

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

Family Super Market,

Appellant,

v.

Case Number: C0212187

Retailer Operations Division,

Respondent.

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 the permanent disqualification of Family Super Market (Family Super Market or Appellant) from participation as an authorized retailer in the Supplemental Nutrition Assistance Program (SNAP), as initially imposed by the Retailer Operations Division, was appropriate.

ISSUE

The issue accepted for review is whether the Retailer Operations Division took appropriate action, consistent with 7 CFR § 278.6(a), (c) and (e)(1) in its administration of the SNAP, when it assessed a permanent disqualification against Appellant.

AUTHORITY

7 USC § 2021 and the 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 September 14, 2018, the Retailer Operations Division charged Appellant with trafficking, as defined in Section 271.2 of the SNAP regulations, based on a series of irregular SNAP transaction patterns that occurred during the months of February 2018 through July 2018. 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 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 did not reply to the charges. After considering the evidence, the Retailer Operations Division issued a determination letter dated October 15, 2018. The determination letter informed Appellant that it was permanently disqualified from the SNAP in accordance with 7 CFR § 278.6(c) and § 278.6(e)(1). The determination letter also stated that Appellant was not eligible for a trafficking CMP because Appellant failed to submit sufficient evidence to demonstrate that the firm had established and implemented an effective compliance policy and program to prevent violations of the SNAP.

By letter postmarked October 22, 2018, ownership appealed the Retailer Operations Division's determination and requested an administrative review.

STANDARD OF REVIEW

In appeals of adverse actions, the Appellant bears the burden of proving by a clear 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, as amended, 7 USC § 2021 and § 278 of Title 7 of the Code of Federal Regulations (CFR). Part 278.6(a), (c) and (e)(1) 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 USC § 2021(b)(3)(B) states, in part:

... 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 § 271.2 states that the definition of "coupon" includes:

... an electronic benefit transfer card or personal identification number issued pursuant to the provisions of the Food and Nutrition Act of 2008, as amended, for the purchase of eligible food.

7 CFR § 271.2 states, in part, that, eligible foods means:

Any food or food product intended for human consumption except alcoholic beverages, tobacco and hot food and hot food products prepared for immediate consumption.

7 CFR § 271.2 defines trafficking, in part, as:

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(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**, . . .” (emphasis added)

7 CFR § 278.6(e)(1) reads, in part:

FNS shall disqualify a firm permanently if personnel of the firm have trafficked as defined in § 271.2.

7 CFR § 278.6(i) states, inter alia:

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) states, in part:

(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 a penalty. [Emphasis added.]

SUMMARY OF THE CHARGES

Appellant was charged and determined to be trafficking based on an analysis of EBT transaction data from February 2018 through July 2018. This involved the following SNAP transaction patterns which are indicative of trafficking:

- There were multiple transactions made from individual benefit accounts in unusually short time frames.
- There were excessively large purchase transactions made from recipient accounts.

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.

APPELLANT'S CONTENTIONS

In its October 22, 2018, administrative review request, and subsequent correspondence dated November 26, 2018, Appellant provided the following summarized contentions, in relevant part:

- Appellant apologized for not responding to the charge letter.
- Appellant is the center of many low-income families and disadvantaged people who highly rely on this program to survive.
- There are very few supermarkets that provide the variety of groceries and food that Appellant provides.
- Many customers do not have transportation to go to Pak N Save.
- Since the 99 cent store closed a few blocks away there has been an influx of customers.
- Although there are other EBT providers many are liquor stores or smoke shops which many households choose not to buy their groceries as there is little to no selection.
- Appellant is a large market for this area that strives to provide fresh groceries and a large selection of quality food items.
- Appellant states that rules and regulations are always respected and followed.
- Due to selection of fresh goods, quality meat, and affordable prices the store became the "go to grocery store".
- Appellant deactivated its ABC license to steer the business model away from beer and wine and solely focus on being a grocery store for the community.

