the Secretary of Defense, who not only used Federal taxpayer dollars to buy lobster and steak dinners, but just asked this body last night for billions of dollars more for an illegal war that both the House and the Senate have already voted on a war powers resolution is an illegal war.

And so, while I appreciate that today is about investigating waste, fraud, and abuse, and I appreciate the oversight on states that have records of challenges, I would also note that the five states to whom this letter was sent have Democratic Governors. It was not sent to any states with Republican Governors.

So, I think we have to ask ourselves, what is this actually about? Is this really about rooting out waste, fraud, and abuse? Or is this about taking food out of the mouths of our children?

So, I look forward to the conversation, and with that, I yield back.

Mr. BURCHETT. Thank you.

I would like to welcome our witnesses. First, we have John Walk. Mr. Walk is the Inspector General for the U.S. Department of Agriculture. Next, we have Dawn Royal, a former two-term president and current Director of the United Council on Welfare Fraud. Next, we have Rachel Greszler. Ms. Greszler is a Senior Research Fellow at the Plymouth Institute for Free Enterprise at Advancing American Freedom.

And last, we have Gina Plata—I am sorry, ma'am. I know I wanted to get it right. That is why I asked, Plata. Burchett, nobody ever gets it right. Plata-Nino. So, thank you, ma'am. And you are the Director of SNAP Policy and Advocacy at the Food Research and Action Center.

And I want to thank you all for joining us, and I look forward to your testimony.

Pursuant to Committee Rule 9(g), the witnesses will please stand and raise their right hand.

Do you solemnly swear or affirm that the testimony that you are about to give is the truth, the whole truth, and nothing but the truth, so help you God?

Mr. WALK. I do.

Ms. ROYAL. I do.

Ms. GRESZLER. I do.

Ms. PLATA-NINO. I do.

Mr. BURCHETT. Let the record show the witness has answered in the affirmative. And thank you. You all may take your seats.

And we appreciate you being here today and look forward to your testimony. Let me remind the witnesses that we have read your written statement, and it will appear in full in the hearing record. Please limit your oral statements to 5 minutes. As a reminder, please press the button on the microphone in front of you so that it is on and the Members can hear you. When you begin to speak, the light in front of you will turn green. After 4 minutes, the light will turn yellow. When the red light comes on, your 5 minutes have expired, and we would ask you to please wrap it up.

I now recognize Inspector General Walk for his opening statement. Sir, you are recognized.

**STATEMENT OF HON. JOHN WALK, INSPECTOR GENERAL
U.S. DEPARTMENT OF AGRICULTURE**

Mr. WALK. Chairman Burchett, Ranking Member Stansbury, and Members of the Subcommittee, thank you for inviting me to testify on Supplemental Nutrition Assistance Program, SNAP, fraud.

SNAP fraud is a reprehensible crime that squanders the compassion of American taxpayers who fund the program and robs from those low-income Americans who qualify for SNAP benefits to feed themselves and their families. SNAP fraud is not confined to a single individual who engages in deceptive practices to apply for SNAP benefits they are not eligible for. Perpetrators of SNAP fraud include highly organized, tech-savvy, sophisticated criminals that steal enormous sums of money. Proceeds of SNAP fraud have gone to individuals linked to terrorist groups, foreign adversary nations, and transnational criminal organizations.

SNAP fraud is not a victimless crime, although its victims are often forgotten. They are the hardworking, taxpaying American farmers, meatpackers, and truck drivers who deliver produce from farm to family. All of America's taxpayers give from the fruits of their labor to fund food assistance, showing America's goodness to less fortunate neighbors, and they are the victims of SNAP fraud.

The other victims are the vulnerable and low-income Americans who SNAP is intended to benefit, people like the woman one of my special agents told me about, a working mom of four, a SNAP recipient who discovered that her SNAP benefits were all stolen from her electronic benefits transfer or EBT card while attempting to pay for food at the grocery store. In tears, she asked how she would feed her family for the month until SNAP benefits would next be paid out. Just this week, I spoke to another victim in New York, a working father of five, whose SNAP EBT card was skimmed and benefits were remotely drained.

I have heard many stories from victims like these, working moms and dads, in my six months as Inspector General. U.S. Department of Agriculture Office of Inspector General (USDA OIG) is working hard every single day on behalf of these victims. They are why SNAP fraud matters.

With limited time, I will highlight some of the prevalent forms of SNAP fraud OIG encounters, though there are many others. EBT card skimming is a serious concern. Criminals use skimming technology to capture information such as the EBT card number

and PIN code. The data captured is then used to clone the victim's EBT card. Criminals will then cash out at the opportune time. The legitimate recipient is left without food assistance.

On this easel here is a picture of a skimmer that can be overlaid to a point-of-sale device in as little as seven seconds. The criminal now controls the EBT card and owns all the dollars that will be loaded to that card.

SNAP trafficking remains an investigatory priority. Today, there are more than 250,000 food retail stores authorized to exchange food for SNAP benefits. They then obtain Federal reimbursement for the food they sell. You can think of them as the providers in this program. Unscrupulous retailers will instead use their stores to launder SNAP benefits. An individual will exchange their EBT card for cash, and the retailer will extract the remaining value from the card or sell it.

But it is not only cash. Picture it as a store in southern California involved in an investigation by local and Federal law enforcement that OIG supported. SNAP EBT cards were trafficked for cash, exchanged with local gang members at that location for crack cocaine. The gang members then use the proceeds from those SNAP cards to purchase guns, all with tax dollars. I will just repeat that. SNAP dollars, Federal tax dollars, used to buy drugs and guns. And as the district attorney of San Diego shared, just perpetuating the violence already in some of our communities.

EBT terminal fraud is also a growing concern. This scheme allows fraudsters to impersonate an authorized retailer and direct SNAP payments to their own bank account. In a recent case, one case, the loss was \$66 million.

Deterring fraud requires exacting real consequences on those who commit fraud. OIG will continue to investigate and make arrests and support convictions. Although a strong law enforcement response is critical, we cannot pay and chase our way to stopping SNAP fraud. To be effective, we need to guard the front door by ensuring that proper internal controls at USDA and state-administering agencies are in place to prevent fraud. Adopting modern technology to verify identity and other applicant information before making payments is crucial.

In addition to the ability to identify and prevent SNAP fraud, we would benefit tremendously from improved information sharing between the Federal Government and the states. Although USDA maintains data on authorized retailers, individual states maintain data on their own program participants, and access to this information would allow Federal oversight to evaluate the effectiveness of internal controls at the applicant level and help fix vulnerabilities.

Finally, low-tech security measures associated with SNAP are outmatched by high-tech schemes. Fraud identification, detection, and prevention systems should be updated to meet the tactics and tools of modern fraudsters.

Thank you again for the opportunity to testify before this Subcommittee on this important topic. I would be pleased to answer any questions you may have.

Mr. BURCHETT. Thank you, General.

Ms. Royal, you are recognized, ma'am.

**STATEMENT OF MS. DAWN ROYAL
FORMER PRESIDENT AND CURRENT DIRECTOR
UNITED COUNCIL ON WELFARE FRAUD**

Ms. ROYAL. Chairman Burchett, Ranking Member Stansbury, other Members of the Subcommittee, thank you for the opportunity to appear before you today.

The United Council on Welfare Fraud is the only national organization of investigators dedicated to protecting public assistance from fraud, waste, and abuse. We are the professionals dedicated to the prevention, investigation, and prosecution of fraud, safeguarding billions of taxpayer dollars to ensure our Nation's welfare programs remain strong to assist those in need.

I appear before you today as a certified welfare fraud investigator with nearly two decades of experience, representing hundreds of investigators who spend their days in the trenches fighting the war against fraud, also advocating to ensure the laws and regulations that are supposed to be supporting these efforts do so.

Unfortunately, too many of the safeguards of our Nation's SNAP program have been weakened, delayed, or inconsistently implemented. The result is predictable. Benefits have been exploited, and public confidence has eroded.

I first had the honor of appearing before this Subcommittee nearly a year and a half ago to discuss the broader issues of fraud. We provided our unique perspective from those dealing with these issues and detailed our recommendations to this panel, many of which were later echoed in the Committee's own recommendations, so thank you on behalf of The United Council on Welfare Fraud (UCOWF) and the beneficiaries we are protecting.

