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

Newyork Minimart,

Appellant,

v.

Office of Retailer Operations and Compliance,

Respondent.

Case Number: C0246996

FINAL AGENCY DECISION

The U.S. Department of Agriculture, Food and Nutrition Service (FNS), finds that there is sufficient evidence to support the determination by the Office of Retailer Operations and Compliance to impose a permanent disqualification against Newyork Minimart (hereinafter Appellant) from participating as an authorized retailer in the Supplemental Nutrition Assistance Program (SNAP).

ISSUE

The issue accepted for review is whether the Office of Retailer Operations and Compliance took appropriate action, consistent with Title 7 of the Code of Federal Regulations (CFR) § 278.6(a), (c) and (e)(1)(i), when it imposed a permanent disqualification against Appellant.

AUTHORITY

According to 7 U.S.C. § 2023 and the implementing regulations at 7 CFR § 279.1, "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

By letter dated July 14, 2021, the Office of Retailer Operations and Compliance charged Appellant with trafficking based on a series of irregular SNAP transaction patterns that occurred in January 2021 through May 2021. The letter noted that the penalty for trafficking is permanent disqualification as provided by 7 CFR § 278.6(e)(1). The letter also noted that the Appellant could request a trafficking civil money penalty (CMP) in lieu of a permanent disqualification within ten days of receipt under the conditions specified in 7 CFR § 278.6(i).

Appellant, through counsel, in an email dated July 19, 2021, requested an extension of time to respond to the charges and was subsequently approved for an extension until August 25, 2021. Appellant requested a further extension via email on August 17, 2021, and was denied on August 20, 2021, by the Office of Retailer Operations and Compliance. Appellant failed to respond to the charges and also did not request or provide any documentation in support of a CMP. The Office of Retailer Operations and Compliance notified Appellant by letter dated August 26, 2021, that the firm was permanently disqualified from participation as a SNAP retailer in accordance with 7 CFR § 278.6(c) and 278.6(e)(1) for trafficking violations. This letter also stated that Appellant was not eligible for the CMP because insufficient evidence was submitted to demonstrate that it had established and implemented an effective compliance policy and program to prevent SNAP violations.

By letter postmarked September 2, 2021, Appellant, without counsel, appealed the Office of Retailer Operations and Compliance's assessment and requested administrative review. Subsequent correspondence was received.

STANDARD OF REVIEW

In an appeal of an adverse action, Appellant bears the burden of proving by a preponderance of evidence that the administrative action should be reversed. That means Appellant has the burden of providing relevant evidence that a reasonable mind, considering the record as a whole, would accept as sufficient to support a conclusion that the argument asserted is more likely to be true than untrue.

CONTROLLING LAW

The controlling law in this matter is contained in the Food and Nutrition Act of 2008, as amended (7 U.S.C. § 2021), and implemented through regulation under Title 7 CFR Part 278. In particular, 7 CFR Part 278.6(a) and Part 278.6(e)(1)(i) establish the authority upon which a permanent disqualification may be imposed against a retail food store or wholesale food concern in the event that personnel of the firm have engaged in trafficking SNAP benefits.

7 CFR § 278.6(a) states: "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."

7 CFR § 278.6(e)(1)(i) states: "FNS shall disqualify a firm permanently if personnel of the firm have trafficked as defined in § 271.2." Trafficking is defined in part as, "The buying, selling, stealing, or otherwise effecting an exchange of SNAP benefits for cash or consideration other than eligible food". Trafficking includes "Intentionally purchasing products originally purchased with SNAP benefits in exchange for cash or consideration other than eligible food".

7 CFR §278.6(i) states: "FNS may impose a civil money penalty in lieu of a permanent disqualification for trafficking . . . 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 of the Program."

7 CFR §278.6(b)(2)(ii) states: "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 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)." Part 278.6(b)(2)(ii) further states that if a firm fails to request a civil money penalty in lieu of a permanent disqualification for trafficking and submit documentation and evidence of its eligibility within the specified 10 days, the firm shall not be eligible for such a penalty.

