

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

Heath St. Family Mini Market LLC,

Appellant,

V.

Retailer Operations Division,

Respondent.

Case Number: C0217789

FINAL AGENCY DECISION

It is the decision of the USDA that the record indicates that Heath St. Family Mini Market LLC, (hereinafter Appellant) committed violations of the Supplemental Nutrition Assistance Program (SNAP). There is sufficient evidence to support a finding that the permanent disqualification from participation as an authorized retailer in the program, 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(c) and (e)(1) in its administration of the SNAP, when it assessed a permanent disqualification against Appellant by letter dated June 17, 2019.

AUTHORITY

7 U.S.C. § 2023 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 May 24, 2019, Retailer Operations Division charged the 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 November 2018 through April 2019. 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 10 days of receipt under the conditions specified in 7 CFR § 278.6(i).

In correspondence dated June 4, 2019, Appellant replied to the charge letter and generally stated that he was the owner of a new market and the store was small with only a few employees. Ownership indicated that this was the first time he has been charged with this offense and the letter was to request that he be considered for a civil monetary penalty (CMP). Ownership stated that he understands that he needs to more closely train and monitor employees to continue with the program and was making assumptions and/or relying on assurances instead of monitoring compliance well enough. He further stated that he will do a better job as an owner and manager to ensure that the program is run well in the store. An explanation was given for each Criterion as to how it was met. Appellant provided an undated copy of a form entitled SNAP Training Program/Health St. Family Mini Market, LLC (sic) as well as an undated copy of a form entitled SNAP Compliance Policy/Health St. Family Mini Market, LLC (sic). Appellant also provided a sheet with employee's names and dates of alleged training.

After giving consideration to the Appellant's reply and evidence of the case, Retailer Operations Division issued a determination letter dated June 17, 2019. The letter informed Appellant that it was permanently disqualified from the SNAP in accordance with Sections 278.6(c) and 278.6(e)(1) of the SNAP regulations. The letter also stated that Retailer Operations Division considered Appellant's eligibility for a trafficking civil money penalty (CMP) according to the terms of Section 278.6(i) of the SNAP regulations. However, Retailer Operations Division determined that Appellant was not eligible for the CMP because it failed to submit sufficient evidence to demonstrate that Appellant had established and implemented an effective compliance policy and program to prevent violations of the SNAP.

In a letter dated June 25, 2019, Appellant appealed the Retailer Operations Division's assessment and requested an administrative review of this action. The appeal was granted.

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 an 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 & Nutrition Act of 2008, as amended, 7 U.S.C. § 2021 and 278 of Title 7 of the Code of Federal Regulations (CFR). Part 278.6(a) (c) and (e)(1)(i) establish the authority upon which a permanent disqualification may be imposed against a retail food store in the event that personnel of the firm have engaged in trafficking SNAP benefits.

7 CFR § 278.6(a) states, *inter alia*, that "FNS may disqualify any authorized retail food store...from further participation in the program 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(c) reads, in part, “*Review of Evidence*. The letter of charges, the response, and any other information available to FNS shall be reviewed and considered by the appropriate FNS regional office, which shall then issue the determination. In the case of a firm subject to permanent disqualification under paragraph (e)(1)...the determination shall inform such a firm that action to permanently disqualify the firm shall be effective immediately upon the date of receipt of the notice of determination from FNS...”

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.” Trafficking is defined, in part, in 7 CFR § 271.2, as “the buying or selling of SNAP benefits for cash or consideration other than eligible food.”

7 CFR § 271.2 states in part that, “Eligible foods mean: Any food or food product intended for human consumption except alcoholic beverages, tobacco and hot food and hot food products prepared for immediate consumption.”

SUMMARY OF THE CHARGES

The charges on review were based on an analysis of SNAP electronic benefit transfer (EBT) transactions dated during the six month period of November 2018 through April 2019. This involved two patterns of EBT transaction characteristics indicative of trafficking:

1. Multiple transactions were made from the accounts of individual SNAP households within a set time period.
2. Your store conducted EBT transactions 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 the questionable transactions were the result of trafficking.

