

**U.S. Department of Agriculture  
Food and Nutrition Service  
Administrative Review Branch**

**Roll Your Own Mart,**

**Appellant,**

**v.**

**Retailer Operations Division,**

**Respondent.**

**Case Number: C0247341**

**FINAL AGENCY DECISION**

It is the decision of the U.S. Department of Agriculture (USDA), Food and Nutrition Service (FNS), that there is sufficient evidence to support a finding that a permanent disqualification from participation as an authorized retailer in the Supplemental Nutrition Assistance Program (SNAP) was properly imposed against Roll Your Own Mart (hereinafter “Roll Your Own Mart” or “Appellant”) by the Retailer Operations Division of FNS.

**ISSUE**

The issue accepted for review is whether the Retailer Operations Division took appropriate action, consistent with 7 CFR § 278.6(e)(1)(i) in its administration of the SNAP, when it imposed a permanent disqualification against Roll Your Own Mart.

**AUTHORITY**

7 U.S.C. 2023 and its implementing regulations at 7 CFR § 279.1 provide that “[A] food retailer or wholesale food concern aggrieved by administrative action under § 278.1, § 278.6 or § 278.7 . . . may file a written request for review of the administrative action with FNS.

**CASE CHRONOLOGY**

In a letter dated December 6, 2021, the Retailer Operations Division informed the Appellant that Roll Your Own Mart was in violation of the terms and conditions of the SNAP regulations, 7 CFR § 270 – 282, based on EBT SNAP benefit transactions that “establish clear and repetitive patterns of unusual, irregular, and inexplicable SNAP activity for your type of firm.” The letter also noted that the Appellant could request a trafficking civil money penalty (CMP) in lieu of a permanent disqualification within 10 days of receipt under the conditions specified in 7 CFR § 278.6(i). Per UPS confirmation of delivery, the charge letter was delivered to the Appellant at the store address of record on December 7, 2021.

The record reflects that on December 14, 2021, the Appellant's counsel requested an extension in time for providing a response to the letter of charges. On December 15, 2021, the Retailer Operations Division granted the Appellant's time extension request. Counsel was informed at that time that the time to request a civil money penalty in lieu of permanent disqualification and to provide documentation to support such a request could not be extended per SNAP regulations.

In responses to the Retailer Operations Division of December 8, 2021, December 14, 2021, January 18, 2022, and January 21, 2022, the Appellant, through counsel, replied to the letter of charges. The record reflects that the Retailer Operations Division received and considered the information provided prior to making a determination.

After considering the Appellant's responses and the evidence in the case, the Retailer Operations Division issued a determination letter dated March 25, 2022, informing the Appellant that Roll Your Own Mart was being permanently disqualified from participation in the SNAP in accordance with 7 CFR § 278.6(e)(1) for trafficking violations. The letter also stated that the Appellant was not eligible for a trafficking civil money penalty (CMP) in accordance with 7 CFR § 278.6(i) as the Appellant did not submit sufficient evidence to demonstrate that the firm had established and implemented an effective compliance policy and program to prevent violations of the SNAP.

In a letter postmarked March 29, 2022, the Appellant, through counsel, requested an administrative review of the Retailer Operations Division's decision to permanently disqualify the firm from participation in the SNAP. FNS granted the Appellant's request for administrative review by letter dated March 29, 2022. In a correspondence of April 19, 2022, the Appellant, through counsel, submitted additional information in support of the request for administrative review.

### **STANDARD OF REVIEW**

In appeals of adverse actions, the Appellant bears the burden of proving by a preponderance of the evidence, that the administrative actions should be reversed. That means the Appellant has the burden of providing relevant evidence which a reasonable mind, considering the record as a whole, would accept as sufficient to support a conclusion that the matter asserted is more likely to be true than not true.

### **CONTROLLING LAW**

The controlling statute in this matter is contained in the Food and Nutrition Act of 2008, amended, 7 U.S.C. § 2021 and 278 of Title 7 of the Code of Federal Regulations (CFR). 7 U.S.C. § 2021, Part 278.6(a) and Part 278.6(e)(1)(i) of the Regulations establish the authority upon which a permanent disqualification may be imposed upon a retail food store or wholesale food concern. There also exist FNS policy memoranda and clarification letters which further explain the conditions necessary in order to permanently disqualify retail stores.

7 U.S.C. § 2021(b)(3)(B) states, inter alia:

... a disqualification under subsection (a) shall be ... permanent upon ... the first occasion or any subsequent occasion of a disqualification based on the purchase of coupons or trafficking in coupons or authorization cards by a retail food store or wholesale food concern or a finding of the unauthorized redemption, use, transfer, acquisition, alteration, or possession of EBT cards ...

7 CFR § 278.6(a) states, inter alia:

FNS may disqualify any authorized retail food store ... if the firm fails to comply with the Food and Nutrition Act of 2008, as amended, or this part. Such disqualification shall result from a finding of a violation on the basis of evidence that may include facts established through on-site investigations, inconsistent redemption data, evidence obtained through a transaction report under an electronic benefit transfer system ... [Emphasis added].

7 CFR § 278.6(e)(1)(i) states:

Disqualify a firm permanently if: Personnel of the firm have trafficked as defined in § 271.2.

7 CFR § 271.2 states, inter alia:

Trafficking means...The buying, selling, stealing, or otherwise effecting an exchange of SNAP benefits issued and accessed via Electronic Benefit Transfer (EBT) cards, card numbers and personal identification numbers (PINs), or by manual voucher and signature, for cash or consideration other than eligible food, either directly, indirectly, in complicity or collusion with others, or acting alone...

7 CFR § 278.6(f)(1) states, inter alia:

A civil money penalty for hardship to SNAP households may not be imposed in lieu of a permanent disqualification.

7 CFR § 278.6(i) states, inter alia:

FNS may impose a civil money penalty in lieu of a permanent disqualification for trafficking as defined in § 271.2 if the firm timely submits to FNS substantial evidence which demonstrates that the firm had established and implemented an effective compliance policy and program to prevent violations ...

7 CFR § 278.6(b)(2) states, inter alia:

(ii) Firms that request consideration of a civil money penalty in lieu of a permanent disqualification for trafficking shall have the opportunity to submit to FNS information and evidence as specified in § 278.6(i), that establishes the firm's eligibility for a civil money penalty in lieu of a permanent disqualification in accordance with the criteria included in § 278.6(i). This information and evidence shall be submitted within 10 days, as specified in § 278.6(b)(1). [Emphasis added].

(iii) If a firm fails to request consideration for a civil money penalty in lieu of a permanent disqualification for trafficking and submit documentation and evidence of its eligibility within the 10 days specified in § 278.6(b)(1), the firm shall not be eligible for such penalty. [Emphasis added].

## **SUMMARY OF CHARGES**

The Appellant was charged and determined to be trafficking based on an analysis of EBT transaction data from December 2020 through May 2021. This involved the following SNAP transactions patterns which are indicative of trafficking:

- There were multiple transactions made from the accounts of individual SNAP households within a set time period; and
- There were EBT transactions conducted that are large based on the observed store characteristics and recorded food stock.

The issue in this review is whether, through a preponderance of evidence, it is more likely true than not true that questionable transactions were the result of trafficking.

## **APPELLANT'S CONTENTIONS**

The following represents a brief summary of the Appellant's contentions in this matter. Please be assured, however, that in reaching a decision, full attention and consideration was given to all contentions presented, including any not specifically recapitulated or specifically referenced herein.