In support of its contentions, Appellant submitted invoices of its inventory purchased during the review period. Appellant also submitted a USB drive but the files were not readable. Appellant was provided additional time to resubmit these files. By e-mail submitted on April 7, 2018, Appellant indicated that the original recording device was written over and he no longer had access to these files.

The preceding may represent only a brief summary of the Appellant's contentions presented 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.

ANALYSIS AND FINDINGS

Store Visit

FNS authorized Family Super Market as a small grocery on September 9, 2015. The case file indicates that in reaching a disqualification determination, the Retailer Operations Division considered information obtained during a March 31, 2018, store visit conducted by a FNS contractor to observe the nature and scope of the firm's operation, stock, and facilities. This information was then 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:

- Family Super Market is approximately 1,800 square feet with 200 square feet of storage for beverages outside of public view.
- The checkout space is small and limited.
- There were some shopping baskets but no shopping carts for customer use.
- There was one cash register and one point-of-sale device.
- There was no fresh meat, poultry, or fish
- There were no bulk packages or any advertised specials.
- The fresh produce was limited and included oranges, limes, green peppers, onions, potatoes, tomatoes, and lettuce.
- Dairy included milk, butter, yogurt, and cheese.
- Frozen food included entrees, vegetables, fried chicken, and vegetables.
- Other staple foods available for purchase were juice, rice, bread, tortillas, beans, cereal, pasta, and a limited selection of canned goods.
- Much of the remaining stock consisted of accessory foods such as candy, spices, and carbonated and uncarbonated drinks.
- Ineligible items included alcohol, tobacco, lottery, health and beauty products, cleaning products, and paper products.

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. The highest priced items noted were frozen fried chicken - \$8.99, sausage - \$6.99, ice cream -\$5.99, and almond milk - \$5.99. Given the available inventory as noted above, there is no indication from the store visit report that the store would be likely to have SNAP redemption patterns significantly different from similar-sized competitors.

Charge Letter Attachments

Each attachment furnished with the charge letter represents the questionable and unusual patterns of SNAP transactions indicative of trafficking which were conducted at the Appellant firm during the review period. As there is more than one pattern of irregular transactions, the case of trafficking becomes more convincing.

Charge Letter Attachment 1. Multiple transactions were made from individual benefit accounts in unusually short time frames. This attachment documents 37 sets of transactions

5 U.S.C. § 552 (b)(6) & (b)(7)(C) in SNAP benefits that meet the parameters of this scan. 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.

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 Appellant's stock and facilities and are therefore indicative of trafficking. Although it is not uncommon for customers to have more than one transaction per day, it is not common that such multiple transactions are for large dollar amounts. The photographs from the store visit offer no explanation as to why SNAP customers would routinely shop at Appellant multiple times during a short period or purchase such a large volume of items, there being no great variety of products, price advantage, profusion of large packages, or significant bulk items for sale. Appellant is not set up to provide for all of one's food needs and lacks an abundant depth and breadth of staple foods. The second and third transactions in each set are too large to consist of forgotten items.

Furthermore SNAP clients who conducted high dollar multiple transactions at Appellant also shopped at larger retailers with a wider variety and volume of product, indicating that these customers did not rely solely on Appellant for all of its food needs. Yet, these households often transacted more at Appellant than at the large retailers. It is questionable why a household would chose to spend the majority of its SNAP benefits at Appellant, a small grocery with no shopping carts, when it had access to a supermarket with a better selection of food items and likely better prices.

Appellant has not offered any evidence to show that the transactions listed in Charge Letter Attachment #1 were legitimate purchases of eligible food.

Charge Letter Attachment 2: Excessively large purchase transactions were made from recipient accounts. This attachment lists 131 transactions 5 U.S.C. § 552 (b)(6) & (b)(7)(C). These large transaction amounts are questionable because they are not consistent with the store's inventory with no fresh meat and limited fresh produce. The SNAP eligible food stocked by the store was generally of a low dollar value consisting mainly of inexpensive canned and packaged goods, and snack foods. The frequency of high-dollar purchases in a six-month period calls into question the legitimacy of these transactions.