APPELLANT’S CONTENTIONS

The Appellant, through counsel, made the following summarized contentions in its response to the permanent disqualification letter issued by Retailer Operations Division, and its request for administrative review, in relevant part:

1. My client provided in his application for the CMP that he had provided all the materials to his employees and had kept track of the dates of the programs. His paperwork regarding that time period is informal, but complies with the programs requirements.
2. His prior system was informal as two of the three employees are relatives and he admits that he did not focus enough on ensuring their SNAP training and fully documenting their training.
3. This is the first time that allegations have been made regarding his compliance with the program and he is committed to making it work.

4. 5 U.S.C. § 552 (b)(6) & (b)(7)(C), through me, is requesting that you overturn the decision of the USDA in regard to CMP eligibility and that he be provided with the opportunity to continue participation in the program.

Appellant provided a copy of its June 4, 2019 and June 7, 2019, response to Retailer Operations Division which included the documents provided for its request for a CMP. The preceding may represent a brief summary of Appellant's contentions in this matter however, in reaching a decision, full attention has been given to all contentions presented, including any not specifically recapitulated or referenced herein.

ANALYSIS AND FINDINGS

The FNS authorized the business as a convenience store on June 14, 2018. The file indicates that in reaching a disqualification determination, Retailer Operations Division considered information obtained during a March 18, 2019, store visit to the business 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 EBT transactions at Appellant that formed patterns indicative of trafficking. The firm review summary documented the following store size, description, and characteristics:

- One cash register and one POS device with a small counter area partially obstructed by other smaller items available for sale and enclosed in Plexiglas.
- Estimated to be approximately 800 square feet.
- No shopping baskets or carts available for customers.
- No adding machines or optical scanners were available at checkout. No specialty registers present.
- Store does not operate through a night window or plastic barrier with food stock behind the barrier.
- No evidence of wholesale business such as posted prices or separate entrances for wholesale customers.
- No unusual pricing structure such as ending most products with 00 cents and does not round transaction totals.
- Food is not stored in an area outside of public view.
- Store has storage freezers or coolers but no food stored off site.
- Store is not primarily selling one food type such as meat, poultry, dairy, seafood, fruits, baked goods or vegetables.
- Store does not take telephone or online orders and does not offer delivery
- Highest priced eligible food items were Mazola Corn Oil (\$8.89), Canella Rice (\$11.99), Nesquik Strawberry (\$7.50) and 4C Idea Tea Raspberry (\$7.49) (sic).
- Store stocks a significant amount of non-food items such as but not limited to paper products, cleaning products, tobacco products, automotive products, health and beauty aids, charcoal and household items.
- Store stocks limited amounts of dairy products, bread and cereal products, fruit and vegetable products and meat, poultry and fish products. No fresh fruits or produce, no fresh meat or poultry. Most meats are canned or packaged.

- Appellant was deficient in the dairy staple food category missing one stocking unit and may not have been eligible to hold its SNAP authorization on the day of the store visit.
- Food items contained a layer of dust and shelves were sparsely stocked.
- A kitchen/prepared food area with hot foods sold and for onsite consumption. Microwave for heating.
- No deli or prepared food section. Stock is not used in preparation of food.
- No meat or seafood specials or bundles or fruit/vegetable boxes sold.

The issue for consideration is whether Retailer Operations Division has presented a convincing case that Appellant likely trafficked in SNAP benefits. 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.

Attachment 1 of the Charge Letter – Multiple transactions were made from the accounts of individual SNAP households within a set time period.