In the replies to the charge letter, in the administrative review request, and in subsequent correspondence to FNS, the Appellant, through counsel, stated the following summarized contentions, in relevant part:

- The Appellant denies that trafficking took place.
- The transactions noted in the charge letter are the result of the store's business operations, business environment, SNAP household demographics and shopping habits, and the store's inventory.
- The Appellant measures 2,400 square feet and sells a variety and quantity of staple food items to the surrounding community such as beef, chicken, eggs, seafood, pork, bread, cereal, rice, butter, cheese, milk, yogurt, fruit, vegetables, and additional food items. The vast majority of the store's offerings are qualified items under the SNAP. The store visit report notes that the firm is sufficiently stocked in all four staple food categories to account for the transactions listed in the charge letter.
- Inventory is replenished on a rolling basis and depending upon demand. Inventory at the beginning of the month is typically superior to inventory at the end of the month.
- This business has never had a compliance problem with SNAP in the past.
- The firm's compliance policy is an important factor and should be taken into consideration as it could have a material impact on the transactions noted during the review period. It would defy logic for the store owner with a long history of compliance to suddenly start trafficking for the de minimus amounts set forth in the charge letter.
- The diversity of business models and differences in local population demographics should be taken into consideration. Differences in local population demographics change the inventory contents, business operations and services offered by these stores, and subsequently result in different transactions that are a function of different circumstances rather than some type of violative activity.
- Store visit reports that are considered for comparison stores should be near to the review period. Store visit reports that are a year or more separated from the review period should

not be utilized—that much distance between a subject store and a review period is not permitted because of the presumption of outdated information and it would be prejudicial and biased to permit comparison store information to have a different information basis.

- Studies show that selecting comparison stores that are in different neighborhoods (sometimes just divided by a major road or geographic feature) can result in very different EBT transactions by the nature of differences in neighborhood shopping dynamics.
- The Appellant serves the surrounding community, which in pertinent part suffers from poverty at a high rate (13.7%). A substantial portion of the Appellant’s customers come from the surrounding neighborhoods and are SNAP participants.
- The Appellant is located next to a homeless camp for displaced residents, within walking distance of 5 U.S.C. § 552 (b)(6) & (b)(7)(C), and sits on a main transportation route. A material portion of these participants visit the store.
- According to USDA’s *Profile of SNAP Households in 2018 for the 3rd Congressional District of 5 U.S.C. § 552 (b)(6) & (b)(7)(C)*, 13% of the local households receive SNAP benefits.
- Households with particular demographic information and located in particular geographic areas are more likely to be disqualified which shows a bias towards smaller grocers. Regional differences in disqualification rates and shopping habits support this contention as well.
- The difference in disqualification rates is likely due to confirmation bias within the retailer disqualifications.
- The numbers show that if a store is in the Mid-Atlantic or Northeast, near a large number of Hispanic or African American households that are comprised of one adult and children, who have more than \$500.00 worth of benefits and four or more household participants, the store is much, much more likely to be flagged through no fault of its own. This is especially true of Scan F transactions which takes into account far greater geographic areas than just the neighborhoods in which these documented transactions occurred.
- In support of the Appellant’s discussions regarding SNAP households’ shopping habits, the following studies were provided and/or cited: *Benefit Redemption Patterns in the SNAP in Fiscal Year 2017 Final Report*, Insight Policy Research, September 2020; *Shopping Pattern and Food Purchase Difference Among SNAP Households and Non-SNAP Households in the United States*, Preventative Medicine Reports, June 20, 2017; and *What Does SNAP Benefit Usage Tell Us About Food Access in Low-Income Neighborhoods?*, Social Science & Medicine, 2014.
- The Appellant also cited the following studies with regard to changes in shopping behaviors due to the COVID-19 pandemic and its correlating closures: A study by Google, Inc., *3 Lasting Changes to Grocery Shopping After COVID-19*, Forbes Magazine, and *Grocery Retail to Lead Restaurants in Food Market Share Post-Pandemic*, Supermarket News.
- The transactions documented in Attachment 1 are the result of the participant forgetting an item in his/her prior transaction, co-shopping, the participant making a purchase, returning home, and then returning to the store to make a second purchase, the store’s business practices, and a reflection of the normal shopping habits of SNAP participants.
- As stated in the court in *Onukwugha v. U.S.*, “multiple transactions occurring over the span of hours” are not “inherently suspicious” as it is not uncommon for a customer to make multiple trips to the same store on the same day (finding it unclear as to why FNS found certain close in proximity transactions to be consistent with patterns of trafficking “rather than the innocent explanation of a shopper realizing he forgot something or, for example, one

household member wanting to make a small purchase . . . while the other household member stays behind to complete a larger purchase).

- Past Administrative Review Branch decisions have identified a number of certain explanations which adequately explain the presence of Attachment 1 transactions. These cases (the Appellant cited numerous administrative review cases and numbers in support thereof) and explanations include: The significant presence of low-income population of SNAP residing near the retailer; absence of local SNAP retailers to compete with the subject store; significant inventory that encourages multiple shopping trips, like the presence of deli or meat by the pound; customer loyalty and loyalty programs; lack of transportation for local SNAP households; delivery services; bulk discounts on food purchases, especially expensive items and sodas (like Red Bull); and forgotten items.
- The pertinent factors in the above referenced cases which are also present in this case include low-income SNAP population near the retailer, significant inventory with items contained in the top 100, customer loyalty, and lack of transportation for local SNAP participants.
- It is important to consider the store's size, inventory, and operations. The store's inventory is sufficient to account for the transactions and greatly exceeds stores around it and has a greater quality and variety than your average convenience store.
- In 5 U.S.C. § 552 (b)(6) & (b)(7)(C), participant benefits are issued on the 1<sup>st</sup> through the 9<sup>th</sup> day of each month, based on a combination of the type of case and the case name. USDA has previously conducted research into the standard practices of participants for food purchases, and purchases made within the first seven days after receiving benefits is not unusual. In fact, on a regular basis, the participants will make significant grocery purchases from the Appellant store within 48 hours of receiving the deposit in their accounts. Such patterns are supported by the *Benefit Redemption Patterns in the Supplemental Nutrition Assistance Program in Fiscal Year 2017 (2020)*. Here, almost all of the transactions set forth in Attachment 2 reflect this standard shopping habit and patterns of SNAP participants.
- Small grocers/convenience stores in African American communities are more likely to have Scan B2 transactions.
- The Appellant services a much higher Asian population than the average SNAP retailer to whom their transactions are compared.
- There is a displaced homeless community "tent city" located directly next to the store. This community is one of ten throughout the 5 U.S.C. § 552 (b)(6) & (b)(7)(C) area. Members of this community visit the store multiple times a day for their needs since they have no refrigeration.
- Also, families (especially those with multiple parents/adults) are more likely to shop in higher frequency and produce Scan B2 transactions because their purchases tend to be higher.
- Many of the local SNAP household members are unemployed. To satiate their boredom, these participants will regularly shop at stores to find something to do.
- In some instances, the act of purchasing an item is pleasing, as much of the month they lack the financial ability to do so. So they will either shop regularly on the same day, or they will binge shop and make large purchases because they have the benefits to do so.
- Co-shopping is on the rise where both adult members are responsible for picking up groceries.
- The Appellant is aware that there are a number of SNAP households that come into the store multiple times a day because of convenience, often sending their children on separate shopping trips to pick up items from time to time. In other cases, participants make purchases for friends, for large gatherings, or to satisfy needs that are not obvious.
- Sometimes customers call for pick up or order items.