SUMMARY OF THE CHARGES

The issue in this review is whether, through a preponderance of evidence, it is more likely true than not true that the questionable transactions were the result of trafficking. The charges on review were based on an analysis of SNAP EBT transaction data during the five month period of January 2021 through May 2021. This involved two patterns of EBT transaction characteristics indicative of trafficking:

1. Multiple transactions were made from individual benefit accounts in unusually short time frames.
2. Excessively large purchase transactions were made from recipient accounts.

APPELLANT'S CONTENTIONS

The following may represent a summary of Appellant's contentions in this matter; however, in reaching a decision, full attention and consideration has been given to all contentions presented, including any not specifically recapitulated or specifically referenced herein:

- The owner requests a review. The firm has an established compliance policy to prevent violations and requests a CMP in lieu of disqualification;
- Losing SNAP would be detrimental to the senior community and the families that frequent the store and who do not have transportation to shop elsewhere. The senior center is across the street and there are hundreds of homes in immediate proximity to the store;
- The owner humbly implores FNS to reconsider suspending New York MiniMart's SNAP license, customers use the store every day to get their groceries and this community is statistically one of the most negatively affected areas of the Covid pandemic in the city;
- The transactions in question were purchases of crab legs and other assorted frozen seafoods sold in the store. These items sell the best during holidays and birthdays, but unfortunately the store doesn't have the resources to check who bought what food items and why; and,
- Items are priced ranging from $16.99-$129.99 and any variations or fluctuations in those amounts can be accounted for by a variety of reasons ranging from hardware error of the EBT machine which is very old and gives us daily issues to birthdays and holy days.

Appellant submitted 24 undated photos of store stock, two photos of a reach-in cooler, and a two page petition in support of these contentions.

ANALYSIS AND FINDINGS

The Appellant was charged with trafficking based on two Attachments to the FNS charge letter that contained patterns of unusual, irregular, and suspicious activity at the Appellant firm during the period under review. Neither Appellant's request for administrative review or its subsequent correspondence dated September 29, 2021, offer any legitimate documentation or explanation to support the legitimacy of the listed transactions in either of the two charge letter Attachments outside of a claim of offering expensive frozen seafood items ranging in price from $16.99-$129.99 which will be addressed separately. Accordingly, this decision will not include an analysis of the transactions listed in the charge letter Attachments as Appellant has offered no contentions to be considered. This also precludes the need for an indepth discussion of the findings from the FNS store visit conducted on May 1, 2021.

It is important to clarify for the record that the purpose of this review is to either validate or to invalidate the earlier decision of the Office of Retailer Operations and Compliance and is limited to what circumstances were at the basis of the action at the time such action was made. In an appeal of an adverse action, the Appellant bears the burden of proving by a preponderance of evidence that the administrative action should be reversed. That means the Appellant has the burden of providing relevant evidence that a reasonable mind, considering the record as a whole, would accept as sufficient to support a conclusion that the argument asserted is more likely to be true than untrue. Assertions that the firm has not violated program rules, by themselves and without supporting evidence and rationale, do not constitute valid grounds for dismissal of the current charges of violations or for mitigating their impact. When store ownership signed the certification page of the SNAP retailer application to become a SNAP retailer and when it reapplied following the six month disqualification period, it confirmed it understood and agreed to abide by program rules and regulatory provisions. It also agreed to accept responsibility on behalf of the firm for violations of the SNAP including those committed by any of the firm's employees, paid or unpaid, new, full-time or part-time. Regardless of whom the ownership of a store may utilize to handle store business or their degree of involvement in store operations, the ownership is accountable for the proper training of staff and the monitoring and handling of SNAP benefit transactions. The certification is clear that store ownership understood by signing the document that violations of program rules can result in administrative actions such as fines, sanctions, withdrawal, or disqualification from the SNAP.