There were 52 sets of 150 SNAP transactions that met the parameters of this attachment. Multiple transactions conducted by the same household account within a set time period is a method which violating stores use to avoid the detection of single high dollar transactions that cannot be supported by the retailer’s inventory and structure. The store visit report does not indicate any compelling reason for customers to consider Heath St. Family Mini Market LLC a first choice destination to fulfill large purchases of food, or that they would have made relatively large, multiple purchases at the store within a set time period. The store’s stock is limited and consists mainly of inexpensive prepackaged accessory foods and canned\bottled beverages; as well as, grocery items like canned and jarred goods; dried goods and condiments.

Appellant, through counsel, did not dispute the transactions cited in the charge letter and did not offer, with its review request, any explanation or related evidence in an attempt to clarify or justify the specific transactional behavior noted in the Attachment 1 of the Charge letter therefore, based on the analysis above and in the absence of any compelling evidence to the contrary, the irregular and unusual transaction pattern cited in the charge letter is unlikely and a strong indicator of trafficking in SNAP benefits.

Attachment 2 of the Charge Letter – Your store conducted EBT transactions that are large based on the observed store characteristics and recorded food stock.

There were 278 SNAP transactions that met the parameters of this attachment. Based on the results of the contracted store visit, the large transaction amounts are not consistent with the store’s inventory of low priced foods. The firm does not offer food in bulk or any ethnic or specialty foods that sell for a high price. Therefore, the substantial number of high dollar purchases calls into question the legitimacy of these transactions.

Appellant, through counsel, did not dispute the transactions cited in the charge letter and did not offer, with its review request, any explanation or related evidence in an attempt to clarify or justify the specific transactional behavior noted in the Attachment 1 of the Charge letter

therefore, based on the analysis above and in the absence of any compelling evidence to the contrary, the irregular and unusual transaction pattern cited in the charge letter is unlikely and a strong indicator of trafficking in SNAP benefits.

Based on this empirical data, and in the absence of sufficient evidence as to the legitimacy of such transactions, 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. In this case, ownership did not provide sufficient evidence to legitimize Appellant’s transaction data as outlined in the Attachments. Retailer Operations Division determined that Appellant’s contentions did not outweigh the evidence that the store was trafficking and concluded, through a preponderance of evidence, that trafficking is the most probable explanation for the questionable transactions listed in the charge letter attachments.

The transaction data and overall firm record convincingly demonstrate repetitive patterns of unusual, irregular, and inexplicable SNAP activity for this type of firm indicative of trafficking. Once Retailer Operations Division established the convincing case against Appellant, ownership bears the burden of proving, by a preponderance of the evidence, that the administrative action 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. If this is not demonstrated, the case is to be sustained.

As noted, 7 CFR § 278.6(a) states 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 inconsistent redemption data, and evidence obtained through a transaction report under an electronic benefit transfer system.

Retailer Operations Division has presented a convincing case that Appellant has likely trafficked in SNAP benefits. This is evidenced by: the suspicious patterns in two attachments of EBT transaction data, the inadequacy of the firm’s eligible food stock as observed and recorded during the onsite visit to support such large transactions, the lack of evidence of invoices of foods in inventory to cover SNAP redemption totals for the review months, the lack of explanation for customer spending habits given that there are other SNAP authorized stores located within proximity to Appellant, and the irregular SNAP transaction data of Appellant as compared to other convenience stores in the State.

Generally, stores caught in trafficking violations consistently display particular characteristic transaction patterns including those cited in the charge letter and, in the absence of evidence for the legitimacy of such transaction patterns, based on information submitted by the Appellant and a comparison of the store’s characteristics and available stock to the transaction patterns cited in the charge letter, a conclusion can be drawn through a preponderance of evidence that the unusual, irregular, and inexplicable transactions and patterns evidence trafficking as the most likely explanation. While ownership was afforded the opportunity to provide valid explanations and evidence that support that the questionable transactions were the result of legitimate

purchases of eligible food items, Retailer Operations Division determined that Appellant's contentions did not outweigh the evidence in the record.