My message today with the focus on SNAP, 15 months after the Subcommittee's first hearing, the passage of H.R. 1, and in light of the nationwide fraud discoveries is more direct. The time for reflection has passed. Action is needed now. SNAP is a vital program, but it is broken. Congress has held hearings, GAO has issued reports, and for its part, UCOWF has submitted detailed recommendations to congressional committees, including this one, to the White House Task Force to Eliminate Fraud, and several Cabinet agencies. The bottom line, SNAP and the beneficiaries who rely on it need you to act.

So, what is missing? Where is the disconnect? Action, accountability, and support. Growing up, like you, my family taught me that actions speak louder than words, but even more so what actions we take on a regular basis form our habits, and that creates our character, illustrating our priorities. When every week brings another screaming headline on another uncovered fraudster, what does this tell us about where we stand on curbing the incidence of SNAP fraud? If we care, as a people, we act. If we do not, the results are predictable.

I would like to share a brief anecdote. One of my colleagues recently brought a case to our attention that illustrates several of the ongoing problems in SNAP. One address, a one-bedroom efficiency, had 27 SNAP and 12 Medicaid beneficiaries. Logic would suggest it is impossible for all of those beneficiaries to live in a one-bedroom apartment, but it is—this is the program we have fostered. These are the types of circumstances that we are dealing with.

Or take another case that is a remnant of the COVID era, long after the end of the public health emergency. There is nothing an investigator, based on current Federal policy, can do to prevent a SNAP beneficiary from using their EBT benefits to have eligible items delivered to someone else in another state. So, a recipient with an EBT card, issued from Nebraska, can order a case of Red Bull on Walmart, Amazon, DoorDash, or Uber Eats, and have it delivered to, or picked up, by someone in Kentucky. This was permitted during the pandemic, but it is one of the few COVID-era policies that has not been rescinded, and it is fraud. Benefits delivery should be restricted to the beneficiary's address of record. It is one of the few safeguards the program has, and convenience of this sort only encourages fraudulent behavior.

My written testimony that builds on UCOWF's comments last year—and I promise I will not go point by point but rather refer it to you, as it represents a perspective of those fighting the daily battles for all of us. Further, it also serves as a blueprint for the work that still needs to be accomplished not only to protect the millions of SNAP beneficiaries but also the taxpayers underwriting the program.

We urge Congress to legislate where authority is needed and protect funds for program integrity. We urge USDA to fully implement the laws and uniformly enforce its regulations. Similarly, Centers for Medicare & Medicaid Services (CMS) must resolve the uncertainty fragmenting SNAP and Medicaid cases due to its inaction. To enforce all of this, the Subcommittee, in coordination with authorizers and appropriators, should require written plans with named officials, measurable milestones, public reporting, and consequences for missed deadlines.

Program integrity and compassion are not competing values. Strong oversight of SNAP program protects taxpayers and recipients. Both parties have a stake in the continuing viability of this program.

Thank you, Mr. Chairman. The dedicated professionals at UCOWF are committed to helping you and your colleagues preserve SNAP and the rest of our country's social welfare programs. And I welcome questions from you and your colleagues.

Mr. BURCHETT. Thank you, Ms. Royal.

Ms. Greszler, you are recognized for 5 minutes, ma'am.

**STATEMENT OF MS. RACHEL GRESZLER
SENIOR RESEARCH FELLOW
ADVANCING AMERICAN FREEDOM**

Ms. GRESZLER. Chairman Burchett, Ranking Member Stansbury, and Members of the Committee, good morning, and thank you for the opportunity to be here today. My name is Rachel Greszler, and I am a Senior Research Fellow at Advancing American Freedom.

The American people must report every dollar they earn to the Federal Government, and they face penalties, audits, and potential prosecution if they do not pay the right amount. Yet, there is remarkably little accountability for the \$4.2 trillion taxpayer dollars that Washington redistributes across about 100 Federal benefit programs. This lack of transparency and accountability is the central problem underlying waste, fraud, and abuse.

A hundred and eighty-four billion dollars, that is the amount that the Federal Government reported last year in improper payments, and it is equivalent to about eight weeks of gas and groceries for every household in America. That figure does not even include programs that are not measured or fraud that goes undetected. The GAO reported that taxpayers lose up to \$521 billion per year. At the upper end, that is almost two months of housing payments for every household in America. It is understandable that many hardworking Americans are frustrated when they struggle to afford ordinary expenses, even as the government fails to safeguard their taxes.

Today, we are talking about the SNAP program, which has exploded over the past 15 years. This growth cannot be explained solely based on need. The poverty rate has declined since 2008, and yet the percentage of people on SNAP benefits has increased over 50 percent. With the explosion in spending has come a five-fold increase in improper payments, a 10.9 percent improper payment rate last year, equal to \$10.2 billion. The incentive problem is obvious. The states decide what to spend, and the Federal taxpayer foots the bill. It does not matter whether a state has a three percent improper payment rate, like South Dakota, or 25 percent, like Alaska. The Federal Government pays it all.

H.R. 1 included a huge win for SNAP accountability by requiring states to share in the costs if their improper payments exceed six percent. This is a crucial step toward protecting taxpayer dollars, and it should be extended to other Federal programs.

It is important to note that much of the outright fraud that occurs, such as that that has been discussed by Inspector Walk and Ms. Royal, often is not counted in the improper payments because it happens after the benefits are delivered. Legal abuse of programs, such as millionaires qualifying for benefits because of eligibility loopholes, also is not included in improper payments.

The Trump Administration and this Congress have taken unprecedented steps toward reducing waste, fraud, and abuse, and many of those actions are in line with my four proposals to establish radical transparency and meaningful accountability for taxpayers' dollars.

First, follow the money. The Federal Government should account for the money it spends as carefully as it accounts for the dollars it collects. We cannot reduce fraud if we cannot follow the money.

Second, close eligibility loopholes. Congress should end legal abuse of Federal welfare programs by eliminating broad-based categorical eligibility, which allows individuals to automatically qualify for benefits based on something as trivial as receiving a brochure. The Department of Agriculture estimated that this loophole allowed 5.6 million individuals who were not eligible under Federal standards to nonetheless receive SNAP benefits. The No Welfare for the Wealthy Act of 2025 would reduce this abuse by requiring households to meet Federal standards for SNAP benefits.

Third, measure improper payments accurately and consistently. Many programs are not measured at all, others are measured inconsistently, and some recent administrations have intentionally undercounted improper payments. Congress should require all distributors of Federal benefits to comply with Federal measurement

standards and data requests. Failure to do so should trigger cost-sharing or disqualification from distributing benefits.

And fourth is to expand skin-in-the-game accountability. Without consequences, laws aimed at protecting taxpayers' dollars will fail. Policymakers should expand H.R. 1 SNAP provisions by imposing fix-it-or-fund-it-yourself requirements across all Federal programs. Congress' constitutional authority over the purse does not end when taxpayer dollars leave the Treasury. Every Federal dollar that is spent should be subject to the same scrutiny and accountability that is required of taxpayers.

Thank you.

Mr. BURCHETT. Thank you, ma'am.

Ms. Plata-Nino is recognized.

**STATEMENT OF MS. GINA PLATA-NINO (MINORITY WITNESS)
DIRECTOR OF SNAP POLICY AND ADVOCACY
FOOD RESEARCH AND ACTION CENTER**

Ms. PLATA-NINO. Good morning, Chairman, Ranking Member, and Members of the Committee. Thank you for the opportunity to testify today.

I am an attorney in good standing, and I have represented clients who needed help accessing SNAP because the process was too burdensome. I have seen firsthand the daily struggles families face when food assistance is delayed, denied, or difficult to obtain. I have also had the opportunity to serve the Federal Government and saw the hard work state agencies do to help programs operate more efficiently and effectively.

I want to begin with a simple point. Program integrity and food access are not competing goals. Congress can protect taxpayers' dollars and protect families from hunger at the same time. But to do that, we must be precise about the problem we are trying to solve. SNAP is not an abstract line item. It is grocery money that allows a grandmother to buy food after paying for prescriptions. It is a support that helps a parent stretch a low paycheck through the end of the month. It is the difference between a child arriving at school ready to learn and a child trying to focus on an empty stomach.

In 2024, over 47 million people in the United States live in food-insecure households, including over 14 million children. Those numbers represent American families making impossible choices every day. SNAP responds to that need. It served over 41 million people in Fiscal Year 2024, and most SNAP households include a child, an older adult, a person with a disability. Many participants work in jobs that pay too little or offer too few stable hours. Others turn to SNAP during a layoff, a health crisis, a caregiving emergency, or a temporary loss of income. SNAP helps people weather hardship, and it helps them move forward.