The ownership and the firm were charged with trafficking based on a computer analysis of the store's transactions for the review period. The charges do not derive from the use of a confidential informant or independent investigator who visited the store and made illegal purchases to support findings of trafficking, but by a computer program used by SNAP Administrators. While traditional undercover operations are still in use by USDA, for many years federal regulations have also authorized the use of evidence consisting of EBT transaction data in investigations of SNAP retail stores to determine if trafficking is occurring and U.S. District Courts have long upheld the validity of EBT transaction data.

The issue under review involves a charge of trafficking SNAP benefits based on EBT transaction data. EBT transaction data is covered in SNAP regulations at 7 CFR § 278.6(a) and is addressed below. Trafficking is always considered to be the most serious violation even if it is a first offense therefore a temporary suspension or lesser penalty would not be applicable. SNAP regulations at 278.6(e)(1) clearly state that, "FNS shall disqualify a firm permanently if personnel of the firm have trafficked as defined in § 271.2." SNAP regulations at 7 CFR § 271.2, define trafficking as, "The buying, selling, stealing, or otherwise effecting an exchange of SNAP benefits for cash or consideration other than eligible food". SNAP regulations at 7 CFR § 278.6(a) clearly 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, 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". In the present case, the data presented in the Attachments is solely based on the SNAP EBT transactions conducted at the Appellant firm during the review period. This firm was selected as a result of a series of complex algorithms that make numerous data comparisons with other like type firms during the review period. All of the transactions were then reviewed and analyzed by the Office of Retailer Operations and Compliance staff before the decision was made to issue a charge letter. This investigative process included a detailed examination of information obtained from various sources, including, but not limited to the inventory report and photos from the FNS store visit, a transaction comparison and analysis of like type and larger stores, and an analysis of shopping patterns for recipient households conducting transactions at the Appellant firm during the review period. This analysis also included a review of the firm to ensure its store classification was correct and the data comparisons with like type firms valid. Additionally, there are nearby like type stores whose transaction data does not form these suspicious patterns and are therefore not at risk of disqualification for trafficking. There is also no regulatory requirement that trafficking disqualifications be based solely on on-site undercover operations.

Based on this empirical data, and in the absence of sufficient evidence for the legitimacy of such transaction patterns, a conclusion can be drawn, through a preponderance of evidence that the "unusual, irregular, and inexplicable" transactions and patterns cited in the charge letter evidence trafficking as the most likely explanation for the questionable transactions listed. It is herein determined that Appellant did not provide a preponderance of evidence demonstrating that the transactions contained in the charge letter were more likely due to eligible food sales than not. Under review, the evidence more substantially supports a conclusion that the transaction activity in the charge letter Attachments is due primarily to trafficking in SNAP benefits.

The Food and Nutrition Act of 2008, as amended, and the regulations issued pursuant thereto do not 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 the most serious violation, even when the exchange of SNAP benefits for cash is dollar-for-dollar or is conducted by a non-managerial 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, Section 278.6(e)(1)(i) of the SNAP regulations states that FNS shall 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 and second chances are not an authorized option under existing regulations.

Expensive Food Items Contentions

Appellant provided 24 undated photos of the store showing well stocked shelves, display racks, and coolers in addition to many star-shaped price tags posted throughout the store with the food item name and price handprinted on them. Nevertheless, this level of stock and signage is not supported by the many photos taken during the FNS store visit that occurred during the review period on May 1, 2021. The FNS store visit report and photos showed several empty or minimally stocked shelves, display racks, and coolers. Additionally, the FNS store visit report, which was completed in conjunction with the store owner, noted that the most expensive items in the store were frozen crab legs priced at $30.00 each with two packages in stock. The owner stated that the next most expensive items were pickled cucumbers in gallon containers priced at $8.99; sliced bacon priced at $6.99; and coffee, frozen pizza, and frozen popcorn chicken all priced at $5.99. The owner did not mention any other expensive items during the store visit, such as the frozen seafood priced from $16.99-$129.99 as claimed in Appellant's September 29, 2021, correspondence and no other expensive items were visible in any of the many FNS photos. The evidence strongly suggests that Appellant's photos were deliberately staged after the fact in an attempt to falsely support Appellant's contention that the firm stocked many expensive food items and therefore the photos are not representative of the stock normally offered for sale at the Appellant firm on a regular basis. No invoices or other evidence supporting additional expensive eligible food items was offered by the Appellant. Consequently the Appellant's photos do not accurately represent the normal stocking levels found at the Appellant firm during the review period and therefore provide no explanation for the unusual transaction patterns in the charge letter Attachments.