- The store does have an optical scanner, but the clerk has the ability to visually identify and enter items into the register. Item prices are usually consistent if not outright uniform, and are frequently memorized by the clerk through repetition over time. Furthermore, the store will tabulate transactions on a rolling basis, meaning that unlike a grocery store when you line up, set all of your items on the counter and then purchase them, this store permits participants to gather items, bring them to the register, and then return to gather more items. Although the EBT transactions are processed consecutively over a matter of a few minutes, the calculations, bagging and gathering of items can take dozens of minutes if the participant chooses.
- From a physical transportation angle, the groceries are bagged, and often the customers carry the groceries by hand (using their children or friends to carry some items). On occasion, other items (like strollers) can be used to help transport the items out of the store. Nevertheless, they are bagged, by the store and physically carried out by the participants.
- It is much easier for the customer to get through the spaces of a store like the Appellant's than it is for them to go into a supermarket/super store. Accordingly, these customers are more likely to come back for supplemental and quick shopping trips than they otherwise would at an average convenience store with an inferior inventory and a further distance from their homes.
- The Appellant is the only neighborhood store that carries a lot of products as most of the area stores are smoke shops.
- The Appellant is in an area with a higher per-capita population of SNAP households than the average store. The surrounding SNAP retailers operate in slightly different business environment conditions, or with material differences in operation, location and inventory. According to USDA's SNAP Retailer Locator, there are eight which participate in the SNAP with the nearest store located 0.16 miles away. This causes a reduction in flow of SNAP participants as they have more direct competition and a smaller portion of the overall business.
- Transportation inconsistency is another reason for the transactions outlined in this Attachment. Participants do not have their own vehicles (it is part of the SNAP participant's application requirements that they have only one vehicle at most), so trips to larger stores are dependent upon rides from friends or family. A household that cannot depend on those trips is forced to shop nearby.
- Past Administrative Review Branch decisions have identified a number of certain explanations for the presence of Attachment 2 transactions. Examples of acceptable explanations for excessively large purchase transactions include (the Appellant cited numerous administrative review cases and numbers in support thereof): Sufficient inventory to account for the transactions, as supported by invoices; sales tax documentation to support sales of food items in amounts to satisfy the transactions; large families shopping contemporaneously; presence of high dollar eligible foods in the store's inventory; presence of specialty or imported foods, which are expensive and not generally available elsewhere; miscategorization of the store, leading to inadequate comparisons of transaction sizes; sales of large quantities of soda; absence of local large SNAP retailers; presence of a large local SNAP population; and presence of bulk pricing or a reward system for larger purchases.
- The transactions documented in Attachment 2 are the result of co-shopping, the store's inventory, the local SNAP household's demographics and shopping habits, the store's pricing structure, reliance on the store as a primary grocer for some minutiae of local participants, or the general aberration and statistical outlier to the average whole.
- The Appellant offers its clientele a considerable inventory in breads, cereals, and meats.

- The items typically purchased by SNAP households include a significant number of “accessory food items” which, while not offering as much in nutritional value as staple food items, are popular none the less.
- According to USDA’s research (*Foods Typically Purchased by SNAP Households*, 2016), sweetened beverages and salty snacks are within the top 10 expenditures for SNAP households, as are meats and a number of other items offered by the Appellant. It is therefore reasonable to expect customers to spend large amounts and/or the majority of their benefits at the Appellant on the inventory evidenced in the on-site inspection.
- Participants spend almost 62% of their monthly benefits on meats, sweetened beverages (sodas and energy drinks, Gatorade and the like), vegetables, frozen prepared foods, prepared desserts, high fat dairy/cheese and breads—in that order. It is therefore reasonable to expect SNAP customers to spend large amounts and/or the majority of their benefits at the Appellant store.
- Households with children are more likely to have Scan B2 and F transactions.
- Households that conducted the transactions in Attachment 2 likely have a larger amount of SNAP residents residing in their homes, thus requiring a larger quantity of grocery products each month than those households with less participants.
- Small convenience grocers in Hispanic/Native American neighborhoods are likely to have more Scan F hits.
- Stores miscategorized as convenience stores are likely to have far higher Scan F hits.
- Households with more benefits are more likely to have Scan B2 and F transactions.
- The largest transaction is \$351.05, and the majority of Scan F transactions are less than \$60.00 (82 of the F transactions are less than \$60.00). Given the higher priced items in the store, it is not difficult to imagine \$100.00 worth of groceries being purchased in a single trip – and being transported by hand back to the store. The remainder of the transactions could easily be transported by two people.
- The number of high priced items in the store does not require the store to have a huge amount of counter space to set all of the items. Given that a number of these items is roughly \$8.00 each, eight of such items would not be difficult to carry and could be placed on the given space set out in the store visit report.
- Furthermore, visual identification on the part of the store clerk is easier than scanning items as they are aware of the prices because of experience so they need only to identify the items and enter the price on the register.
- The store visit report captured a snapshot of the store’s inventory, though it was not documented in complete detail. The inspector’s list of higher priced items was not exhaustive as there appears to be items in the inventory that were documented but not listed by price. These items include: Spend \$100.00 and get \$10.00 off; bread at 2 for \$5.00; vegetable oil at 2 for \$8.00; sugar at 2 for \$9.00; soda at 3 for \$20.00 (3 cases, mix-n-mix) + deposit; Little Debbie at 2 for \$4.25 + deposit; Rock Star energy at 2 for \$3.50 + deposit; Monster energy drink at 2 for \$4.25 + deposit; Bang energy at 2 for \$4.25 + deposit; Monster energy at 2 for \$6.00 + deposit; Monster coffee at 2 for \$5.00+ deposit; Dunkin coffee at 2 for \$5.50 + deposit; Coca Cola at 2 for \$3.50 (20 ounces) and 2 for \$4.25 (1 liter) + deposit; Vitamin water at 2 for \$3.50 + deposit; Powerade at 2 for \$3.00 + deposit; tea at 2 for \$2.22 + deposit; Smart water at 2 for \$4.00 (1 liter) + deposit; 7-Up products at 2 for \$3.50 + deposit; Pepsi at 2 for \$3.50 (20 ounces) and 2 for \$4.25 (1 liter) + deposit; Gatorade at 2 for \$4.00 + deposit; milk at \$4.69 or 2 for \$8.99; Soda at \$7.99 (6 pack) and bottle at 2 for \$4.00 + deposit; cereal at \$3.69-\$5.99; frozen pizza at \$7.99; sandwiches and frozen meals at \$1.99-\$5.99; noodles at \$12.00; water at \$4.99 per case + deposit; cheese at \$3.29-\$11.99;

chocolate milk at \$26.99 per case; sausage at \$3.99-\$6.99; cookies at \$2.99-\$5.99; chips at \$1.99-\$5.99; beef jerky at \$1.49-\$12.39; coffee at \$5.99-\$15.99; peanut butter at \$3.59-4.99; ice cream at \$1.99-\$6.99; bacon at \$5.99-\$8.69; Monster energy at \$49.99 per 24 pack; Rockstar energy at \$20.99 per 12 pack; and Bang energy at \$24.99 per 12 pack.

- The Appellant sells CBD products to include CBD energy 250 mg at \$29.99 or 2 for \$50.00, CBD oil 1000 mg at \$79.99, CBD oil 125 mg at \$39.99, CBD oil 200 mg at \$149.99, and CBD sparkling water at \$7.99 or \$60.00 per case.
- The submitted inventory receipts and other information support the Appellant's position that trafficking did not occur.
- Also submitted are affidavits from 11 of the store's SNAP customers, stating that they spend between \$50.00 to \$250.00 during a single trip, exhausting between 50% to 100% of their benefits at the Appellant, and the majority attesting to frequenting the store multiple times in a single day.
- Because the Appellant is located much closer to the SNAP participants (who do not have regular access to transportation—otherwise they would not qualify to be SNAP participants) and its inventory contains such a wide variety of items, these transactions are more likely to occur as a matter of course.
- Furthermore, the only other stores that are nearby do not have the inventory variety that the Appellant has. Accordingly, this store is going to have larger transactions than the average small retail store.
- USDA does not know the correlation coefficient between ALERT scans and trafficking. The Appellant has calculated this based on results of undercover investigations and determined that it was a positive correlation, but the relationship between the values is weak. FNS does not know the correlation coefficient is between any of the ALERT Scans and trafficking in SNAP benefits.
- FNS has been adamant over the years that an EBT analysis case is not dependent upon any one particular component. As noted in *Arch Street Market vs. Retailer Operations Division*, the ALERT Scan categories (and the transactions which comprise them) are allegedly just one part of the overall analysis, which includes consideration of a series of factors.
- The pertinent burden of proof of SNAP disqualification is the "preponderance of evidence" standard, which means that the evidence must be adequate enough which is a reasonable mind, considering the record as a whole, would accept as sufficient a conclusion that the matter is asserted more likely to be true than not true. See *L&M Grocery Market, Inc. vs. Retailer Operations and Compliance*. The Department bears the burden of proof, not the retailer. See *Cardenes Market vs. Retailer Operations and Compliance*.
- Not holding the determinations in abeyance while a FOIA response is pending violates 7 CFR § 278.6(b)(1) according to *Triple E Express vs. ROD*, because the Appellant is not given a full opportunity to respond.