That is why accuracy matters. Every dollar should reach the people who qualify for help. But we must not confuse payment errors with fraud. Fraud involves intentional wrongdoing. Payment errors often involve complicated rules, changing work hours, missing paperwork, outdated systems, or agency mistakes. Treating every hour as fraud misdiagnoses the problem. It also drives policies that

can punish eligible families instead of fixing the administrative systems that need support.

SNAP already has one of the most rigorous integrity systems in the Federal Government. Applicants complete detailed applications, participate in interviews, submit documentation, and have their information checked against Federal and state databases. States conduct ongoing reviews, and the SNAP quality control system reexamines tens of thousands of cases each year. When states identify errors, they must correct them and, where required, submit corrective action plans.

The greatest fraud threat facing SNAP households, as my colleague said, today is organized benefit theft. Criminals skim, clone, and phish EBT cards, then drain benefits from households that have already proven their eligibility, costing billions of dollars in taxpayers' money. Behind every claim is a household that expected to buy groceries and instead found an empty account. Congress should focus on the vulnerabilities that actually harm families and taxpayers. That means accelerating chip-enabled EBT cards.

Congress should also protect the administrative capacity that makes integrity possible. States reduce errors when they can hire trained eligibility workers, modernize outdated systems, answer phones, process documents on time, and conduct meaningful quality reviews. Cutting administrative support, as H.R. 1 has done, by shifting an additional 25 percent to states while demanding greater accuracy runs counter to the goal of accountability.

Finally, Congress should evaluate SNAP performance with a full set of measures, payment accuracy, benefit theft, timeliness, access, churn, customer service, and participation among eligible households. A state can lower an error rate by making the program harder to access, but that does not mean it has improved integrity. It may simply mean eligible people gave up, missed an interview, could not reach a call center, or lost food assistance because of paperwork.

The right standard is clear. SNAP should be accurate, secure, timely, and accessible. Families should not have to prove their hunger repeatedly through unnecessary barriers. States should not have to choose between service delivery and fiscal survivors. Taxpayers should not expect oversight that targets real risk, not policies that shift costs onto families with the least ability to bear them.

SNAP works when it reaches eligible people and protects public resources. We can strengthen both. I urge you to invest in secure payment technology, restore and preserve strong Federal-state administrative support, measure what truly matters, and keep the human impact at the center of every integrity discussion that has cost over four million individuals losing SNAP benefits since the passage of H.R. 1.

Thank you, and I look forward to your questions.

Mr. BURCHETT. Thank you, ma'am. And I will commend all you all. You got it done in 5 minutes, which is kind of incredible. So, you all get your rewards in heaven, all right? Because this is a subcommittee. We do not even have food back here. Anyway, thank you all. And I now recognize myself for 5 minutes of questions.

This is for all you all. According to nonpartisan anti-fraud experts, improved data sharing is needed to better identify and prevent fraud in Federal benefit programs, especially those administered by the states. The 21 states have, for the past year, refused to provide food stamp data with the Department of Agriculture. The Agriculture Department identified \$3 billion in potential fraud just from the food stamp data submitted by 29 states. That includes benefits going to 186,000 deceased individuals and the 442,000 beneficiaries with fake Social Security numbers.

Based on these results, is it fair to assume the Trump Administration could identify additional fraud if it had the data from 21 noncompliant states? Ms. Plata-Nino, thank you, ma'am.

Ms. PLATA-NINO. Plata-Nino.

Mr. BURCHETT. Say it one more time for me.

Ms. PLATA-NINO. Plata-Nino.

Mr. BURCHETT. They have told me this back here, and I am just terrible. I apologize.

Ms. PLATA-NINO. That is okay.

Mr. BURCHETT. I am going to get it.

Ms. PLATA-NINO. That is all right.

Thank you for the question. The Privacy Act of 1974 and the Paperwork Reduction of 1980 creates a balance between Congress and the Executive branch to make sure that we protect the privacy of Americans. The data that USDA handles and the states handle has the high rigorous quality control measures that are important to protect the safety of American families.

The data request that is being asked goes above and beyond that. It asks for five years of Americans' families' data, including Health Insurance Portability and Accountability Act (HIPAA)-protected information, whether or not they were eligible, whether or not they applied. So, think about the 15-year-old child and single mother who applied during the pandemic, and right after, they found a job. Now, that 15-year-old child with many medical needs, that information will go over to an entity that we do not know what sort of protections and privacy will go forward.

The quality control program, as USDA has stated, has rigorous control measures, and the data that is currently being sent by those states is randomized and anonymized to protect privacy of American individuals.

Mr. BURCHETT. Thank you, ma'am.

Ms. Greszler?

Ms. GRESZLER. Yes, it is absolutely fair to assume that you could catch significantly more fraud if you take 50 different siloed databases and compile them together. And just one example of that is that the same Social Security number could be used to claim food stamps in 50 states plus the District of Columbia. And none of those states will know that because they do not have access to the other one.

Mr. BURCHETT. There is no cohesive force between the two. There is no—as we found with the IRS and a lot of our agencies, the computers just do not hook up. Is that what you are telling me?

Ms. GRESZLER. Yes, they are not looking across them. And essentially, the Federal Government is granting a blank check to the states to apply these programs, and yet they are not returning the

data for the recent requests to be able to ensure the integrity of those dollars.

Mr. BURCHETT. Right. Thank you. Ms. Royal?

Ms. ROYAL. Ms. Greszler did an excellent job of answering that question. Of course, more data is going to be able for us to identify more fraud. The trouble right now, states do not have access to information if a recipient or applicant is already receiving benefits in another state. There is a question on the application that requires the applicant to provide that information. You know, have you received benefits in another state? If so which one? If they mark "no" to that, then as an investigator, there is no way for me to contact another state to verify that. So having access to the data, making sure that benefits are not already being issued by another state and preventing dual issuance would be a significant savings to the taxpayer.

Mr. BURCHETT. Inspector General?

Mr. WALK. Thank you, Mr. Chairman. I can just give a couple of examples. So, with OIG—and I will just speak from OIG's perspective. I know USDA is doing a separate data request. But about a year ago under my predecessor, OIG requested data from the top ten SNAP states in terms of spending in order to review integrity and quality of state data. We have released one report very recently from Ohio and found \$13.3 million in anomalies that would not have otherwise been found because we were able to work with the state. The state, before that report even became public, started working on those anomalies to be able to figure out what was actually going on.

Puerto Rico, although not one of the state agencies that we were looking at, their comptroller general looked at their own data and came up with—found \$150 million of SNAP benefits that went to dead people, 38,000 dead people that received that nutrition dollars. And almost immediately, we went down to Puerto Rico and met with the comptroller general and with their Inspector General (IG) to talk through how we can help from a Federal perspective to exercise Federal oversight.

Because the states have this participant data, if we do not have it, we cannot even find the vulnerabilities, much less start to collaborate about how we can go about changing it. And today, we have six of those ten states that have provided the data. Four have continued to object after a year. And I recently ordered subpoenas for that data, and we are still waiting on it.

Mr. BURCHETT. Okay. Thank you. I have run over a little bit. As Chairman, I am allowed to do that apparently, but I hate it when they do that. So, I am going to recognize my Ranking—no, you want me to go to the next Democrat? Okay.

Yes, go ahead, brother. You are recognized.

Mr. WALKINSHAW. Thank you, Mr. Chairman.

Mr. Walk, were you involved in the development of Project 2025? Did you have any involvement in it?

Mr. WALK. I was—

Mr. WALKINSHAW. It is a yes or no.

Mr. WALK. Yes, I was a volunteer.

Mr. WALKINSHAW. Limited involvement maybe?

Mr. WALK. I was a volunteer, sir.

Mr. WALKINSHAW. Okay. Before you were nominated as IG, you were a political appointee, USDA?

Mr. WALK. I was actually the judicial officer at USDA since December 2020.

Mr. WALKINSHAW. Were you a political appointee at any point in your career in the Trump Administration?

Mr. WALK. Sure, I was a——

Mr. WALKINSHAW. Okay.

Mr. WALK [continuing]. Political appointee after about—after nearly ten years as a career employee at DHS.

Mr. WALKINSHAW. Before your nomination as IG, did you have any experience specifically in auditing? Did you ever serve as an auditor?

Mr. WALK. When I was at the Homeland Security Department, one of my first assignments as an attorney was to provide advice to——

Mr. WALKINSHAW. You provided legal advice——

Mr. WALK. About——

Mr. WALKINSHAW [continuing]. To auditors?

Mr. WALK. About our inspector general audits.

Mr. WALKINSHAW. So, you never conducted any audits?