Appellant explains that due to its selection of fresh goods, quality meat, and affordable prices the store became the "go to grocery store". Appellant further states that it is a large market for this area that strives to provide fresh groceries and a large selection of quality food items. However, it is important to note that there is another authorized SNAP retailer that operates the meat counter located within the store. Thus, the SNAP transactions cannot be explained by any alleged purchases of quality meat. The evidence from the store visit does not support that Appellant carried a wide variety of food items. In fact, the Retailer Operations Division noted that its stock is similar to a convenience store.

The Retailer Operations Division compared Appellant to the average for small groceries in

Alameda County. Appellant's total SNAP redemptions dollar value was **5 U.S.C. § 552 (b)(7)(E)** greater than the average dollar volume for small groceries in the State during the review period. **5 U.S.C. § 552 (b)(6) & (b)(7)(C)**. As noted previously, the highest priced items at cost just \$8.99, \$7.99, \$6.99, and \$5.99. The store does not stock fresh meats, sell bulk foods, or offer specials which might account for transactions **5 U.S.C. § 552 (b)(6) & (b)(7)(C)**. As such, the Retailer Operations Division considered this an indicator of trafficking considering Appellant's eligible food stock, infrastructure, and proximity to larger, better stocked stores.

With its reply to the Retailer Operations Division, Appellant submitted invoices of its eligible food products purchased. There were no invoices provided for February 2018 and very few invoices for April 2018. The Retailer Operations Divisions determined that the invoices for the review other review months do support that Appellant purchased sufficient inventory to support the redemptions. However, the Retailer Operations Division determined that sufficient inventory alone does not explain the suspicious patterns of SNAP transactions, such as rapid and consecutive transactions by households during the same store visit or in a single day. The large dollar transactions remain questionable even when there is sufficient food inventory to support such transactions when consideration is made of there being only a limited variety of stock in the store, very little counter space to place food for purchase at the checkout counter, and a greater variety of foods at lower prices at other stores, including supermarkets at which many customers also shop. Even with sufficient food stock at Appellant to mathematically support high dollar transactions, there does not appear to be anything that would reasonably attract SNAP households to shop there and spend substantial amounts of their SNAP benefits.

It is important to note that at least one invoice showed that the items were purchased with a SNAP EBT card, which is a strong indicator of trafficking. **5 U.S.C. § 552 (b)(6) & (b)(7)(C)**. Appellant submitted the receipt for this transaction as evidence of the food it purchased. It appears that this household received a new EBT Card after June 22, 2018. With its new EBT card, it conducted two questionable transactions at Appellant on June 26 and June 27, 2018.

Appellant explained that it changed its business practice and chose to stop selling alcohol. However, the evidence from the store visit show a sign posted from the State of California Notice of Suspension for violations of the Alcohol Beverage Control Act. Appellant's statement is not credible.

Appellant also contends that its redemptions increased when the 99 Cent store located nearby closed. The available evidence shows that a 99 Cent store did stop redeeming SNAP benefits in January 2017. However, it does not appear that Appellant's SNAP redemptions increased until April 2017. It appears unlikely that this increase is directly related to the store closing given that the impact was seen four months later. Moreover, the transactions in question occurred more than one year after this nearby store closed.