In support of these contentions, the Appellant, through counsel, submitted the following information for review:

- Customer affidavits (11 total);
- Six-page list of "SNAP Household Expenditures" noting "yes/no/sometimes" for each item and indicating that according to this commodity report, the Appellant carries a significant number of items which households purchase. Items listed range from soft drinks to frozen pizza to bananas, etc.;

- A one-page document (38-lines) noting invoices with dates ranging from June 2020 to December 2021;
- Business bank and credit card statements;
- 27 pages of Coca-Cola invoices ranging from December 2020 to May 2021;
- A one-page document titled “5 U.S.C. § 552 (b)(6) & (b)(7)(C)” where the six month total for December 2020 to May 2021 is \$6,015.00 for items ranging from Red Bull to Jarritos beverages;
- 15 vendor invoices from May 2021;
- 2020 U.S. Individual Income tax return for store owner (8 pages)
- Undated food stock photos (11 total);
- Excel report created on December 23, 2021 noting “units sold”;
- Excel Velocity report for December 1, 2021 to May 31, 2021;
- *Profile of SNAP Households in 2018*, 5 U.S.C. § 552 (b)(6) & (b)(7)(C) Congressional District 3, USDA FNS;
- *Benefit Redemption Patterns in the SNAP in FY 2017 Final Report*, Insight Policy Research;
- *Know Your Core, Protect Your Core*, Convenience Store News for the Single Store Owner, April 2016;
- *U.S. Grocery Shopping Trends Annual Report*, FMI, 2016;
- *Pearson Correlation Coefficient Calculator*, Social Science Statistics;
- *What Does SNAP Benefit Usage Tell Us About Food Access in Low-income Neighborhoods?* Social Science & Medicine, 2014;
- *Shopping Pattern and Food Purchase Differences Among SNAP Households and Non-SNAP Households in the United States*, Preventative Medicine Reports, June 20, 2017; and
- *Foods Typically Purchased by SNAP Households*, USDA FNS, November 2016.

## **ANALYSIS AND FINDINGS**

### **SNAP Authorization**

During the review period of December 2020 through May 2021, Roll Your Own Mart was classified as a convenience store. When the Appellant was authorized by FNS for participation in the SNAP, the owner signed a SNAP application for the store and acknowledged he was aware of the SNAP regulations and understood those regulations. That application included a certification and confirmation that the owner would “accept responsibility on behalf of the firm for violations of the SNAP regulations, including those committed by any of the firm’s employees, paid or unpaid, new, full-time or part-time.” The violations listed on this certification include accepting SNAP benefits in exchange for cash, otherwise known as trafficking, and other violations such as accepting SNAP benefits as repayment on credit accounts or in exchange for ineligible items.

### **Store Visit Observations**

The case file indicates that in reaching a disqualification determination, the Retailer Operations Division considered information obtained during a March 31, 2021 store visit conducted by a FNS contractor to observe the nature and scope of the firm’s operation, stock, and facilities. The available inventory of SNAP eligible food at the time of the store visit showed food stock that would be typical of a convenience store, where households normally purchase a limited number of items. The SNAP-eligible food stocked by the store was generally of a low dollar value, consisting mainly of

inexpensive canned and packaged goods, snack foods, single-serving food items and accessory food items. This information obtained from the store visit was also used to ascertain if there were justifiable explanations for the firm's irregular SNAP transactions. The store visit report and photographs documented the following store size, description, and characteristics:

- Approximately 1,800 square feet in size with approximately 232 square feet of additional storage area outside of public view which stocked nonfood items;
- Did not have storage coolers/freezers;
- No shopping carts and no hand-held baskets available for customer use;
- One small checkout counter area with limited check-out counter space;
- One cash register and one EBT point-of-sale (POS) device for use in ringing-up SNAP transactions;
- Had an optical scanner;
- Did not have a special pricing structure, such as prices ending in \$.x9;
- Did not round transactions up or down at the checkout counter;
- Had ATM or money transfer service;
- No signs posted or flyers available advertising the availability of bulk foods offered at a discounted rate to include meats in bulk, foods sold by the case, and grocery package deals;
- No meat/seafood specials or bundles or fruit/vegetable boxes that might sell for high prices;
- No evidence of a wholesale business such as posted prices or separate entrances for wholesale customers;
- Telephone and on-line orders were not taken;
- Delivery was not offered;
- The six most expensive (i.e., costing \$5.00 and above) SNAP-eligible food items in stock were Folgers coffee at \$9.99 per 38.4 ounces (1 unit in stock), Maxwell House coffee at \$8.68 per 24.5 ounces (1 unit in stock), Peet's coffee at \$7.99 per 12 ounces (2 units in stock), Bar S franks at \$7.89 per 48 ounces (2 units in stock), Jack Links jerky at \$6.89 per 2.85 ounces, and Captain Crunch Berries cereal at \$5.89 per 40 ounces (3 units in stock);
- No fresh or frozen unprocessed meats, poultry, or seafood;
- Had a limited variety and amount of frozen food stock to include such items as ice cream, Philly cheese steaks, bacon, Hot Pockets, pot pies, pizza, and meals;
- Did not have a kitchen and hot foods were not sold;
- Did not have a deli or prepared food section and deli meats and cheeses were not sold by the pound;
- Prepackaged deli sandwiches were available for purchase;
- Meat items included units of eggs, packaged lunch meat, canned/potted meat, meat jerky, canned fish, bacon, sausage, and hot dogs;
- Dairy included milk (dairy and coconut varieties), margarine, butter, sour cream, yogurt, and cheese;
- Fresh produce stock consisted of a few bananas;
- Other staple foods available for purchase included such items as juice, pasta, cereal, loaf bread, buns/rolls, tortillas, flour, rice, corn meal, bagels, and canned goods;
- Much of the remaining food stock consisted of accessory foods such as candy, carbonated and non-carbonated drinks, condiments, sugar, snack foods, and cakes/pastries; and
- Ineligible nonfood items included tobacco products, health and beauty aids, paper products, household cleaning supplies, automotive supplies, alcohol, housewares, gift items/party goods/souvenirs, cell phone accessories, and firewood.

## **Charge Letter Attachments**

On review, the investigative materials provided by the Retailer Operations Division, including computer printouts of transaction data available from Federal records, store visit observations, information regarding area competitor firms, and household shopping patterns, were analyzed.

Government analyses of stores caught in trafficking violations during on-site investigations have found that transactions involving trafficking consistently display particular characteristics or patterns. These patterns include, in part, those cited in the letter of charges. Based on this empirical data, and in the absence of any reasonable explanations for such transaction patterns, a conclusion can be drawn through a preponderance of evidence that the most likely explanation for “unusual, irregular, and inexplicable” transactions and patterns cited in the letter of charges is trafficking. Transactions having such characteristics sometimes do have valid explanations that support that they were the result of legitimate purchases of eligible food items. This is why opportunities are afforded to charged retailers to explain the questionable transactions cited. In this case, the Retailer Operations Division determined that the Appellant’s contentions did not outweigh the evidence. The issue in this review is whether, through a preponderance of evidence, it is more likely true than not true that questionable transactions were the result of trafficking. As patterns of unusual transactions appear across multiple Attachments, the case of trafficking becomes more convincing.

### **Repeat Transactions by the Same Household (Charge Letter Attachment 1)**

This charge letter Attachment documents 24 sets of transactions (56 total transactions) that total \$4,632.65 in SNAP benefits to meet the parameters of this scan. These transactions were conducted by 13 different SNAP households. Multiple transactions conducted by the same household account within a short period of time is a method which violating stores use to avoid single high dollar transactions that cannot be supported by a retailer’s inventory and structure.