Mr. WALK. No.

Mr. WALKINSHAW. Did you ever work in an IG's office as a deputy staff member, ever work in any IG office at any level before your nomination?

Mr. WALK. No, I did not work at an IG's office.

Mr. WALKINSHAW. Okay. During your tenure as IG at USDA, have you recused yourself from any matters involving decisions you made during your tenure previously as an advisor at the agency?

Mr. WALK. I have not.

Mr. WALKINSHAW. You have not found the need to, or you have made a decision that you are not going to recuse, you do not think you need to recuse?

Mr. WALK. As——

Mr. WALKINSHAW. If you were involved in anything or just——

Mr. WALK. Sure, I have spoken with counsel and—as well as the career ethics official at USDA, and there have been no issues raised that has required my recusal based on their counsel.

Mr. WALKINSHAW. Interesting, okay. Your predecessor, IG Fong, had 22 years of experience before she became IG. She had IG experience before that. Bipartisan credibility, Mr. Chairman, you can go back and watch the videos in this Committee. I stood in this room and watched Democrats and Republicans praise her work. She was fired by President Trump because he does not want independent IGs with experience. He wants you, no IG experience, no audit experience, a political actor and a political appointee. SNAP fraud is a real issue, and that is why we need qualified, independent, nonpartisan, nonpolitical IGs. The Trump Administration has systematically fired them.

But let us talk about some waste, fraud and abuse. I went down to the Reflecting Pool yesterday, to check out the President's new project. This guy here—and I do not like to judge a book by its cover; appearances can be deceiving—but sometimes if it walks like a duck and quacks like a duck and dresses like a duck, it is a

crook. This is John Cafaro. He is a crook. He pled guilty to bribery and campaign finance violations, longtime Republican donor, got a \$1.7 million no-bid contract to filter the water at the Reflecting Pool.

I went down to check it out yesterday. Somewhat ironically—I did not believe this when I was told it—his company’s name is Greenwater Services. The President promised us beautiful blue water, gave a contract to this crook who gave us green water, algae, and dying ducks.

Mr. Chairman, at some point this Committee will have to address the waste, fraud, the abuse that is taking place in this Administration. The wolves are in the house. They are in the White House. The waste, the fraud, and abuse is happening under our own eyes, and this DOGE Committee, committed to government efficiency, hears no evil and sees no evil because this is the President’s buddy from Mar-a-Lago, said he is a great guy.

The President and this Congress, this Republican Congress, have literally taken food from the mouths of hungry children, and they are putting it in the pockets of crooks like this. If that is not fraudulent, Mr. Chairman, I do not know what is.

I yield back.

Mr. BURCHETT. Thank you.

I now yield to 5 minutes to Mr. Cloud.

Mr. CLOUD. Thank you, Mr. Chairman, and I appreciate you holding this hearing. Us getting rid of the waste, fraud, and abuse in our government is extremely important. Ms. Greszler, I think you mentioned \$184 billion in fraud in just a year. I am on the Appropriations Committee and only two of our appropriations bills that fund the government are over that amount, so that is significant with what we could be doing or returning to the American people if we could rein in the waste, fraud, and abuse.

I am also constantly amazed by how much we try to measure compassion by how many dollars go out the door, how many people are on the rolls without looking to whether it is going to accomplish those needs. I appreciate, Mr. Walk, what you had pointed out, that some of these dollars are actually being used fraudulently by gangs to buy drugs and guns and nefarious activities, not to mention some going overseas to bad actors and all those different kind of things. It is important that we make sure that it is going to do exactly what it was supposed to do.

I note that SNAP has almost doubled in the last five years. Meanwhile, the poverty rate in our country is roughly where it was about five years ago within a percentage. And so, it seems like maybe there is some overhead. Recently, just in the data shared, as the Chairman had mentioned, \$3 billion a year in potential waste, fraud, and abuse just among the states that have shared information, 186 deceased individuals who are on the rolls. Now, if we take those off the rolls and the numbers of SNAP beneficiaries went down, what you would hear is, oh, children are not being fed, from the left, but actually, we are just trying to make sure that we are not sending money to people who are not alive anymore.

There are 356- to 500,000 duplicate enrollees, so some of these are people who are enrolled in multiple states. I think, Ms. Greszler, you had talked about that, some up to six states that we

know of. And this is of the states sharing information. I would think that those states not sharing information, that potentially the problem is worse, and maybe that is not why they are sharing information. Who knows?

You know, Ms. Royal, you talked about the checkbox that, you know, all you have to do is say, you know, are you not receiving—us hoping that those committing fraud would be honest on their application, right? This is the big check we have.

Ms. Greszler, I was wondering if you could speak to, and maybe we will go down the line, you mentioned some of them, but some of the protections that we could put in place to make sure that the SNAP benefits are going to those who are truly in need and that we are making sure that the Federal taxpayers—I was really struck by your thought of what we require the information of those paying taxes into this. Those who are basically footing the bill for SNAP, we require to know every dollar that they are making. But those who are receiving the benefits, it does not seem like we have that same sort of—

Ms. GRESZLER. Yes, thank you.

Mr. CLOUD. Okay.

Ms. GRESZLER. And I want to go over two things, and the first is looking at and addressing the benefits that the government delivers the same as the taxes it collects. And so, what we need to do is establish some new 1099 reporting forms. You know, if you receive a Social Security benefit, you file that with your taxes each year. We should be able to have every benefit that goes out the door, a beginning-to-end accounting of that. And then you can have a situation where automatically this gets detected.

The Department of Justice announced a \$6.5 billion fraud take-down yesterday, 455 dependents, healthcare programs. Some of those were stolen identities, and then the individuals had benefits claimed on the stolen identity's individual's behalf. Well, if you do not have that individual claiming on their form that they received that benefit, that is going to be an automatic trigger to look back to the next step, the next pathway in this, you know, beginning-to-end accounting to say, were you the point of fraud, or was it that next one? But you should be able to follow that end to end.

And the second is getting rid of these eligibility loopholes. If you look at the seven states that actually use the Federal standards instead of this categorical eligibility, they have 50 percent fewer people on SNAP, and they have the exact same poverty rate.

Mr. CLOUD. It seems to me that states are actually incentivized to just get more people on the rolls, whether it is valid or not.

Ms. GRESZLER. It is money into the state, and they pay \$0 of it.

Mr. CLOUD. Yes, Ms. Royal, did you want to speak to that?

Ms. ROYAL. Having access to the National Accuracy Clearinghouse, which is a nationwide database that would provide information to states to prevent or identify dual enrollment, would be critical.

The next thing, ID verification to make sure that a person applying for the benefits is not deceased, is who they say they are, and we can make sure, again, that the benefits are issued accurately.

Ending self-attestation. Someone can go in and submit an application and answer a question with a shoulder shrug and still re-

ceive benefits. So, verifying the information provided for eligibility would be significant.

Increasing the retention amount. So, when a state has determined that benefits have been issued to a household that they should not have received, when the state recovers that, they are able to retain a portion of that money. And increasing that percentage to incentivize states to actually identify and prosecute or prevent and detect fraud would be substantial.

And finally, requiring that retention money be used for the prevention, detection, and prosecution of fraud. Often, many states just roll that into their general fund, so investigators continue to be understaffed and under-sourced.

Mr. CLOUD. Thank you. My time is up, Chairman. I yield back.

Mr. BURCHETT. Thank you.

Mr. TIMMONS, you are recognized.

Mr. TIMMONS. Thank you, Mr. Chairman. I want to thank you for holding this hearing.

There is a huge opportunity to get government benefits to people that need them and deny government benefits to people that do not qualify for them, and it is an incredibly important issue. Hundreds of billions of dollars every decade are lost to waste, fraud, and abuse.

And we have actually been working on a bill that actually passed this Committee, passed this Committee unanimously. That does not happen often. But it is called the TAB Act, Timely and Accurate Benefits. And what it does is it uses technology to confirm that a person does not make enough money. And what you do is, you log into a website. You then go to your bank. You then go to your Cash App, your Zelle, your Venmo, and you would then get benefits immediately. And if you make too much money, you do not get benefits. And it is just using technology to make sure that we are being efficient with our resources.

Ms. Royal, are you familiar with this proposal?

Ms. ROYAL. I am not familiar with the proposal, but based on what you described, I am going to get familiar with it because it sounds wonderful.

