

**U.S. Department of Agriculture
Food and Nutrition Service
Administrative Review Branch
Alexandria, VA 22302**

Oasis Market and Deli,

Appellant,

v.

Retailer Operations Division,

Respondent.

Case Number: C0188058

FINAL AGENCY DECISION

The U.S. Department of Agriculture (USDA), Food and Nutrition Service (FNS) finds that there is sufficient evidence to support the determination by the Retailer Operations Division to impose a permanent disqualification against Oasis Market and Deli (“Appellant”) from participating as an authorized retailer in the Supplemental Nutrition Assistance Program (SNAP).

ISSUE

The purpose of this review is to determine whether the Retailer Operations Division took appropriate action, consistent with Title 7 of Code of Federal Regulations (CFR) § 278.6(e)(1)(i) in its administration of SNAP when it imposed a Permanent Disqualification against Appellant on March 6, 2018.

AUTHORITY

According to 7 U.S.C. § 2023 and its 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

The USDA conducted an investigation Appellant’s compliance with federal SNAP law and regulations during the period of January 5, 2017 through January 30, 2017. The investigation reported that personnel at Appellant accepted 5 U.S.C. § 552 (b)(6) & (b)(7)(C) in SNAP benefits in exchange for cash (trafficking) in the amount of 5 U.S.C. § 552 (b)(6) & (b)(7)(C) on one occasion and 5 U.S.C. § 552 (b)(6) & (b)(7)(C) on another occasion, as well as permitting the purchase of another non-food item with SNAP benefits. The investigation revealed that three unidentified clerks were involved in the impermissible transactions.

As a result of evidence compiled from this investigation, the Retailer Operations Division informed Appellant, in a letter dated February 5, 2018, that its firm was charged with violating the terms and conditions of the SNAP regulations, 7 CFR § 278.6(e)(1). This letter stated, in part, “As provided by Section 278.6(e)(1) of the SNAP regulations, the sanction for trafficking . . . is permanent disqualification.” The letter also states that “under certain conditions, FNS may impose a civil money penalty (CMP) . . . in lieu of a permanent disqualification of a firm for trafficking.”

Appellant, through counsel, replied to the charges in a subsequent letter to the Retailer Operations Division. The record reflects that the Retailer Operations Division received and considered this information prior to making a determination.

The Retailer Operations Division notified Appellant in a letter dated March 6, 2018 that the firm was being permanently disqualified from participation as an authorized retailer in SNAP in accordance with Section 278.6 (c) and 278.6(e)(1) for trafficking violations. This determination letter also stated that Appellant’s eligibility for a trafficking civil money penalty (CMP) according to the terms of Section 278.6(i) of the SNAP regulations was considered. However, the letter stated to Appellant that “. . . you are not eligible for the CMP because you failed to submit sufficient evidence to demonstrate that your firm had established and implemented an effective compliance policy and program to prevent violations of the Supplemental Nutrition Assistance Program.”

On March 16, 2018, Appellant, through counsel, appealed the Retailer Operations Division’s assessment and requested an administrative review of this action. The appeal was granted.

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 § 278.6(e)(1)(i) establishes 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 of SNAP benefits.

7 CFR § 278.6(e)(1)(i) reads, in part:

FNS shall . . . [d]isqualify 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] or other benefit instruments for cash or consideration other than eligible food.

APPELLANT’S CONTENTIONS

Appellant’s responses regarding this matter are essentially as follows:

- Disqualification poses an undue hardship on the firm and participants who rely on the firm;
- Appellant requests a CMP. Appellant provided three pages of its SNAP compliance policy and described its training program. Appellant provided its policy signed by two employees dated June 2017 and four affidavits dated January 2018 signed by employees stating they were trained when they were hired;
- Appellant has operated for 15 years without a SNAP or WIC disqualification;
- The amounts involved in the trafficking were limited in value;
- This is the firm’s first violation;
- Appellant has posted SNAP compliance reminders at the front counter and a SNAP compliance poster visible to all; and,
- Appellant is increasing supervision of employees.

These explanations may represent only a brief summary of Appellant’s contentions. However, in reaching a decision, full consideration has been given to all contentions presented, including any others that have not been specifically listed here.

ANALYSIS AND FINDINGS

Appellant contends that it has thoroughly trained its staff. When ownership signed the FNS application to become an authorized SNAP retailer, this included a certification and confirmation that the owner(s) 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 document include trafficking. Regardless of whom the ownership of a store may utilize to operate the cash register and handle store business, ownership is accountable for the proper handling of SNAP benefit transactions. To allow store ownership to disclaim accountability for the acts of persons chosen to handle store business would render the enforcement provisions of the Food and Nutrition Act and the enforcement efforts of the USDA virtually meaningless.

First SNAP Violation

Appellant contends that it has operated for 15 years and this is the first time there has been an issue related to SNAP. A record of program participation with no documented previous violations, however, does not constitute valid grounds for mitigating the impact of the present

serious determination of trafficking. In addition, the investigation report shows not one but at least two store employees were involved in the trafficking violations.

This review is limited to considering the circumstances at the time the Retailer Operations Division's decision was made. It is not within this review's scope to consider actions that Appellant may have taken subsequent to this decision to begin to comply with program requirements. There is no provision in SNAP regulations for reducing an administrative penalty on the basis of corrective actions implemented subsequent to investigative findings of program violations. Therefore, Appellant's posting of compliance notices and increasing supervision do not provide any valid basis for dismissing the charges or for mitigating the penalty imposed.