#### **5 U.S.C. § 552 (b)(7)(E).**

The Appellant contends that FNS has previously conducted research (*Benefit Redemption Patterns in the Supplemental Nutrition Assistance Program in Fiscal Year 2017* (2020)) which indicates that purchases made within the first seven days after receiving benefits is not unusual. In fact, on a regular basis, the participants will make significant grocery purchases from the Appellant within 48 hours of receiving the deposit into their accounts. In some instances, the act of purchasing an item is pleasing, as much of the month they lack the financial ability to do so. So they will either shop regularly on the same day, or they will binge shop and make large purchases because they have the benefits to do so.

Although it is not uncommon for customers to have more than one transaction per day and there are no limits on the number of times EBT cards may be used or the amount of eligible foods that may be purchased, it is not common that such multiple transactions are for large dollar amounts. The SNAP transactions noted in the charge letter are questionable not because they exceed any limits for use, but rather because they display characteristics of use inconsistent with the nature and extent of the Appellant’s stock and facilities and are therefore, indicative of trafficking.

Although many SNAP households do shop early in the month as opposed to later in the month, most households do not spend all or a majority of their monthly benefit allotment in just one or two days, especially from a convenience store like the Appellant firm that has a moderate food stock, no fresh or frozen unprocessed meats, poultry, or seafood, a limited variety and amount of frozen food stock, no fresh produce stock other than a few bananas, and lacks an abundant depth and breadth of staple foods.

While FNS acknowledges the cited *Benefit Redemption Patterns in the Supplemental Nutrition Assistance Program in Fiscal Year 2017* report, it is important to note many of the statistics cited by the Appellant have little to no connection to the case against the subject firm. The subject firm is located in 5 U.S.C. § 552 (b)(6) & (b)(7)(C), which is located in the 5 U.S.C. § 552 (b)(6) & (b)(7)(C) region so household transaction activities in the other regions do not appear to be impactful on this particular case. In addition, there is nothing in this report supporting a finding that average SNAP households make multiple substantial (more than \$20.00) transactions in short periods, which exceeds the transaction amount for this store type (convenience store) average for the state and county (\$9.53 and \$9.60, respectively). Lastly, there is nothing in the study which would explain why households in the charge letter are traveling to the subject convenience store which has a moderate stock to complete repetitive and excessively large dollar transactions.

The Appellant contends that the store services a much higher Asian population than the average SNAP retailer to whom their transactions are compared. Small grocers/convenience stores in African American communities are more likely to have Scan B2 transactions. Also, families with children (especially those with multiple parents/adults) are more likely to shop in higher frequency and produce Scan B2 transactions because their purchases tend to be higher.

However, there is no indication as to how these factors explain the questionable transaction patterns addressed in the charge letter. Many households are comprised of a diverse family dynamic, yet this is not an indication that questionable transactions would be occurring at any given store. The subject store shows unusual transaction patterns that are not occurring in other similarly or even better stocked stores. If specific diverse family needs are causing these questionable transactions at the subject store, it would be expected that similar patterns would exist at other neighboring stores. However, this is not the case.

In addition, there is nothing in the study cited by the Appellant (*Benefit Redemption Patterns in the SNAP in Fiscal Year 2017*) which indicates that African American communities are more likely to conduct Scan B2 transactions. This study noted that African American Non-Hispanic households averaged 9.9 transactions per month with an average EBT transaction of \$28.66 (as opposed to White Non-Hispanic households that averaged 8.5 transactions per month with an average transaction of \$29.95).

The Appellant contends these transactions are the result of the participant forgetting an item in his/her prior transaction, the participant making a purchase, returning home, and then returning to the store to make a second purchase, the store's business practices, and a reflection of the normal shopping habits of SNAP participants. The Appellant is aware that there are a number of SNAP households that come into the store multiple times a day because of convenience, often sending their children on separate shopping trips to pick up items. Some participants make purchases for friends, for large gatherings or to satisfy needs that are not obvious. There is a displaced homeless community "tent city" located directly next to the store. Members of this community visit the store

multiple times a day for their deeds since they have no refrigeration. The store's inventory is sufficient to account for the transactions and greatly exceeds stores around it and has a greater quality and variety than your average convenience store.

However, the second, third, and subsequent transactions in each set are too large to consist of forgotten items. In addition, the report and photographs from the store visit as well as the photos submitted by the Appellant offer no explanation as to why SNAP customers would routinely shop at Roll Your Own Mart multiple times during a short period or purchase such a large volume of items, there being no great variety or advertisements of products, price advantage, profusion of large packages, or significant bulk items or food cases for sale. While the Appellant is correct that the firm was sufficiently stocked in the four staple food categories at the time of the store visit, the majority of the store's food stock consists of generally low dollar items such as packaged food items, canned items, accessory food items, snacks, and beverages. The inventory purchase receipts provided by the Appellant confirm that purchases of these low dollar items are predominant and account for a considerable portion of the firm's overall SNAP sales. While the Appellant contends that sometimes customers call for pick up or order items, the store visit report, which was completed in collaboration with and signed by the store owner, indicates that the firm offered no special or custom services to customers, such as on-line or telephone orders and/or delivery services or a profusion of specialty or ethnic goods, which would entice SNAP customers to utilize the subject store over other area authorized retail stores.

FNS does not refute the Appellant's contention that it is easier for a customer to get through the spaces of a store like the subject firm than it is for them to go into a supermarket/super store. Nor does FNS refute the Appellant's claim that customers are more likely to come back for supplemental and quick shopping trips than they would at an average convenience store with an inferior inventory and a further distance from their homes. However, these contributing factors do not explain the multiple and often large transactions made at the Appellant from the same household in a short period of time.

The Appellant contends that the store does have an optical scanner, but the clerk has the ability to visually identify and enter items into the register. Item prices are usually consistent if not outright uniform, and are frequently memorized by the clerk through repetition over time. Furthermore, the store will tabulate transactions on a rolling basis, meaning that unlike a grocery store when you line up, set all of your items on the counter and then purchase them, this store permits participants to gather items, bring them to the register, and then return to gather more items.

While the store visit observations indicate that the Appellant has an optical scanner, it was also confirmed that the firm had a small checkout area with limited check-out counter space, one cash register and EBT POS device for ringing up grocery purchases, and no conveyor belts to expedite high dollar or rapid consecutive purchases. The customers have no place to put multiple purchases while shopping. As a customer this would be inconvenient at best and it would make it hard for the cashiers to keep a running total of items purchased as the Appellant suggests. As such, even if cashiers do know the price of goods by memory, these factors call into question that this is a reasonable explanation for the transactions.

As to whether or not co-shopping actually affected the Appellant firm during the review period, this argument is little more than conjecture. The Appellant has provided no evidence to show that co-shopping is particularly common among SNAP recipients in 5 U.S.C. § 552 (b)(6) & (b)(7)(C). If

co-shopping truly impacted Roll Your Own Mart as the Appellant suggests, it would stand to reason that co-shopping would affect other nearby firms as well. This would manifest itself in comparable firms having similar transaction patterns – multiple transactions from the same household in a short period of time. But this is simply not the case.

No evidence was submitted to support the Appellant's contentions that these transactions are the result of unemployed local SNAP household members satiating their boredom by regularly shopping at stores to find something to do. If shopping due to boredom were a regular occurrence at the Appellant, this pattern would manifest itself in comparable firms having similar transaction patterns. But this is simply not the case. No evidence was submitted to support the Appellant's contention that there are eight SNAP retailers in the area with the nearest located 0.16 miles away, causing a reduction in flow of SNAP participants. The Appellant's sales would also be impacted if its claim is true that the store is located in an area in which there is a reduction in flow due to more direct competition and a smaller portion of the overall business.

With regard to the Appellant's statements regarding vehicle restrictions in SNAP, households are eligible to receive SNAP benefits based on their income, not vehicle ownership. According to the USDA SNAP eligibility requirements, a vehicle may be counted as a resource (<https://www.fns.usda.gov/snap/recipient/eligibility>); resources are deducted from a household's gross income for the purpose of determining eligibility. However, a household may own one or more vehicles without them being counted as a resource or being subjected to the equity test based on the listed criteria.