Mr. TIMMONS. So, the Congressional Budget Office scored it as costing a half a million dollars over a ten year window, which I think is ridiculous. There was a pilot program where it was implemented in Missouri, and it saved 20 percent. It saved 20 percent. We spend \$1.5 trillion on social safety nets. Twenty percent of that is a lot of money. And over a ten year budget window, it is \$2-plus trillion. And again, that is not money that—it is money that we could put to better use because it is people that need it.

And so, I think that we need to get the TAB Act on the Floor, and we need to get it passed, because giving states the ability to get a better picture of an individual's earning capacity is step one. And this is actually really exciting because the first thing we do is we use technology to get a better understanding of whether people actually qualify for it. And the second part is more critically important, and that is we end the benefits cliff. So right now, you got people that are gaming the system, and it is—I would too. If I needed these benefits, I would game the system.

But if you make more than a certain amount of money, you lose all your benefits, and that is not helpful. You are not helping people get out of the situation they are in. So, if you stratify them to say, all right, you are going to get this, this amount for now. We could even give more at the beginning and create an incentive structure to get out of whatever situation they are in to end the benefits cliff. We cannot do that now because it is too complicated, but with technology, we could.

Ms. Plata-Nino, does that make sense to you to use technology to get people benefits faster and then create incentive structures to help them get back on their feet? Does that make sense?

Ms. PLATA-NINO. I think that is what every person who is applying for SNAP benefits would like. No one wants to be in the program. If the economy and jobs was strong, individuals would not be in the program.

Mr. TIMMONS. And I think we agree that we have an obligation to help people that are down on their luck. I mean, that is what these social safety nets are for, but they are not designed for generational cyclical poverty. If a grandmother, a mother, and a daughter have all experienced the need for SNAP benefits, our social safety nets are not working, I mean, because that is not the desired outcome. It should be a transitory opportunity for them to get back on their feet.

Ms. Greszler, what are your—I mean, this makes sense. Is this not just a no-brainer? We have the ability to use this technology. It has been tested, and we could literally transform our social safety nets. Does that make sense?

Ms. GRESZLER. Absolutely. And we have seen yesterday with the Department of Justice's announcement of fraud that there are advanced techniques that are being used, and yet there are still many silos that are out there. And so, in the same way that we need the data to no longer be siloed so that you can also deliver benefits more quickly, we also need the welfare programs to not be siloed. So, the individuals—it has always got to be work-oriented welfare. And oftentimes, you do face these benefit cliffs, and you may not know that if I take this benefit, I am going to lose this benefit. And so, to have a coordinated system—Congress has allowed Utah to do it because they were grandfathered in but currently prevents the other states from adopting this like one-door model that actually helps individuals get into work instead of trapping them in a maze of welfare.

Mr. TIMMONS. And we have the ability to do all of this, and this Committee has seen it appropriate to pass a bill unanimously, and it is currently waiting a vote on the Floor. The TAB Act has the ability to transform our social safety nets and to save billions and billions and hundreds of billions of dollars. So, we are going to be pushing to get a vote on that on the Floor.

And again, using technology to get benefits quickly to people that deserve them and deny individuals that are trying to take advantage of the system, it is a no-brainer, and we have to do this. We are \$40 trillion in debt. We are running out of opportunities to start saving money.

So, Mr. Chairman, I really appreciate you holding this hearing, and with that, I yield back. Thanks.

Mr. BURCHETT. Thank you, Mr. Timmons.

Mr. Burlison, you are recognized for 5 minutes.

Mr. BURLISON. Thank you, Mr. Chairman.

The American people expect their tax dollars to be spent wisely. They expect us to be stewards, wise stewards of the money that they work so hard to put food on the table and then send some to this government, and for us to be wasteful with those dollars is not acceptable.

But unfortunately, for many in the Federal Government, your hard-earned dollars are an afterthought. That is part of the reason why we see billions of dollars lost to waste, fraud, and abuse, and why we have a \$39 trillion debt. It is clear that many programs are not working as intended, and the American people deserve better.

Over the past year, the Trump Administration has taken meaningful steps, and this body has taken meaningful steps to make sure that those dollars are going to be put in the hands of the people that truly need them.

And so, my first question is to you, Ms. Plata-Nino. In your testimony, you emphasized the importance of distinguishing between fraud and administrative errors, but the USDA Inspector General and multiple audits have documented that organized fraud rings are stealing hundreds of millions, sometimes billions of dollars. Do you believe those reports?

Ms. PLATA-NINO. I believe he was talking about skimming where there is no way to measure that, especially after the government stopped doing reimbursement and instead stopped taking claims.

Mr. BURLISON. So, you do not believe the information is accurate?

Ms. PLATA-NINO. Not fully.

Mr. BURLISON. Really? So, we have three panelists here that are all experts that have studied this. You are saying that they do not know what they are talking about?

Ms. PLATA-NINO. There is underreported data in terms of how many millions of dollars, if not billions, have been stolen from vulnerable Americans in terms of skimming, but there is no data to really ascertain the full amount.

Mr. BURLISON. Okay. I think we could kind of put blinders on. I mean, all of us could put blinders on and continue to mount up \$39 trillion in debt, but I am not going to do that. I am going to focus on—let me ask you this question. Only 29 states have provided their data. Should all of the states at least provide data back to Congress about how that money is being spent?

Ms. PLATA-NINO. The SNAP program does have a high-quality control program, and states have been historically providing the data in order to ascertain high-quality control measures. The data that is being asked is in violation of the Privacy Act and the Paper Reduction Act. The data is incredibly sensitive, and it is not necessarily—

Mr. BURLISON. Apparently, most of the states are fine. Most of the states are being responsible. They are responding because they see the problem.

Ms. Plata-Nino, let me ask you this question. Is \$39 trillion debt, is that acceptable to you?

Ms. PLATA-NINO. It is unacceptable that we still have over
40—

Mr. BURLISON. Do you know how much that is per taxpayer?

Ms. PLATA-NINO. [continuing]. Million people in—

Mr. BURLISON. Do you have any idea how much each taxpayer in America, if they had to pay right now, what that would be? I will tell you.

Ms. PLATA-NINO. I am an expert on food insecurity, sir.

Mr. BURLISON. It is \$356,000. If you care about the national debt, if you care about the money that is coming out of this building, you should care about the fact that every hardworking American who is trying to put food on the table at the end of the day has to somehow pay \$356,000 for all of the misuse of funds that this Congress and previous Congresses have made. I do not find it acceptable. And we are trying to do everything we can to unwind this clock and undo the damage that previous Congresses have done to not just the American people today but future generations. And to demonize that work, I think, is unacceptable.

Mr. WALK. Thank you for your service as an Inspector General. Can you describe the scale of the threat, based on the investigations your office has conducted, on the sophisticated organized crime that is occurring that we are seeing with the SNAP program?

Mr. WALK. I think it is very large scale. We, in terms of skimming that requires some kind of sophistication, it requires organization, and so we are seeing a lot of what Baltic transnational criminal organizations involved in skimming. That money oftentimes goes overseas. We also know that in some—in many of our investigations, or—we have seen ties of individuals, subjects, that have had ties to known or suspected terrorists. So, it very much is a sophisticated—

Mr. BURLISON. In which countries do you see that activity the most? From which countries? Are they organizing, scheming?

Mr. WALK. Well, we see a lot of skimming from Romania.

Mr. BURLISON. From Romania. When you talk to the American people about this, how do you think they feel, to find out that their dollars are not even going to their neighbor in need, they are going to some fraud, organized crime syndicate out of Romania?

Mr. WALK. Well, I actually had a conversation with a victim just this week. I was in a store in New York, and this father of five told me he was skimmed more than once. The card was replaced, and he was skimmed again. He showed me on his device that—how the money got into his account. At about midnight, they were sitting on that account. They had already cloned the number, apparently, because they were able to skim all the money deposited by 7 a.m., seven hours.

Mr. BURLISON. That is unacceptable.

Mr. WALK. Seven hours.

Mr. BURLISON. Thank you for your work in trying to fix it. I yield back.

Mr. BURCHETT. Chairlady [sic] Stansbury, you are recognized, ma'am.

Ms. STANSBURY. All right, well, I appreciate the conversation. I always find these conversations about public benefits interesting. Especially as somebody who grew up in a low-income family and

a low-income community, I always find it fascinating to hear how people talk about low-income people.

But let me just start out with some facts. Can any of our panelists here answer the question, by dollar, what are the top three causes of improper payments, waste, fraud, and abuse in SNAP? Nobody wants to volunteer? Top three.

Ms. GRESZLER. Number one would be eligibility errors.

