

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

Pete’s Market,

Appellant,

v.

Retailer Operations Division,

Respondent.

Case Number: C0223714

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 Pete’s Market (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 December 30, 2019, 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 June 2019 through October 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 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 January 23, 2020. 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 dated January 31, 2020, Appellant, through counsel, appealed the Retailer Operations Division's determination and requested an administrative review. The administrative review 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 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 June 2019 through October 2019. This involved the following SNAP transaction patterns which are indicative of trafficking:

- There were multiple transactions made from individual benefit accounts within a set time period.
- 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 January 31, 2020, administrative review request, and subsequent letters dated March 2, 2020, Appellant, through counsel, provided the following summarized contentions:

- Appellant's bookkeeper was supposed to respond to the charge letter but did not.
- Appellant has operated the store for over 12 years and has never had any issues with anything related to SNAP.
- The store critically needs SAP to serve the neighborhood community which lacks another outlet in the vicinity.
- Appellant requests an alternative penalty such as a fine or a probation period.

In support of its contentions, Appellant submitted an affidavit from the store manager/operator that states the following:

- The family has operated the store for the past 37 years and has never faced any disciplinary action.
- The store is critical to the community.
- An employee, who has since been dismissed, must have conducted the SNAP transactions to cover up the fact that he was embezzling funds from the operation and was hoping that by increasing the volume of SNAP sales it would go unnoticed.
- The store is committed to operating the SNAP program legally and appropriately.

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 Pete's Market as a convenience store on June 12, 2008. The case file indicates that in reaching a disqualification determination, the Retailer Operations Division considered information obtained during a November 4, 2019, 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:

- Pete's Market Mart is approximately 1200 square feet, with storage for beverages outside of public view.
- There was one checkout space one cash register and one point-of-sale device.
- There was no optical scanner for the speedy processing of items at checkout.
- There were no shopping baskets or shopping carts for customer use.
- The checkout space was small and limited with items for sale covering much of the space and an ice cream cooler in front.
- There was no fresh unprocessed meat, poultry, or fish.
- There were some packages of bacon and deli meat.
- There was limited fresh produce with only a basket of onions.
- Dairy included milk, cheese, butter, and infant formula
- Other staple foods available for purchase were eggs, juice, rice, bread, tortillas, beans, cereal, pasta, and a 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, health and beauty products, cleaning products, automotive supplies, 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 infant formula priced at \$39.99, \$28.99, \$25.99, and \$19.99. 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 31 sets of SNAP

transactions conducted by 16 households **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.

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 154 SNAP 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. The frequency of high-dollar purchases in a five-month period calls into question the legitimacy of these transactions.

There appears to be no basis for increased customer attraction to Appellant, there being no evidence of a great price advantage, profusion of specialty or ethnic goods, or special or custom services rendered. The available inventory of SNAP-eligible food items at the time of the visit showed stock that is primarily of low dollar value staple foods or convenience foods. Since Appellant's business carries no fresh or frozen unprocessed meat or seafood, minimal fresh produce, and minimal staple food stock, these patterns are deemed to be suspicious. Moreover, Appellant has a small checkout area and no shopping baskets or carts thereby making it difficult to facilitate the quantities of eligible food items required to make up these high dollar transactions.

The Retailer Operations Division compared Appellant to the two closest similarly stocked stores and determined that the transaction pattern of Appellant exceeded the two stores, as seen on the table. The data from these nearby stores show that the transaction patterns at the Appellant firm were highly unusual and indicative of possible trafficking violations.

5 U.S.C. § 552 (b)(7)(E)

The Retailer Operations Division also determined that Appellant conducted more SNAP transactions in each ten dollar range **5 U.S.C. § 552 (b)(6) & (b)(7)(C)** compared to the average for small groceries in Alameda County during the review period. The Retailer Operations

Division considered this an indicator of trafficking considering Appellant's eligible food stock and infrastructure.

Sometimes a firm may have higher than average SNAP transactions amounts due to the lack of access to other SNAP authorized stores. However, the Retailer Operations Division determined that within a one-mile radius of Appellant there are 28 authorized stores, including 17 convenience stores, three small groceries, six medium groceries, one supermarket, and one super store. The Retailer Operations Division examined three households identified in the charge letter to analyze their shopping patterns at Pete's Market Mart compared to their shopping patterns at other SNAP authorized stores. Despite access to better stocked stores, each of the other households conducted excessively large transactions at Pete's Market Mart within a short time of shopping at a supermarket or super store. 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 Pete's Market Mart does not support these transactions.

Lesser Penalty

Appellant does not deny the trafficking charges and in the provided affidavit states an employee likely conducted the transactions. Appellant, through counsel, states that it has not had any previous SNAP violations and requests a lesser penalty. Trafficking in SNAP benefits is an extremely serious violation and both 7 U.S.C. § 2021(b)(3)(B) and 7 CFR § 278.6(e)(1)(i) state that a first time violation warrants a permanent disqualification.

Household Hardship

Counsel stated that a permanent hardship presents an extreme hardship to the surrounding community and that there are no other outlets in the vicinity. As indicated, the Retailer Operations Division determined that within a one-mile radius of Appellant there are 28 authorized stores including one supermarket and one super store. Moreover, where there is a hardship to SNAP households, FNS may impose a hardship CMP on a firm in lieu of a disqualification where there is a lack of authorized stores in the area. However, 7 CFR § 278.6(f)(1) clearly states that "a civil money penalty for hardship to [SNAP] households may not be imposed in lieu of a permanent disqualification." Because the Retailer Operations Division has taken action to permanently disqualify Appellant's firm, a hardship CMP in lieu of disqualification cannot be granted.

Evidence

Appellant does not deny the transactions and indicates that an employee conducted them. 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 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 is also sustained.

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 5, 2020