The Appellant contends that the surrounding SNAP retailers operate in slightly different business environment conditions, or with material differences in operation, location and inventory. There are eight SNAP retailers in the area with the nearest store located 0.16 miles away. The Appellant is the only neighborhood store that carries a lot of products as most of the area stores are smoke shops. It is recognized that sometimes a firm may have unusual transaction patterns due to a recipient's lack of access to other SNAP authorized stores. However, during the review period there were 22 SNAP authorized retailers located within a 1.0 mile radius of Roll Your Own Mart, including 1 super store, 1 supermarket, 2 large grocery stores, and 2 medium grocery stores, and 61 SNAP authorized retailers located within a 2.0 mile radius of the Appellant including 2 super stores, 1 supermarket, 3 large grocery stores, and 9 medium grocery stores, which could meet the nutritional needs of SNAP customers. Some of these area authorized stores offer a comparable or greater quantity and variety of food products at comparable or better prices as compared to the subject store.

The Appellant contends that transportation inconsistency is another reason for the transactions outlined in this Attachment. Participants do not have their own vehicles so trips to larger stores are dependent upon rides from friends or family. A household that cannot depend on those trips is forced to shop nearby. However, the record indicates that SNAP customers who shopped at Roll Your Own Mart during the review period also shopped at other area grocery stores and, therefore, transportation to other stores is not an issue for these customers. Therefore, lack of access to other authorized stores or the availability of other food stores does not appear to be an explanation for the Appellant's abnormally high SNAP transaction amounts conducted within a short timeframe of each other.

The Appellant has not provided any evidence to show that the transactions listed in this Attachment were legitimate purchases of eligible foods and not the result of trafficking of SNAP benefits. The arguments presented by the Appellant hold little weight without some kind of evidence to

substantiate its claims. The Appellant has the burden to provide relevant evidence to rebut the trafficking charges. This burden has not been met.

### **Excessively Large Purchase Transactions (Charge Letter Attachment 2)**

This charge letter Attachment documents 159 SNAP transactions, as large as \$351.05, that total \$12,603.08. These large transaction amounts are not consistent with the store's observed characteristics and food inventory. The frequency of high dollar purchases in the review period calls into question the legitimacy of these transactions.

The Appellant contends that the store sells a variety and quantity of staple food items and that it is sufficiently stocked in all four staple food categories to account for these transactions. The vast majority of the store's offerings are qualified items under the SNAP. The Appellant offers its clientele a considerable inventory in breads, cereals, and meats.

However, the food stock and facilities of the Appellant as reported in the store visit documentation do not appear sufficient to provide for all of one's food needs. People generally do not spend large sums at such stores. They usually stop at convenience stores to pick up a few staple food items, such as bread, milk, or a can or two of food that they may consider are not worth a trip to the supermarket to purchase. The Appellant contends that the large transactions are not the result of trafficking of SNAP benefits. However, it is rare for a convenience store such as Roll Your Own Mart to have purchases like those included in this Attachment to the charge letter.

The Appellant contends that the number of high priced items in the store does not require the store to have a huge amount of counter space to set all of the items and it is not difficult to imagine \$100.00 worth of groceries being purchased in a single trip. Given that a number of these items is roughly \$8.00 each, eight of such items would not be difficult to carry and could be placed on the given space set out in the store visit report. In addition, visual identification on the part of the store clerk is easier than scanning items as they are aware of the prices because of experience so they need only to identify the items and enter the price on the register.

However, a review of the store visit report and photos as well as the photos provided by the Appellant indicates that Roll Your Own Mart is a convenience store offering a moderate variety and amount of staple food items and does not offer any specialty or ethnic food items that are not available at other area authorized retail food stores. The firm had a small checkout area with limited check-out space, one cash register and one EBT POS device for use in ringing up grocery purchases, and no conveyor belts to expedite high dollar or rapid consecutive purchases. In addition, there were no shopping carts or hand-held baskets in which to transport the large number of items required to make up these large transaction amounts. Without these, it is unlikely that such large dollar value transactions could be for actual food purchases and more likely they are trafficking. The customers have no place to put multiple purchases while shopping. As a customer this would be inconvenient at best and it would make it hard for the cashiers to keep a running total of items purchased as the Appellant suggests. As such, even if cashiers do know the price of goods by memory, these factors call into question that this is a reasonable explanation for the transactions.

The Appellant contends that the store visit report captured a snapshot of the store's inventory, though it was not documented in complete detail. The inspector's list of higher priced items was not exhaustive as there appears to be items in the inventory that were documented but not listed by price.

It is important to note that many of the items listed by the Appellant as being “high priced items” would not have been noted on the store visit report as they are either less than \$5.00 (the store visit report includes the six most expensive SNAP-eligible items costing \$5.00 and above) or were priced above \$5.00 but less than \$5.89, the lowest “high priced” item noted during the store visit. In addition, the store visit report, which was completed in collaboration with and signed by the store owner, as well as the store photos noted that there were only a few expensive foods in stock that would account for these large amounts. Specifically, the six most expensive SNAP-eligible food items in stock were Folgers coffee at \$9.99 per 38.4 ounces, Maxwell House coffee at \$8.68 per 24.5 ounces, Peet’s coffee at \$7.99 per 12 ounces, Bar S franks at \$7.89 per 48 ounces, Jack Links jerky at \$6.89 per 2.85 ounces, and Captain Crunch Berries cereal at \$5.89 per 40 ounces, and that all but one of these food items were stocked in limited quantities. In addition, the store visit observations indicate that there were no signs posted or flyers available advertising the availability of bulk foods offered at a discounted rate to include meats in bulk, foods or drinks sold by the case, specials such as buy one food item and get one for free, and grocery package deals, no evidence of meat/seafood specials or bundles or fruit/vegetable boxes that might sell for high prices, and no evidence of a wholesale business such as posted prices or separate entrances for wholesale customers.

The CBD oils/products noted by the Appellant and included in the Appellant’s stock photos are made by 5 U.S.C. § 552 (b)(6) & (b)(7)(C). A search of these products on-line indicates that these items do not carry a Nutrition Facts Label and therefore, do not qualify as an eligible food item within the SNAP program. 5 U.S.C. § 552 (b)(7)(E). As such, purchases of CBD oils/products, even if they were SNAP-eligible items, do not explain the transactions noted in the charge letter.

It is important to note that even if there were a few food items not noted in the store visit report that are stocked by the store, the Appellant did not provide adequate evidence of continuously purchasing inventory throughout the review period to satisfy the large transactions (see “Supporting Documents” section of the Final Agency Decision). The store must have stocked inventory to repetitively generate large sales, which was not evident in the store visit. The inventory purchase invoices provided by the Appellant also indicate that purchases of low dollar value foods, mainly inexpensive canned and packaged goods, snack foods, single-serving items and accessory foods, are predominant and account for a considerable portion of the firm’s overall SNAP sales.

The Appellant contends that it offers the following promotion to customers: “Spend \$100 on food and get \$10.00 off”. However, no evidence was submitted validating the offering of this promotion. Of the 11 photos submitted by the Appellant it would be expected that at a minimum, a sale sign would have been included showing this promotional offer; however, it was not. In addition, of the 159 F scan transactions included in Attachment 2, only one was for 100.00, three were for 100.xx, and none (0) of the transactions were flagged for \$90.00 – which one would expect if a household qualified for this promotion and saved \$10.00 on their \$100.00 purchase. Therefore, this evidence is found insufficient to explain the charges or to mitigate the sanction in this case.

While the Appellant firm may be located in a neighborhood with households that qualify for SNAP benefits, near a homeless camp, and within walking distance of multiple schools, parks, apartment buildings, and low-income housing developments, and sits on a main transportation route, these factors are not an indication that questionable transactions would be occurring at any given store. The subject store shows unusual transaction patterns that are not displayed in other similarly stocked stores. If specific household needs are causing these questionable transactions at the subject store, it

would be expected that similar patterns would also present themselves at nearby firms as well. But this is simply not the case.