Ms. STANSBURY. Wrong. It is improper payments. It is improper payments, it is intentional SNAP fraud, and the third is criminal organizations who are actually explicitly stealing people's SNAP benefits. That is what is the top three causes of SNAP fraud and the loss of Federal taxpayer dollars. It is actual criminal organizations. Does anyone on the panel know what the penalties are for committing SNAP fraud? Raise your hand. Anyone know? Yes, please, Ms. Royal?

Ms. ROYAL. There are different penalties. An individual who is found guilty of committing SNAP fraud is subject to criminal prosecution, incarceration, fines, and restitution.

Ms. STANSBURY. Yes, so it is—

Ms. ROYAL. Somebody who is found guilty of an intentional program violation is subject to disqualification, either 12 months, 24 months, permanent, or a ten year, other special disqualification penalties.

Ms. STANSBURY. Excellent, yes. And in fact, in some cases, with extreme fraud, can be up to \$250,000 and 20 years in prison.

All right. Who can answer about what the average individual receives per month in SNAP benefits?

Ms. Plata-Nino?

Ms. PLATA-NINO. For a household of two, it is less than \$320 a month.

Ms. STANSBURY. And about per person, what would you say?

Ms. PLATA-NINO. It is about \$200.

Ms. STANSBURY. Yes, so it depends on the household and the beneficiaries, but when you average it out, according to the USDA, it comes out to between about \$174 and \$177 per person per month. And so, when you break that down, that is about \$6 a day, right? Six dollars a day. Can anyone answer, who is the number one beneficiary of SNAP benefits?

Ms. Plata-Nino?

Ms. PLATA-NINO. Retailers, because the money goes straight into the retailers' stores and then goes and offers up into the local economy, raising taxes and increasing wages.

Ms. STANSBURY. But in terms of the actual beneficiaries, in terms of—

Ms. PLATA-NINO. Children.

Ms. STANSBURY [continuing]. The people who receive the SNAP benefits, but yes, the economic—

Ms. PLATA-NINO. It is children followed—

Ms. STANSBURY [continuing]. Downstream impacts—

Ms. PLATA-NINO. Yes, it is children, followed by older adults and people with disabilities.

Ms. STANSBURY. Exactly. Thirty-nine percent of SNAP beneficiaries are children under 18 years old, not fraudsters, children; ten percent, people living with disabilities; 20 percent, older adults

over 60. The vast majority of SNAP recipients are not committing fraud. They are children, they are people living with disabilities, and they are seniors.

Now, I am going to save you because I know many people do not want to share this publicly, but I would ask if any of you have actually been on SNAP benefits. And I want to say publicly, there is no shame in being on SNAP benefits because it is a program that was created to help people who are struggling. It is to help grandparents who are taking care of children. It is to help take care of kids who are in the foster care system. It is there so that when a mom goes through a divorce and she loses her job and is having a hard time, she can take care of her kids. That is what the SNAP program exists for. It is a bridge. It does not even cover the cost.

I would like to know, can any single person on this panel feed your family for \$174 a month? Anybody? Can anybody in this room feed your family for \$174 a month? Anybody? Not a single hand in the room? Yes, okay. This is not a joke, my friend.

Let us get real here. There is actual waste, fraud, and abuse in this system. It is criminal activity. It is activity that is just like every single financial system out there. There are bad people who take advantage of financial systems. But the vast majority of beneficiaries of this program are seniors, children, and people living with disabilities. And when you make it harder for them to access benefits, then it means that they go hungry. They skip meals. They do not have access to food. They go to our food banks, who are already struggling because of the cuts that were put in this budget to cut other programs that put food to our food banks. And essentially, it leaves our people, our children, our seniors, our grandparents, without access to food.

And so, Mr. Chairman, I am happy to work with you on bipartisan efforts to deal with criminal activity involving waste, fraud, and abuse in SNAP, but I will not support cutting programs for people who need them. I yield back.

Mr. BURCHETT. Thank you, ma'am.

Next, we have Representative Fallon.

Mr. FALLON. Thank you, Mr. Chairman.

Mr. BURCHETT. From Texas.

Mr. FALLON. So, unlike some of us—we are not in a classroom, so I am not going to ask anybody to raise your hands, okay? We will just have a civil conversation. Ms.—is it Plata-Nino? Am I saying it correctly? Okay. You have worked for how long in your current position?

Ms. PLATA-NINO. Over a year.

Mr. FALLON. Okay. And did you have related jobs that were similar?

Ms. PLATA-NINO. I served as an attorney for multiple years representing low-income individuals—

Mr. FALLON. Okay.

Ms. PLATA-NINO [continuing]. In various public benefit programs.

Mr. FALLON. Okay. Do you know what the amount the Federal Government spent in SNAP benefits in Fiscal Year 2019 was?

Ms. PLATA-NINO. 2019? Not off the top of my head.

Mr. FALLON. And I am not going to try to play gotcha. It was \$65 billion. And then in 2025, do you think it went up or down from that number?

Ms. PLATA-NINO. It went up because of the pandemic and the job loss and the economy

Mr. FALLON. Yes, but the pandemic has long since been over, several years at this point. It was \$102 billion, which is a massive increase of 68 percent. And yet the GDP per capita, if you adjust for inflation, is only 8.9 percent. So, that is quite a leap and quite a difference. And according to the GAO, at minimum, we are looking at \$300 million in fraud, waste, and abuse. And, of course, I think we all could agree that the reality is far more. Would you agree that in a perfect world, there should not be any American that needs SNAP benefits?

Ms. PLATA-NINO. Americans want to have jobs and employment, so if the economy is strong, absolutely.

Mr. FALLON. Yes, in a perfect world, there would literally be no one on SNAP. That is what we are all working toward. Ironically, you would be working toward finding another job.

Ms. PLATA-NINO. Oh, absolutely.

Mr. FALLON. I agree, yes. That would be amazing. Do you think that able-bodied, able-minded, non-elderly adults should be eligible for SNAP benefits, philosophically?

Ms. PLATA-NINO. Individuals who need SNAP and who need the resources should be eligible for SNAP.

Mr. FALLON. Do you think that if you are able-bodied, able-minded, you are non-elderly, you should receive SNAP benefits?

Ms. PLATA-NINO. It is a matter of having job sufficiency and available jobs, and—

Mr. FALLON. So, you think, yes, that seems to me that is your answer.

Ms. PLATA-NINO. Americans who are—

Mr. FALLON. That an able-bodied, able-minded person should be eligible for SNAP benefits. I philosophically disagree. I think it is shocking that 21 percent of the people on SNAP are non-elderly, able-bodied, able-minded. It costs the American taxpayers \$18 billion, and there are 8.8 million of those folks. Does that sound like a large number?

Ms. PLATA-NINO. I think it is an incorrect number since many individuals do have disabilities who have been undiagnosed—

Mr. FALLON. Well, this is—

Ms. PLATA-NINO [continuing]. Because of healthcare costs—

Mr. FALLON [continuing]. Able-bodied, able-minded, but—

Ms. PLATA-NINO [continuing]. Cannot be able to prove those disabilities.

Mr. FALLON. You know, I have been in Congress six years now, and when people come into our office, and there is a various array of fields that they work in, that every single one of them has something in common. They are desperate for labor. The unemployment rate is very low, and yet, there are still folks that claim that they are able-bodied, able-minded, and they just cannot find jobs. They can if their belly was—if they were truly—that is a motivator, is someone that, when you are hungry, you will go out and find a job

and not just have to rely on someone else to do it, again, when you are able-bodied, able-minded.

Secretary Rollins directed all SNAP state agencies to share their participant eligibility data with USDA's Food and Nutrition Association. Were you aware of that, that she directed them to do that, the states?

Ms. PLATA-NINO. I am aware that the labor market has been very weakened for blue-collar workers and that—

Mr. FALLON. That is not what I asked you. What I asked about was Secretary Rollins directed the state SNAP agencies to share their participant eligibility data. Were you aware that she asked them that, the states?

Ms. PLATA-NINO. Are you talking about the data request?

Mr. FALLON. Let us try it again. Secretary Rollins asked the states, the 50 states and D.C., to share their participant eligibility data with the USDA. Were you aware of it or not? If you were not, we can talk about it, and I can tell you what happened.

Ms. PLATA-NINO. If it is a data request, yes.

Mr. FALLON. Okay. Yes. And did you know that 22 states did not share that data?

Ms. PLATA-NINO. Yes.

Mr. FALLON. Do you know what they all have in common?

Ms. PLATA-NINO. That they do not care about protecting Americans' privacy?