Based on the discussion above, there is not any valid basis for dismissing the charges or for mitigating the permanent disqualification penalty imposed.

CIVIL MONEY PENALTY

A CMP for hardship to SNAP households may not be imposed in lieu of a permanent disqualification as specified in SNAP regulations at 7 CFR § 278.6(f). Trafficking is a permanent disqualification so Appellant is not eligible for a hardship CMP.

The Office of Retailer Operations and Compliance determined that the Appellant was not eligible for a trafficking CMP in lieu of a disqualification under 7 CFR 278.6(i) because Appellant failed to submit sufficient evidence to demonstrate that the firm had established and implemented an effective compliance policy and program to prevent SNAP violations within the specified timeframe. As such, the Office of Retailer Operations and Compliance determined that Appellant was not eligible for a trafficking CMP in lieu of permanent disqualification.

As previously stated, when store ownership signed the certification page of the SNAP retailer application to become a SNAP retailer, it confirmed it understood and agreed to abide by program rules and regulatory provisions. It also agreed to accept responsibility on behalf of the firm for violations of the SNAP including those committed by any of the firm's employees, paid or unpaid, new, full-time or part-time. SNAP regulations do authorize a trafficking CMP for those owners who can document that they established and implemented an effective compliance policy and program to prevent SNAP violations under 7 CFR 278.6(i) and described below.

To be considered eligible for a trafficking CMP a firm must establish, by substantial evidence, its fulfillment of each of the following criteria:

- Criterion 1: The firm shall have developed an effective compliance policy as specified in Section 278.6(i)(1).
- Criterion 2: The firm shall establish that both its compliance policy and program were in operation at the location where the violation(s) occurred prior to the occurrence of violations cited in the charge letter sent to the firm.
- Criterion 3: The firm had developed and instituted an effective personnel training program as specified in Section 278.6(i)(2).
- Criterion 4: Firm ownership was not aware of, did not approve, did not benefit from, or was not in any way involved in the conduct or approval of trafficking violations. Or it is the first occasion in which a member of firm management was aware of, approved, benefited from, or was involved in the conduct of any trafficking violations by the firm.

SNAP regulations are explicit in what constitutes substantial evidence. Specifically, 7 CFR § 278.6(i)(1) and 278.6(i)(2) state, "(1) Compliance policy standards. As specified in Criterion 1 above, in determining whether a firm has established an effective policy to prevent violations, FNS shall consider written and dated statements of firm policy which reflect a commitment to ensure that the firm is operated in a manner consistent with this part 278 of current FSP regulations and current FSP policy on the proper acceptance and handling of food coupons. As required by Criterion 2, such policy statements shall be considered only if documentation is supplied which establishes that the policy statements were provided to the violating employee(s) prior to the commission of the violation. In addition, in evaluating the effectiveness of the firm's policy and program to ensure FSP compliance and to prevent FSP violations, FNS may consider the following: (i) Documentation reflecting the development and/or operation of a policy to terminate the employment of any firm employee found violating FSP regulations; (ii) Documentation of the development and/or continued operation of firm policy and procedures resulting in appropriate corrective action following complaints of FSP violations or irregularities committed by firm personnel; (iii) Documentation of the development and/or continued operation of procedures for internal review of firm employees' compliance with FSP regulations; (iv) The nature and scope of the violations charged against the firm; (v) Any record of previous firm violations under the same ownership; and (vi) Any other information the firm may present to FNS for consideration." "(2) Compliance training program standards. As prescribed in Criterion 3 above, the firm shall have developed and implemented an effective training program for all managers and employees on the acceptance and handling of food coupons in accordance with this part 278. A firm which seeks a civil money penalty in lieu of a permanent disqualification shall document its training activity by submitting to FNS its dated training