The Appellant contends that according to USDA's research (*Foods Typically Purchased by SNAP Households*), sweetened beverages and salty snacks are within the top 10 expenditures for SNAP households, as are meats and a number of other items offered by the Appellant. It is therefore reasonable to expect SNAP customers to spend large amounts and/or the majority of their benefits at the Appellant store.

It is acknowledged that the subject store does offer items that SNAP households would purchase; however, many of these items are accessory items that a SNAP customer would not purchase all the time. However, the key findings of the noted study indicate that there were no major differences in the expenditure patterns of SNAP and non-SNAP households, no matter how the data was categorized. The study noted that similar to most American households: About 40 cents of every dollar of food expenditures by SNAP households was spent on basic items such as meat, fruits, vegetables, milk, eggs, and bread; another 20 cents out of every dollar was spent on sweetened beverages, desserts, salty snacks, candy and sugar; the remaining 40 cents was spent on a variety of items such as cereal, prepared foods, dairy products, rice, and beans; and the top 10 summary categories and the top 7 commodities by expenditure were the same for SNAP and non-SNAP households, although ranked in slightly different orders.

The Appellant contends that certain household types are more likely to conduct transactions that fit the Scan F thresholds and would therefore generate hits in the Scan report. In particular, households with children and multiple adults tend to make much larger purchases on average. However, the *Benefit Redemption Patterns in the SNAP in Fiscal Year 2017* report cited by the Appellant does not state or suggest the finding that households with children are more likely to have Scan B2 or F transactions. Nothing in the report indicates that households with children were likely to seek out typically stocked convenience stores to complete repetitive and excessively large transactions. In fact, the report indicates that households with children spent 83.2% of their SNAP benefits on average at supermarkets and super stores. Also, households with children had an average transaction at convenience stores of just \$7.81 while their average transaction at supermarkets/super stores was \$48.00.

The Appellant provided statistics pertaining to the general demographic and noted that households that conducted these transactions have a larger amount of SNAP residents residing in their homes and/or receive more benefits. However, there is no indication as to how this explains the questionable transaction patterns addressed in the charge letter. Many households are comprised of a diverse family dynamic, yet this is not an indication that questionable transactions would be occurring at any given store. The subject store shows unusual transaction patterns that are not occurring in other similarly or even better stocked stores. If specific family needs are causing these questionable transactions at the subject store, it would be expected that similar patterns would exist at other neighboring stores. However, this is not the case.

The Appellant contends that households with particular demographic information and located in particular geographic areas are more likely to be disqualified which shows a bias towards smaller grocers. Regional differences in disqualification rates and shopping habits support this contention as well. However, the Retailer Operations Division does not complete disqualification actions against SNAP households. It reviews household shopping patterns, transaction data, store visit data,

etc. The race of the store owner and SNAP recipients shopping at the firm is not part of the consideration given. With very few exceptions, the Retailer Operations Division does not have access to information with regard to household size. Similarly, the Retailer Operation Division does not have access to the ethnicity of the households shopping at the subject firm. All of this data is maintained and collected by state agencies. After taking permanent disqualification actions against retailers (of any size), the Retailer Operations Division sends a referral to the state agency partners with a list of all transactions in the charge letter. The state agency then conducts their own investigations of SNAP households which the Retailer Operations Division does not take part of.

The Appellant's contention that stores miscategorized as convenience stores are likely to have far higher Scan F hits may be true. However, nothing in this case suggests the subject firm was miscategorized. Roll Your Own Mart was classified as a convenience store by FNS based on information the firm provided in its initial application and subsequent periodic reauthorization (if applicable) applications to SNAP. 5 U.S.C. § 552 (b)(7)(E). At the time of the March 31, 2021 store visit, the firm's stock met the criteria of a convenience and is therefore, categorized as such. 5 U.S.C. § 552 (b)(7)(E).

5 U.S.C. § 552 (b)(7)(E).

The Appellant contends that the affidavits submitted from 11 of the store's customers attest that they spend between \$50.00 to \$250.00 during a single trip, exhausting between 50% to 100% of their benefits at the Appellant, and the majority attesting to frequenting the store multiple times in a single day. 5 U.S.C. § 552 (b)(7)(E).

5 U.S.C. § 552 (b)(7)(E). As such, these statements are not found to be more persuasive of legitimate SNAP transactions for eligible foods than the evidence supporting trafficking.

The Appellant's contentions with regard to co-shopping and lack of other stores located nearby which stock the inventory variety of the subject store were addressed in the previous (Attachment 1) section. As to the Appellant's contention that there have material changes to the store since the pandemic, these factors are not an indication that questionable transactions would be occurring at any given store. The subject store shows unusual transaction patterns that are not displayed in other similarly stocked stores. If specific household needs are causing these questionable transactions at the subject store, it would be expected that similar patterns would also present themselves at nearby firms as well. But this is simply not the case.

In support of the Appellant's discussions regarding SNAP households' shopping habits, the following studies were provided and/or cited: *Benefit Redemption Patterns in the SNAP in Fiscal Year 2017 Final Report*, Insight Policy Research, September 2020; *Shopping Pattern and Food Purchase Difference Among SNAP Households and Non-SNAP Households in the United States*, Preventative Medicine Reports, June 20, 2017; and *What Does SNAP Benefit Usage Tell Us About Food Access in Low-Income Neighborhoods?*, Social Science & Medicine, 2014, a study by Google, Inc.; *3 Lasting Changes to Grocery Shopping After COVID-19*, Forbes Magazine; and *Grocery Retail to Lead Restaurants in Food Market Share Post-Pandemic*, Supermarket News. While FNS does not dispute the findings of these studies, they do not provide any evidence that trafficking was not occurring at Roll Your Own Mart.

5 U.S.C. § 552 (b)(7)(E).

Based on the store layout, infrastructure, and available inventory, it is not credible that the Appellant would so frequently conduct large transactions closely resembling those typically found at a supermarket or super store. It is not plausible that the firm's customers would regularly carry very large amounts of merchandise around the store without the benefit of shopping carts, especially since larger, better-stocked stores are readily available and in the vicinity of the Appellant firm. The Appellant is not set up to process high-dollar transactions, as indicated by its lack of equipment to facilitate large transactions and limited counter space. There are no legitimate bases for SNAP customers' unusual attraction to the firm such as a superior selection of staple foods, price advantages, package specials, bulk or promotional items, an extensive variety of otherwise unavailable ethnic food items at other area stores, or special services rendered. The Appellant failed to provide convincing evidence to establish the legitimacy of these excessively large transactions, 5 U.S.C. § 552 (b)(7)(E). Based on all of these factors discussed in this section, the large volume of transactions for high dollar amounts is unlikely to indicate a pattern of legitimate food purchases.

### **Evidence of Trafficking**

Regarding the Appellant's contentions with respect to the reliability of the ALERT system and Confirmation Bias, USDA employs a computerized fraud detection tool to identify EBT transactions that form patterns that have characteristics indicative of trafficking. However, this tool does not, by itself, determine or conclude that trafficking has occurred. The Retailer Operations Division analyzes the transaction data and patterns along with other documentation such as, information from the onsite store visit report including photographs of stock and the store layout, an analysis of recipient shopping behavior, and comparisons with similar store types in local area, to render a determination as to whether or not the questionable transaction patterns were, more likely than not, the result of trafficking. The regulations at 7 CFR § 278.6(a) state that FNS may disqualify any authorized retail food store if the firm fails to comply with the Food and Nutrition Act of 2008, as amended, and that such disqualification shall result from a finding of a violation on the basis of evidence that may include facts established through, inconsistent redemption data, and evidence obtained through a transaction report under an electronic benefit transfer system.

The Appellant argues that USDA does not know the correlation coefficient between ALERT scans and trafficking. The Appellant asserts that it has calculated this based on results of undercover investigations and determined that it was a positive correlation, but the relationship between the values is weak. These contentions are pure conjecture on the part of the Appellant. The Appellant does not have the necessary data to perform a reliable correlation analysis.