Mr. FALLON. Every single one of them has a Democratic Governor, all of them. So, it is Arizona all the way through Washington State and D.C. I find it ironic when I was doing a little research for this that when you take the states that are run by Democrats and you take the states that are run by Republicans, particularly the larger ones, you are 30 percent more likely to be on SNAP if you live in a blue state. You think it is just because they are just terribly mismanaged or maybe they are abusing the system?

Ms. STANSBURY. [Off mic.]

Mr. FALLON. Ah, it is my time. This is not a classroom.

Ms. PLATA-NINO. They are ensuring that individuals who need access to benefits to be able to meet their basic needs have those resources.

Mr. FALLON. Well, let us hope that we can get in a perfect world and SNAP benefits go away completely.

Mr. Chair, I yield back.

Mr. BURCHETT. Thank you.

Mr. Gill, you are recognized.

Mr. GILL. Thank you, Mr. Chair, for holding this hearing and for your intense and steadfast work on combating waste, fraud, and abuse. We certainly appreciate it. I know taxpayers appreciate it. And thank you to the witnesses for taking the time to be here.

Ms. Plata-Nino, did I pronounce that correctly?

Ms. PLATA-NINO. Plata-Nino.

Mr. GILL. Plata-Nino? Okay. Plata-Nino. I got a couple of questions for you. Should SNAP dollars be spent on sodas?

Ms. PLATA-NINO. The purpose of the SNAP program is to provide families to have food and beverages.

Mr. GILL. Should it be spent on sugary sodas?

Ms. PLATA-NINO. I am happy to talk about hunger and nutrition but not dictate what Americans should or should not eat or may have access to.

Mr. GILL. I am asking if tax dollars should be used to pay for sodas.

Ms. PLATA-NINO. Taxpayers' money should be utilized to ensure that individuals have access to the food that they need to survive or may be accessible to them.

Mr. GILL. Do they need sugary sodas to survive?

Ms. PLATA-NINO. Some of them do, who do have low blood issues, who may have——

Mr. GILL. Is that right?

Ms. PLATA-NINO [continuing]. Or who have kidney issues, yes.

Mr. GILL. You think they need Coca-Cola to survive? You think that is the most appropriate use of our tax dollars?

Ms. PLATA-NINO. I am not a physician, but medical records and expertise do show that——

Mr. GILL. You were just citing——

Ms. PLATA-NINO [continuing]. In some circumstances, they do.

Mr. GILL [continuing]. The health needs, apparently, of the American people. So, do the American people need Coca-Cola to survive?

Ms. PLATA-NINO. I did not say that. I said that individuals——

Mr. GILL. I am asking you.

Ms. PLATA-NINO [continuing]. Need to have beverages.

Mr. GILL. I am giving you the opportunity to say yes or no.

Ms. PLATA-NINO. I will not answer for individuals and their choices.

Mr. GILL. You think that there are some Americans who need Coca-Cola to survive? Is that your testimony?

Ms. PLATA-NINO. I am happy to talk about the food and nutrition needs——

Mr. GILL. You just do not know?

Ms. PLATA-NINO [continuing]. That individuals have.

Mr. GILL. You just do not know? I think most people can rationally say that you do not need Coca-Cola to survive. Wouldn't you agree?

Ms. PLATA-NINO. I agree that we have a hunger crisis and that we need to address it by ensuring that individuals have the food resources that they need.

Mr. GILL. Got it. And one of those is sugary Coca-Cola. What does SNAP stand for?

Ms. PLATA-NINO. It is the Supplemental Nutrition Assistance Program.

Mr. GILL. What is nutritional about Coca-Cola?

Ms. PLATA-NINO. I am not a nutritionist. I am a food security expert in ensuring that individuals have the food resources that they need.

Mr. GILL. This is a commonsense question. All of these have been commonsense questions. I am just asking you, is there nutritional value to sugary sodas?

Ms. PLATA-NINO. There are—I——

Mr. GILL. It is a yes or no question.

Ms. PLATA-NINO. I am not an expert. I would have to look at the dietary guidelines and look at—

Mr. GILL. You are not an expert. I do not think that there is nutritional value to sugary sodas. I think most people in this room would agree with that assessment, but you have no opinion?

Ms. PLATA-NINO. I am here to talk about the food needs and the hunger crisis that individuals here in America are facing.

Mr. GILL. Are you that ideologically dug in that you want our tax dollars paying for sugary sodas that you will not, in a straight-forward way, admit that sugary sodas are not healthful for the American people?

Ms. PLATA-NINO. I think that focusing on soda when people are going hungry is—

Mr. GILL. A lot of our tax dollars are spent on soda. That is why I am asking about it.

Ms. PLATA-NINO. We have no—

Mr. GILL. And you appear to be so ideologically dug in that you will not answer a simple question that that is not an appropriate use of our tax dollars and that that does not, in fact, make the American people healthier.

Ms. PLATA-NINO. I will not answer because there is no data sort of proving that.

Mr. GILL. Do you need data to determine whether drinking soda is healthy?

Ms. PLATA-NINO. I think facts—

Mr. GILL. I am sorry, it is a serious question. Do you believe that perhaps drinking sodas every day is healthy?

Ms. PLATA-NINO. The worst health outcome is hunger. When the individuals do not have the resources—

Mr. GILL. Do you satiate hunger with Coca-Cola?

Ms. PLATA-NINO. I did not say that.

Mr. GILL. But you said that the worst health outcome is hunger, and I am asking you about sugary sodas.

Ms. PLATA-NINO. And I am focusing on the nutrition needs and making sure that children have the resources—

Mr. GILL. Is your organization funded by soft drink makers?

Ms. PLATA-NINO. I am not in charge of development, but no.

Mr. GILL. It is not, okay. Is your organization funded by organizations that make money from food stamps? Do organizations who profit off of food stamps fund your organization or businesses?

Ms. PLATA-NINO. I mean, in the—I cannot comment to that, happy to talk about the resources that need—

Mr. GILL. Does General Mills fund your organization?

Ms. PLATA-NINO. I do not have access to that information.

Mr. GILL. I do. It is right here. They do fund your organization. Do they profit off of food stamps?

Ms. PLATA-NINO. Retailers are the major beneficiaries of—

Mr. GILL. Do you think that that is a conflict of interest?

Ms. PLATA-NINO. That is where EBT dollars are utilized.

Mr. GILL. Yes, and they are profiting off of your advocacy. Do you think that that is a conflict of interest?

Ms. STANSBURY. [Off mic.]

Mr. GILL. I think most people think that is a conflict of interest. I know you do not want to answer.

My time is up. Thank you, Mr. Chairman.

Mr. BURCHETT. Thank you, Mr. Gill.

Mr. JACK, you are recognized for 5 minutes.

Mr. JACK. Thank you, Mr. Chairman. Thank you very much as well for convening this hearing.

I want to start my line of questioning with Mr. Walk. Thank you for your testimony. And I know that my colleague, Mr. Fallon, covered this briefly, but I understand that by the direction of our Secretary of Agriculture, Brooke Rollins, the USDA requested SNAP participant eligibility data from all 50 states to ensure the benefits are being dispersed properly, but only 29 states have released that data. And I was hoping you could illuminate for this Committee why you believe the 21 states who have not yet released that data have not done so.

Mr. WALK. Well, I can—I cannot speak to the USDA’s request. I can speak to my own OIG’s request for state SNAP data. So, about a year ago, we asked for the top ten states, in terms of SNAP spending, for their participant data because we wanted to do an evaluation of the integrity and quality of that data, especially as it touched on qualification, your eligibility to be on SNAP. And we received six states—the data from those six states. And I would just say that we finished a report of Ohio. And I think—I know I spoke a little bit to this earlier, but we found \$13.3 million in anomalies just from that one state who shared their data with us.

Before that report became public, they had already started working on those vulnerabilities. But three—four states, California, New York, Illinois, and Michigan, have yet to give us that data so that we could do the same thing and look at the issues in their states. We have been—we find things such as applications that miss key data, like Social Security numbers, blanks in terms of citizenship, duplicate enrollments, like people who are clearly not living in that state but being paid out funding from that state. So, with these four states, California, New York, Illinois, and Michigan, if they do not provide the data, we cannot even start to look at that.

Now, you did mention USDA. They—we—I know that they have requested from all 50 states. And the request is a little bit different, so I cannot get too much into that. And they are a separate organization, but I know that from our separate requests where I have ordered a subpoena, which is very unusual that a state agency will require the IG to issue a subpoena for that kind of information, but we have issued four subpoenas to those states, and we are still waiting on that information.