curricula and records of dates training sessions were conducted; a record of dates of employment of firm personnel; and contemporaneous documentation of the participation of the violating employee(s) in initial and any follow-up training held prior to the violation(s). FNS shall consider a training program effective if it meets or is otherwise equivalent to the following standards: (i) Training for all managers and employees whose work brings them into contact with SNAP benefits or who are assigned to a location where SNAP benefits are accepted, handled or processed shall be conducted within one month of the institution of the compliance policy under Criterion 1 above. Employees hired subsequent to the institution of the compliance policy shall be trained within one month of employment. All employees shall be trained periodically thereafter; (ii) Training shall be designed to establish a level of competence that assures compliance with Program requirements as included in this part 278; (iii) Written materials, which may include FNS publications and program regulations that are available to all authorized firms, are used in the training program. Training materials shall clearly state that the following acts are prohibited and are in violation of the Food and Nutrition Act of 2008 and regulations: the exchange of food coupons, ATP cards or other program access devices for cash; and, in exchange for coupons, the sale of firearms, ammunition, explosives or controlled substances, as the term is defined in section 802 of title 21, United States Code."

Appellant failed to respond to the charge letter and submitted no evidence supporting that the firm had established and implemented an effective compliance policy and program to prevent SNAP violations. Appellant did not submit a copy of the firm's SNAP compliance policy and program showing its effective date or zero tolerance policy, any dated training curricula, any dated employee training records, any records containing the names/employment start dates for store employees, or any documents showing any periodic refresher training. Based on the lack of required documentation supporting a trafficking CMP, it is more likely than not that store ownership did not have an effective compliance policy and program in effect for the Appellant firm prior to the occurrence of the charge letter violations.

Based on the above discussion and the evidence under review, Appellant failed to meet the regulatory standard for a trafficking CMP as it did not provide substantial evidence that it met all four criteria required by 7 CFR §278.6(i). Based on the above, the Office of Retailer Operations and Compliance's decision not to impose a CMP in lieu of disqualification is sustained as appropriate pursuant to 7 CFR §278.6(i).

CONCLUSION

The Office of Retailer Operations and Compliance presented a case that Appellant has likely trafficked in SNAP benefits. Their analysis of Appellant's EBT transaction record was the primary basis for its determination to permanently disqualify Appellant. This data provided substantial evidence that the questionable transactions during the review period had characteristics consistent with trafficking violations in SNAP benefits. This is evidenced by: the suspicious patterns in two Attachments of EBT transaction data, the inadequacy of the store's staple food stock as observed during the store visit to support large transactions in short time frames, the lack of adequate evidence for customer spending habits given that there are other SNAP authorized stores located within proximity to Appellant that likely offer a greater selection

of eligible food items at competitive prices, and the irregular SNAP transaction data of Appellant as compared to other like type and larger stores in the county and state.

The retailer has not provided sufficient evidence to rebut the case that Appellant most likely trafficked in SNAP benefits. Therefore, based on a review of all of the evidence in this case, it is more likely true than not true that program violations did, in fact, occur as charged. Based on the discussion above, the determination to impose a permanent disqualification against Appellant is sustained. Furthermore, the Office of Retailer Operations and Compliance properly determined that Appellant was not eligible for a trafficking CMP according to Section 278.6(i) of the SNAP regulations.

RIGHTS AND REMEDIES

Applicable rights to a judicial review of this decision are set forth in 7 U.S.C. § 2023 and 7 CFR § 279.7. If a judicial review is desired, the complaint must be filed in the U.S. District Court for the district in which Appellant's owner resides, is engaged in business, or in any court of record of the State having competent jurisdiction. This complaint, naming the United States as the defendant, must be filed within thirty (30) days of receipt of this decision.

Under the Freedom of Information Act, we are 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.

ROBERT T. DEEGAN
ADMINISTRATIVE REVIEW OFFICER

January 20, 2022