

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

AV Mini Mart,)
)
Appellant,)
)
v.)
)
Retailer Operations Division,)
)
Respondent.)
_____)

Case Number: C0192228

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 deny the application of AV Mini Mart (hereinafter Appellant) to participate as an authorized retailer in the Supplemental Nutrition Assistance Program.

ISSUE

The issue accepted for review is whether Retailer Operations Division took appropriate action, consistent with 7 CFR § 278.1(b)(1), in its administration of the Supplemental Nutrition Assistance Program (SNAP) when it denied the application of Appellant to participate as an authorized SNAP retailer on July 26, 2016.

AUTHORITY

7 U.S.C. § 2023 and its 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 July 26, 2016, Retailer Operations Division denied the application of Appellant to participate as an authorized retailer in SNAP. This denial action was based on evidence obtained during a store visit on July 1, 2016, as well as information provided on the firm’s retailer application.

Retailer Operations Division determined that the firm did not meet eligibility Criterion A or Criterion B under 7 CFR § 278.1(b)(1) of the SNAP regulations. The denial letter stated the Appellant failed to meet the requirements of Criterion A because it did not offer for sale on a continuous basis a variety of foods in the dairy products category, and the meats, poultry, or fish category. Also, the Appellant failed to meet the requirements of Criterion B because staple food sales did not comprise more than 50 percent of its total gross retail sales.

As the firm failed to meet either eligibility criterion for approval, Appellant was informed that the firm could not submit a new application to participate in SNAP for a period of six months as provided in § 278.1(k)(2).

In a letter postmarked July 28, 2016, Appellant appealed Retailer Operations Division' decision and requested an administrative review of this action. The appeal was granted.

STANDARD OF REVIEW

In appeals of adverse actions, an 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 and Nutrition Act of 2008, as amended, 7 U.S.C. § 2018 and § 278 of Title 7 of the Code of Federal Regulations (CFR). Part 278.1(k) establishes the authority upon which the application of any firm to participate in SNAP may be denied if it fails to meet established eligibility requirements.

7 CFR § 278.1(b)(1)(i) relays specific program requirements for retail food store participation, which reads, in part, “An establishment . . . shall . . . effectuate the purposes of the program if it . . . meets one of the following criteria: Offer for sale, on a continuous basis, a variety of qualifying foods in each of the four categories of staple foods . . . including perishable foods in at least two of the categories (Criterion A); or have more than 50 percent of the total gross retail sales of the establishment . . . in staple foods (Criterion B).”

7 CFR § 271.2 defines staple food, in part, as “those food items intended for home preparation and consumption in each of the following food categories: meat, poultry, or fish; bread or cereals; vegetables or fruits; and dairy products.”

7 CFR § 278.1(b)(1)(ii)(A) of the SNAP regulations define continuous basis as offering for sale no fewer than three different varieties of food items in each of the four staple food categories on any given day of operation.

7 CFR § 278.1(b)(1)(ii)(B) of the SNAP regulations define perishable foods as “items which are either frozen staple food items or fresh, unrefrigerated or refrigerated staple food items that will spoil or suffer significant deterioration in quality within 2-3 weeks...”

7 CFR § 278.1(b)(1)(ii)(C) of the SNAP regulations define variety as “. . . different types of foods, such as apples, cabbage, tomatoes and squash in the fruit or vegetable staple food category, or milk, cheese, butter and yogurt in the dairy category. Variety of foods is not to be interpreted as different brands, different nutrient values, different varieties of packaging, or different package sizes. . . .”

7 CFR § 278.1(k) reads, in part, “FNS shall deny the application of any firm if it determines that: (1) The firm does not qualify for participation in the program as specified in paragraph (b), (c), (d), (e), (f), (g), (h) or (i) of this section; or (2) The firm has failed to meet the eligibility requirements for authorization under Criterion A or Criterion B, as specified in paragraph (b)(1)(i) of this section. Any firm that has been denied authorization on these bases shall not be eligible to submit a new application for authorization in the program for a minimum period of six months from the effective date of the denial.”

APPELLANT’S CONTENTIONS

The Appellant made the following summarized contentions in its response to the denial letter and its request for administrative review, in relevant part:

- I carry bread, milk, potatoes, and lemons and I have also started selling pre-packaged food such as salads and TV dinners.
- Most of my customers use food stamps so my product reaches the expiration date and I have to remove it from the shelves. In order for me to move it quickly I would need to be able to accept SNAP.

The preceding may represent only a brief summary of Appellant’s contentions in this matter. However, in reaching a decision, full attention and consideration has been given to all contentions presented, including any not specifically recapitulated or specifically referenced herein.

ANALYSIS AND FINDINGS

In regards to Appellant’s contentions it is important to clarify that the purpose of this review is to either validate or to invalidate the earlier decision of the Retailer Operations Division. It is not the purpose of this review to consider what subsequent actions may have been taken so that a store may begin to comply with program requirements. Section 278.1(b)(ii)(A) of the SNAP regulations state in part “. . .firms shall offer for sale and normally display in a public area, qualifying staple food items on a continuous basis, evidenced by having, **on any given day of operation**, no fewer than three different varieties of food items in each of the four staple food categories.” [*Emphasis Added*]

A review of the firm visit documentation indicates that the firm was deficient in the dairy products category, the meat, poultry, or fish category. The store also did not appear to carry perishables in at least two staple food categories as required by 7 CFR § 278.1(b)(1)(ii)(B) of the SNAP regulations. Therefore, Retailer Operations Division correctly concluded Appellant did not meet Criterion A because the firm did not offer “qualifying staple foods on a continuous basis in each of the four staple food categories.” Appellant’s contentions do not provide any valid basis for dismissing or mitigating the adverse action imposed.

Appellant reported on its retailer application that ten percent of its projected total annual gross retail sales were from the sale of staple foods. Appellant’s application, the photographs and firm inventory provided from the firm visit, confirm that Appellant did not derive more than 50 percent of its projected total annual gross retail sales from the sale of staple foods. Accordingly, Retailer Operations Division correctly determined Appellant was not eligible for authorization under Criterion B.

7 USC 2018 (b)(7)(e)

7 CFR § 278.1(k)(2) states, in part, “FNS shall deny the application of any firm if it determines that the firm has failed to meet the eligibility requirements for authorization under Criterion A or Criterion B, as specified in paragraph (b)(1)(i) of this section . . . for a minimum period of six months from the effective date of the denial.” There is no agency discretion to impose a sanction less than six months when a firm does not meet the aforementioned eligibility requirements for authorization.

CONCLUSION

Based on the discussion herein, the determination by Retailer Operations Division to deny the application of AV Mini Mart to participate as an authorized SNAP retailer is sustained. Appellant shall not be eligible to submit a new application for SNAP authorization for a period of six months, effective July 26, 2016.

RIGHTS AND REMEDIES

Applicable rights to a judicial review of this decision are set forth in 7 U.S.C. § 2023 and 7 CFR § 279.7. If a judicial review is desired, the complaint must be filed in the U.S. District Court for the district in which Appellant’s owners 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 (FOIA), it may be necessary to release this document and related correspondence and records upon request. If such a request is received, FNS will seek to protect, to the extent provided by law, personal information that if released could constitute an unwarranted invasion of privacy.

/S/

MONIQUE BROOKS
ADMINISTRATIVE REVIEW OFFICER

10/03/2016

DATE