Mr. JACK. Well, we will look forward to seeing their results once returned and complied with.

Ms. Royal, next question to you. I want to commend your organization for publishing this report, “Why Food Stamp Program Integrity Is More Important Now Than Ever.” And specifically, I just want to note from the report, in 2023 alone, food stamp enrollees in one state own more than 14,000 luxury vehicles. And among those, you had three Ferraris, 11 Lamborghinis, 59 Maseratis, and thousands of other luxury vehicles.

The supposed goal of the SNAP program, of course, has been litigated today, but what was revealed in this report seems to be the

program's reality. Help this Committee and the constituents back home understand, how does a program dedicated to feeding low-income families end up subsidizing Lamborghinis and Bentleys?

Ms. ROYAL. People make false statements on applications. And there is very little access to technology for states to verify that information before benefits are issued. So, it is the pay-and-chase model where even though a benefits worker may think that information is suspicious or suspect, they still have to issue those benefits, get it to a fraud investigator. The fraud investigator puts it on the stack of an already overwhelming caseload and then has to go back and verify the facts. It is not having access to technology and trying to fight these increased fraud numbers with a minimum amount of investigators is a Herculean task that we cannot accomplish.

Mr. JACK. Thank you very much. In my closing 30 seconds, Ms. Greszler, good to see you again. Thank you for testifying again before this Committee. I would love for you to close out by just illuminating how helpful the One Big Beautiful Bill Act, Working Families Tax Cut, was in ensuring that we are rooting out waste, fraud, and abuse.

Ms. GRESZLER. Yes, it was a great first step toward that and primarily in the SNAP program because if you do not have accountability at the end of the day, there is zero incentive for any state or any agency that is delivering these Federal benefits to be able to reduce those. And we cannot accept, as a cost of business, having up to \$500 billion per year in fraud just so that we can make it easier so that those who are actually eligible for these programs will receive them. You have to go after that. There is no private sector business that could stay in business if it accepted the level of fraud, waste, and abuse that is going on now.

Mr. JACK. Very well said.

Mr. Chairman, my time is up. Before I yield back, if I could enter into the record "Why Food Stamp Program Integrity Is More Important Now Than Ever," this report, at your will, sir.

Mr. BURCHETT. Accept.

Ms. STANSBURY. Mr. Chairman, I also have a UC.

Mr. BURCHETT. Ma'am?

Ms. STANSBURY. I ask unanimous consent to enter into the record 12 letters issued by House Oversight and Government Reform, Democrats on the importance of data security and privacy in government programs, which we have sent to the Administration, which they have failed to respond to. Thank you.

Mr. BURCHETT. Without objection.

Representative Luna, you are recognized. Ma'am?

Mrs. LUNA. Thank you, Chairman.

Honorable Walk, in Operation Cold SNAP, 20 Minnesota retail locations were hit in a single operation for SNAP trafficking. Minnesota is also the epicenter of the largest documented social service fraud scandal in American history where over 98 individuals charged, 85 being of Somali descent, nearly \$300 million stolen from the USDA's Federal Child Nutrition Program. Did Minnesota's sanctuary status contribute to allowing that network to operate for years?

Mr. WALK. Congresswoman, I am not sure if that did, but I do know that in terms of Operation Cold SNAP and Feeding Our Futures, that there was a big nexus to the Somali community. But I—we have not looked at the issue of how the sanctuary jurisdictions affected that.

Mrs. LUNA. I understand this to be correct not just in Minnesota, though. In most states that actually have illegal immigration problems and provide sanctuary status to these people, where they are limiting cooperation with Federal immigration enforcement, do you find it to be the case that similar cases also exist in regards to SNAP fraud?

Mr. WALK. Well, I think that we do—we need to be able to cooperate across jurisdictional lines when it comes to law enforcement, so if we are not getting cooperation from the state agencies and the proper degree of information sharing, it is very difficult to go after the fraud, particularly in terms of illegal alien communities because what we found is that often does involve false identities, false document rings. And that the resources that are needed to get at that is not just going to be within USDA. We do need cooperation from state and locals and other Federal agencies to get at that.

Mrs. LUNA. Ms. Plata, do you think that if the Federal Government gives a set budget for people to be able to access these programs and then you have others being able to access them as well that have not paid into the system, in your opinion, would that limit the nutrition access for Americans?

Ms. PLATA-NINO. SNAP has the high-quality control measures to ensure that only eligible individuals are accessing the program.

Mrs. LUNA. So, you do not think that fraud is occurring?

Ms. PLATA-NINO. Absolutely. We have billions of dollars that are being skimmed and scammed by families.

Mrs. LUNA. Okay. My next question would be for Ms. Greszler. SNAP recipients have significantly higher rates of obesity, specifically type 2 diabetes and hypertension versus the general population. USDA's own data shows approximately \$7 billion a year in SNAP funds spent on soda alone. Is it accurate to say that the Federal Government is currently running a program that simultaneously funds poor nutritional choices through SNAP and then funds the resulting chronic illness through Medicaid, effectively subsidizing the same disease twice?

Ms. GRESZLER. I think it is fair to say that there is a link there, and that might mean that Congress should consider revising those standards of what qualifies as food under the SNAP program.

Mrs. LUNA. Okay. Have any of you—just yes or no, quickly, Honorable Walk, have you ever been on SNAP or EBT?

Mr. WALK. No, ma'am.

Mrs. LUNA. Okay. Ms. Royal?

Ms. ROYAL. No, ma'am.

Ms. GRESZLER. Not to my knowledge, but my identity could have been stolen to be used elsewhere.

Ms. PLATA-NINO. No, ma'am.

Mrs. LUNA. Okay. The reason I ask you guys is because what I am finding is some of the poorest of the poor communities, specifically minority communities as well, and then obviously impover-

ished White Americans are given access to this program, but because of the amount of special interest money going into what they can and cannot buy, they are actually being made sick.

Just being very direct, it is basically a government-funded pipeline to chronic illness and it did not happen by accident. The SNAP eligible food list is not written by nutritionists. In fact, it is written by lobbyists. And every time a state will specifically try to restrict SNAP purchases, whether it be New York, Maine, or even Florida, the American Beverage Association and the processed food industry killed a waiver at the USDA, not because nutritional restrictions were bad policy, but because Coca-Cola and Pepsi-Cola have spent tens of millions of dollars protecting a \$7 billion in annual government-guaranteed soda revenue. I am just curious, do you really think that this program currently, as written, if special interest is controlling it, is really benefiting children? Honorable Walk, yes or no?

Mr. WALK. I cannot give a policy opinion, but I do certainly understand that there are questions about how nutritious some of it is.

Mrs. LUNA. Do you think special interest money should be deciding that, yes or no?

Mr. WALK. No.

Mrs. LUNA. Okay. Ms. Royal, yes or no, do you think special interest money should be deciding?

Ms. ROYAL. No.

Ms. GRESZLER. No.

Ms. PLATA-NINO. There is multiple research that SNAP supports the healthy—

Mrs. LUNA. Okay. I will be honest with you. I do not think that special interest money at all should be going to funding this, especially when you have Democrats, to include, you know, a young Democrat from the State of Washington, which is where I used to be stationed, that found it very problematic that you could essentially open up a bag of chips but not serve in a daycare a banana because it did not meet compliance standards because there were not enough sinks.

So, all that to say, I appreciate you guys being here, but we clearly need to fix our SNAP program. Thank you.

Ms. STANSBURY. Mr. Chairman, I have another UC.

Mr. BURCHETT. You have another what?

Ms. STANSBURY. Unanimous consent.

Mr. BURCHETT. Oh, yes, ma'am.

Ms. STANSBURY. Yes.

Mr. BURCHETT. Go ahead.

Ms. STANSBURY. I would like to ask for unanimous consent to enter into the record a report from this Committee's House Democrats entitled "Abandoning Americans to Disease: The Trump Administration's Reckless Crusade is Harming America's Health," which is about an investigation into the policies that this Administration is forwarding, including some of the food standards at the Federal Food and Drug Administration.

Mr. BURCHETT. No objection.

And I want to enter, with no objection, a letter that I wrote to Governor Gavin Newsom of California for the record.

And I want to thank you all so much for being here, for our Committee. We are getting out in record time. Everybody got their questions in, so we are good.

With that, and without objection, all Members have five legislative days within which to submit materials and additional written questions for the witnesses, which will be forwarded to the witnesses.

If there is no further business, without objection, the Subcommittee stands adjourned.

[Whereupon, at 11:32 a.m., the Subcommittee was adjourned.]