Appellant states that there are few supermarkets or markets in general that provide the variety of groceries and food that Appellant provides. Appellant further reports that many customers do not have transportation to go to Pak N Save. The Retailer Operations Division determined that within a two-mile radius of Appellant there were two large groceries, six supermarkets, and five super

stores. The Retailer Operations Division examined six households identified in the charge letter to analyze their shopping patterns at Family Super Market compared to their shopping patterns at other SNAP authorized stores. Despite this access to better stocked stores, five of the six households conducted excessively large transactions at Family Super Market within a short time of shopping at a supermarket or super store. The Retailer Operations Division determined that four of these six households lived between 0.5 miles and 16.6 miles from Appellant. Thus, these households appear to have access to transportation. It is questionable as to why households would conduct large transactions at Appellant, when these households had just visited or planned to visit larger stores with a better selection of fresh meat and produce and likely better prices. The inventory and layout at Family Super Market Corp does not support these transactions. There is no compelling reason for customers to consider Family Super Market, as a first choice destination to fulfill large purchases of food.

In summary, Appellant's layout, business structure, and food inventory do not support a high percentage of transactions markedly exceeding the average SNAP transaction amount of similar type stores. 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. Therefore, based on this empirical data, and in the absence of evidence to legitimize 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 letter of charges evidence trafficking as the most likely explanation.

Evidence

The transactions reports are derived from the ALERT system, a computerized fraud detection tool to identify SNAP transactions that form patterns having characteristics indicative of trafficking. However, this tool does not by itself determine or conclude that trafficking has occurred. The Retailer Operations Division must still conduct an extensive analysis of the transaction data and patterns, often with other factors such as, in this case, observations from store visits, an analysis of customer shopping behavior and a comparison of stores in the area, and render a determination whether the questionable transactions were, more likely than not, the result of trafficking.

The legality of this method is supported by 7 CFR §278.6(a) which 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.]

The documentation and evidence provided by the Retailer Operations Division was thoroughly examined. From all indications, the Retailer Operations Division obtained the EBT data (provided by ALERT), found it to be suspicious in comparison to other area stores of similar size, and then undertook a thorough investigation before concluding that trafficking was likely occurring.

Appellant bears the burden of demonstrating by a preponderance of the evidence that the administrative actions should be reversed and that the transactions detailed in the charge letter were more likely than not due to the legitimate sale of eligible food in exchange for SNAP benefits. Appellant offered no relevant evidence to prove that the transactions listed in the charge letter were legitimate purchases of eligible food. In the absence of compelling information or documentation weighed in comparison to the evidence provided by the Retailer Operations Division, the evidence weighs in favor of the Retailer Operations Division's determination that SNAP-benefit trafficking substantially produced the transaction activity at issue in the present case.

CIVIL MONEY PENALTY

In the charge letter, the Retailer Operations Division informed Appellant of its right to request a trafficking CMP under 7 CFR § 278.6(i). Appellant was informed that it would need to provide both the request and supporting evidence within ten calendar days of receiving the charge letter and that no extension of time could be granted for making the request or for providing the required evidence. Appellant did not request consideration for a trafficking CMP in lieu of a permanent disqualification under 7 CFR § 278.6(i), even though it was informed of the right to do so in the charge letter.

Even if a timely request had been submitted, Appellant would likely not have been eligible for a trafficking CMP in lieu of disqualification because there is insufficient evidence to demonstrate that the firm had established and implemented an effective compliance policy to prevent SNAP violations. Therefore, the Retailer Operations Division's decision not to impose a trafficking CMP in lieu of disqualification is sustained as appropriate pursuant to 7 CFR § 278.6(i).

CONCLUSION

The Retailer Operations Division's 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 that are consistent with trafficking violations 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 occur as charged by the Retailer Operations Division. The determination to impose a permanent disqualification against Appellant is sustained.

The Retailer Operations Division also determined that Appellant was not eligible for a trafficking civil money penalty according to the terms of 7 CFR Section 278.6(i) of the SNAP regulations. Under review, the denial of a trafficking CMP was deemed correct and proper.

RIGHTS AND REMEDIES

Applicable rights to a judicial review of this decision are set forth in 7 USC § 2023 and 7 CFR § 279.7. 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 the Appellant's owner

resides or is 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, 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.

MARY KATE KARAGIORGOS
Administrative Review Officer

May 8, 2019