### **Supporting Documents**

The Appellant contends that the submitted inventory receipts and other information support the firm's position that trafficking did not occur.

The Appellant submitted a 6-page list of SNAP household expenditures annotating ye/no/sometimes. 5 U.S.C. § 552 (b)(7)(E). Therefore, this evidence is found insufficient to explain the charges or to mitigate the imposed sanction.

The Appellant submitted a one-page document (38-lines) noting invoices with dates ranging from June 2020 to December 2021. 5 U.S.C. § 552 (b)(7)(E). Therefore, this evidence is found insufficient to explain the charges or to mitigate the sanction in this case.

The bank and credit card statements submitted are within the review period and reflect activities such as withdrawals and deposits made by the Appellant and credit card activity. The statements provide general descriptions of transactions made through Bank of America and First Data but do not provide detailed transactions that would allow FNS to evaluate the store's inventory. 5 U.S.C. § 552 (b)(7)(E). Therefore, this evidence provides little probative value.

The Appellant submitted 15 purchase invoices/receipts from May 2021 and 27 pages of Coca-Cola invoices ranging from December 2020 to May 2021. Two of the submitted invoices were illegible and one lacked a date. As such, these invoices were excluded from analysis. It is important to note that the inventory purchase invoices confirm that purchases of low dollar value foods, mainly inexpensive canned and packaged goods, snack foods, single-serving items and accessory foods, are predominant and account for a considerable portion of the firm's overall SNAP sales.

5 U.S.C. § 552 (b)(7)(E). In sum, the invoices do not explain the questionable transactions at the Appellant.

The Appellant submitted a one-page document titled "5 U.S.C. § 552 (b)(6) & (b)(7)(C)" where the six-month total from December 2020 to May 2021 is \$6,015.00 for items ranging from Red Bull to Jarritos beverages. No vendor name is indicated for this invoice. An on-line search for "5 U.S.C. § 552 (b)(6) & (b)(7)(C)" yields no results other than a 5 U.S.C. § 552 (b)(6) & (b)(7)(C) to which FNS could find any correlation to this case. Therefore, this information is insufficient to explain the imposed charges.

5 U.S.C. § 552 (b)(7)(E).

The Appellant submitted an Excel report created on December 23, 2021 noting "units sold". 5 U.S.C. § 552 (b)(7)(E). As such, this information provides no probative value with regard to explaining the transactions noted in the charge letter.

The Appellant submitted an Excel Velocity report for December 1, 2021 to May 31, 2021. 5 U.S.C. § 552 (b)(7)(E). As such, this report does not sufficiently explain the transactions noted in the charge letter Attachments.

The submitted 2020 U.S. Individual Income tax return for store owner does not contain sufficient detail for FNS to evaluate the store's inventory. The document provides no insight into the inventory purchased by the store or the individual SNAP transactions that occurred during the review period. As such, this document does not offer additional insight as to what occurred during the charge letter transactions and do not validate that they were legitimate, bona-fide transactions.

### **Compliance History**

The Appellant asserts that this firm has never had a compliance problem with SNAP in the past. The firm's compliance policy is an important factor and should be taken into consideration as it could have a material impact on the transactions noted during the review period. It would defy logic for the

store owner with a long history of compliance to suddenly start trafficking for the de minimus amounts set forth in the charge letter.

The Appellant is correct that the firm has not been cited for prior violations. However, a record of participation in the SNAP with no previously documented instance of violations does not constitute valid grounds for dismissal of the current charges of violations or for mitigating the impact of those charges.

Neither the Food and Nutrition Act of 2008, as amended, nor the accompanying regulations cite any minimum dollar amount of cash or SNAP benefits, or number of occurrences, for such exchanges to be defined as trafficking. Nor do they cite any degrees of seriousness pertaining to trafficking of SNAP benefits. Trafficking is always considered to be extremely serious, even when the exchange of SNAP benefits for cash is dollar-for-dollar or is conducted by a nonmanagerial store clerk. This is reflected in the Food and Nutrition Act, which reads, in part, that disqualification "shall be permanent upon . . . the first occasion of a disqualification based on . . . trafficking . . . by a retail food store." In keeping with this legislative mandate, § 278.6(e)(1)(i) of the SNAP regulations states that FNS must disqualify a firm permanently if personnel of the firm have trafficked. There is no agency discretion in the matter of what sanction is to be imposed when trafficking is involved.

### **Case Laws and Past Administrative Reviews**

With regard to the case laws cited by the Appellant, it is beyond the scope and authority of this review to determine the applicability of same. This review is limited to consideration of whether or not the Retailer Operations Division duly adhered to the Food and Nutrition Act of 2008, as amended, and the implementing regulations, and whether or not the action taken is sustainable by a preponderance of the evidence. Therefore, the application of any judicial precedent is better addressed via judicial review. Accordingly, no further findings or conclusions are rendered in this regard.

With regard to the prior Final Agency Decisions cited by the Appellant, this administrative review decision is based on the specific circumstances of this case as documented by the materials provided by the Appellant and the Retailer Operations Division. This administrative review decision does not establish policy or supersede Federal law or regulations. The determination in this case conforms to SNAP regulations and is consistent with sanctions imposed upon other retailers that have committed similar violations.

### **FOIA**

The Appellant contends that not holding determinations in abeyance while FOIA responses are pending violates 7 CFR §278.6(b)(1) according to *Triple E Express vs. ROD*, because the Appellant is not given a full opportunity to respond. With regard to this contention, effective October 26, 2020, the changes to 7 CFR § 278.6 and 7 CFR § 279.4 went into effect. These changes prohibit holding determinations and administrative reviews in abeyance while FOIA responses are pending. The finding in *Triple E Express* was based on outdated regulations.

### **CIVIL MONEY PENALTY**

As previously indicated, the March 25, 2022 determination letter advised the Appellant of the ineligibility for consideration for a trafficking civil money penalty according to the terms of Section

278.6(i) of the SNAP regulations. The letter of charges dated December 6, 2021 advised the Appellant that documentation of eligibility for that alternative sanction was to be provided within 10 days. The regulations specify that such documentation must, in part, establish that there was an effective compliance policy and training program and that both were in effect and implemented prior to the occurrence of violations. The letter indicates that no information was provided by the Appellant for consideration; therefore, on review the Retailer Operations Division's determination that the Appellant firm is ineligible for the imposition of civil money penalties in lieu of disqualification is affirmed.

## **CONCLUSION**

The Retailer Operations Division's analysis of the Appellant's EBT transaction record, upon which charges of violations are based, together with observations made during the store visit and an analysis of customer shopping behaviors, provide substantial evidence that questionable transactions during the focus period have characteristics and display patterns that are not consistent with legitimate sales of eligible food to SNAP benefit customers at a store of this type, size and makeup. Rather, the characteristics are indicative of illegal trafficking in program benefits. The Appellant's contentions do not outweigh this evidence.

The record has yielded no indication of error or discrepancy in the reported findings by the Retailer Operations Division that program benefits were accepted in exchange for cash or consideration other than eligible food. Therefore, based on a review of the evidence in this case, it is more likely true than not true that program violations did, in fact, occur as charged. Therefore, the decision to impose a permanent disqualification from participation in the SNAP against Roll Your Own Mart is sustained.

## **RIGHTS AND REMEDIES**

Your attention is called to Section 14 of the Food and Nutrition Act of 2008 (7 U.S.C. 2023) and to Section 279.7 of the Regulations (7 CFR § 279.7) with respect to your right to a judicial review of this determination. Please note that if a judicial review is desired, the Complaint, naming the United States as the defendant, must be filed in the U.S. District Court for the district in which you reside or are engaged in business, or in any court of record of the State having competent jurisdiction. If any Complaint is filed, it must be filed within thirty (30) days of receipt of this Decision.

Under the Freedom of Information Act, FNS is releasing this information in a redacted format as appropriate. FNS will protect, to the extent provided by law, personal information that could constitute an unwarranted invasion of privacy.

LORIE L. CONNEEN  
ADMINISTRATIVE REVIEW OFFICER

June 9, 2022