Egregiousness of Trafficking Violation

It is Appellant's contention that the violations are not egregious and limited in value. Appellant contends that on one occasion the clerk refused to engage in trafficking. While a clerk did refuse to engage in trafficking on two occasions, clerks permitted the sale of non-food items or the exchange of SNAP benefits for cash on three other occasions. In any case, 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 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 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.

No Undue Hardship to Appellant

Appellant maintains that disqualification would pose an extreme hardship to the firm. Economic hardship is a likely consequence whenever a store is permanently disqualified from SNAP participation. However, there is no provision in the SNAP regulations for reducing an administrative penalty on the basis of possible economic hardship to the firm resulting from such a penalty. To excuse Appellant from an assessed administrative penalty based on purported economic hardship would render the enforcement provisions of the Food and Nutrition Act of 2008 and the enforcement efforts of the USDA virtually meaningless.

Moreover, giving special consideration to the firm for economic hardship would forsake fairness and equity to competing stores and other participating retailers who are complying fully with program regulations, and also to those retailers who have been disqualified from the program in the past for similar violations. Therefore, Appellant's contention that it will incur economic hardship due to an administrative penalty does not provide any valid basis for dismissing the charges or for mitigating the imposed penalty.

No Undue Hardship to SNAP Participants

Appellant asserts that disqualification would be a hardship to SNAP households who rely on the store. Some degree of inconvenience to SNAP benefit users is inherent in the disqualification from SNAP of any participating food store, since the normal shopping pattern of such SNAP participants may be changed due to the disqualification. Section 278.6(f)(1) of SNAP regulations provides for Civil Money Penalty (CMP) assessments in lieu of disqualification in cases where disqualification would cause “hardship” to SNAP households because of the unavailability of a comparable participating retail food store in the area to meet their needs. However, this regulation also sets forth the following specific exception: “A CMP for hardship to SNAP households may not be imposed in lieu of a permanent disqualification.” Because the matter at hand involves a permanent disqualification, this CMP provision is not applicable.

CIVIL MONEY PENALTY

Appellant requested a civil money penalty (CMP) contending that it had established and implemented an effective compliance policy and program to prevent SNAP violations. According to 7 CFR § 278.6(i) of the SNAP regulations, FNS may impose a CMP in lieu of permanent disqualification for trafficking.

7 CFR § 278.6(i) sets forth the eligibility requirements for a CMP:

The firm shall, at a minimum, 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); 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 Section 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 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 . .

. .

In support of Appellant’s contention that it is eligible for a CMP, it provided policy signed by two employees dated June 2017 and four affidavits dated January 2018 signed by employees

In this regard, the various documentation provided by Appellant is not “substantial evidence” that fulfills each of the four criteria of 7 CFR § 278.6(i), demonstrating “that the firm had established and implemented an effective compliance policy and program to prevent violations.” None of these documents have dates of when training allegedly occurred after training at the time of hire. Appellant did not submit any signed employee agreements prior to the trafficking,

and did not provide any signed documents establishing the owners were trained. There is no contemporaneous documentation that could verify that Appellant's compliance policy existed prior to the trafficking. The documentation provided could have simply been created subsequent to the firm being charged.

The standards of eligibility for a trafficking CMP are high. They require substantial proof that a compliance policy and program was established and implemented prior to the occurrence of violations. These standards exist to thwart attempts to falsely present compliance policies and programs that were not actually implemented prior to violations. Although these standards are high, they are required by the regulations and Appellant must be held to them during the course of this review.

The size of a firm, or its number of personnel, is not a consideration in determining eligibility for a civil money penalty in lieu of permanent disqualification for trafficking. It might require significant effort to develop and maintain a compliance policy and program. Yet, even substantial effort does not lessen the consequences if the firm fails to meet the requirements. As noted, the criteria for eligibility for a civil money penalty in lieu of permanent disqualification are clearly stated as minimum standards below which eligibility is precluded.

As Appellant did not provide the required supporting documentation, the Retailer Operations Division did not assess a CMP. According to the requirements stated in 7 CFR § 278.6(b)(1), § 278.6(b)(2)(ii and iii), and § 278.6(i), Appellant is not eligible for a CMP in lieu of a permanent disqualification from participation as an authorized retailer in SNAP. The determination by the Retailer Operations Division to deny Appellant a civil money penalty is sustained.

CONCLUSION

Based on a review of the evidence, it appears that the program violations at issue did, in fact, occur as charged. As noted previously, the charges of violations are based on the findings of a formal USDA investigation. All transactions cited in the letter of charges were conducted under the supervision of a USDA investigator and all are fully documented. A review of this documentation has yielded no indication of error or discrepancy in any of the reported findings. Rather, the investigative record is specific and accurate with regard to the dates of the violations, the specific exchanges of SNAP benefits for cash, and in all other critically pertinent detail.

Based on the discussion above, the determination by the Retailer Operations Division to impose a permanent disqualification against Oasis Market and Deli from participating as an authorized retailer in SNAP is sustained.

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 Appellant desires a judicial review, 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.

RICH PROULX
Administrative Review Officer

April 30, 2018