The purpose of the administrative review process is to ensure that firms aggrieved by Retailer Operations Division's adverse actions have the opportunity to have their position fairly considered by an impartial review authority prior to that adverse action becoming final. Appellant has been duly given, and has taken the opportunity to present to USDA through the administrative review process whatever evidence and information it deems pertinent in support of its position that Retailer Operations Division's adverse action should be reversed. Therefore, any evidence and information that Appellant presented to Retailer Operations Division, as well as any such information submitted subsequently, have now been considered in this administrative review in rendering the final agency administrative decision in this case. The record does not indicate any departure from established policy or procedures with regard to Appellant's right to a fair and thorough review.

CIVIL MONEY PENALTY

The Appellant, through counsel, requested consideration for a CMP and contends that it provided all the materials to its employees and kept track of dates of the program. The paperwork regarding the time period is informal but complies with the programs requirements.

The issue to be decided here, then, is whether, through a preponderance of the evidence, Heath St. Family Mini Market LLC had an effective policy and program to prevent trafficking violations that was fully in accord with the provisions of 7 CFR §278.6(i), and thus that it is eligible for a CMP.

7 CFR §278.6(i) specifies that in order for a firm to qualify for a CMP in lieu of permanent disqualification, it must submit *substantial evidence* that it has fulfilled each of the following criteria:

Criterion 1: The firm shall have developed an effective compliance policy as specified in §278.6(i)(1); and

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; and

Criterion 3: The firm had developed and instituted an effective personnel training program as specified in §278.6(i)(2); and

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 only 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..."

As it relates to the above Criteria 1 and 2, 7 CFR §278.6(i)(1), entitled "Compliance policy standards," provides the following, in relevant part:

"...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 SNAP regulations and current SNAP 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 SNAP compliance and to prevent SNAP 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 SNAP regulations;
- ii. Documentation of the development and/or continued operation of firm policy and procedures resulting in appropriate corrective action following complaints of SNAP 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 SNAP 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."

As it relates to the above Criterion 3, 7 CFR §278.6(i)(2), entitled "Compliance training program standards," provides the following, in relevant part:

"...the firm shall have developed and implemented an effective training program for all managers and employees on the acceptance and handling of (SNAP benefits)...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 and regulations: the exchange of... (SNAP benefits)...for cash..."

The documentation provided by Appellant, through counsel, was considered insufficient and did

not provide adequate evidence for Appellant to be considered for a trafficking CMP in lieu of disqualification. The owner's training sign-in sheets and store policy documents do not rise to the level, required by regulation, to be considered for a CMP in lieu of permanent disqualification. Therefore, Retailer Operations Division correctly determined that Appellant was not eligible for a trafficking CMP as set forth in the SNAP regulations.

CONCLUSION

Ownership has not provided sufficient evidence to rebut the convincing case that Appellant most likely trafficked in SNAP benefits. As such, the SNAP regulations are specific with regard to the action that must be taken if personnel of the firm have trafficked, which is that FNS shall disqualify the firm permanently.

Retailer Operations Division's analysis of Appellant's EBT transaction record was the primary basis for its determination to permanently disqualify Heath St. Family Mini Market LLC from participation in the SNAP. This data provided substantial evidence that the questionable transactions during the review period had characteristics that are consistent with trafficking in SNAP benefits. Therefore, based on a review of all the evidence in this case, it is more likely true than not true that program violations did, in fact, occur as charged by Retailer Operations Division. Based on the discussion herein, the determination to impose a permanent disqualification against Heath St. Family Mini Market LLC is sustained.

RIGHTS AND REMEDIES

Your attention is called to Section 14 of the Food and Nutrition Act of 2008, as amended, (7 U.S.C. § 2023) and to Title 7, Code of Federal Regulations, Part 279.7 (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 (FOIA), 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.

Monique Brooks
ADMINISTRATIVE REVIEW OFFICER

January 8, 2020