

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

214 BP Gas,

Appellant,

v.

Case Number: C0210522

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 the Retailer Operations Division properly denied the application of 214 BP Gas (hereinafter “Appellant”) to participate as an authorized retailer in the Supplemental Nutrition Assistance Program (SNAP). As a result, the firm may not reapply for SNAP authorization for a period of six months from the date of denial.

ISSUE

The issue accepted for review is whether or not the Retailer Operations Division took appropriate action, consistent with Title 7 Code of Federal Regulations (CFR) Part 278, in its administration of SNAP when it denied the retailer application of 214 BP Gas.

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 June 1, 2018, the Retailer Operations Division denied the Appellant’s application to participate as an authorized retailer in SNAP. This denial action was based on observations made during a May 4, 2018, store visit as well as information provided on the firm’s application.

The Retailer Operations Division determined that the firm did not meet eligibility under Criterion A or Criterion B pursuant to SNAP regulations at 7 CFR § 278.1(b)(1). 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 all four staple food categories. It also stated that the Appellant failed to meet the requirements of Criterion B because staple food sales did not comprise more than 50 percent of its total retail sales. Additionally, the letter indicated that FNS considered the firm's eligibility under the Need for Access provision of the regulations found at 7 CFR § 278.1(b)(6), but determined that the Appellant does not qualify for SNAP under this provision.

As a result of being found ineligible for participation under both Criteria A and B, and being found ineligible under the Need for Access provision, the Appellant's SNAP application was denied for a period of six months pursuant to regulation at 7 CFR § 278.1(k)(2).

In a letter postmarked June 11, 2018, the Appellant requested an administrative review of the Retailer Operations Division's decision. The request was granted. It should be noted that on July 19, 2018, the Appellant submitted an additional letter of explanation along with 11 pages of inventory invoices to be considered in this review.

STANDARD OF REVIEW

In an appeal of adverse action, such as an application denial, an appellant bears the burden of proving by a preponderance of the evidence that the administrative action should be reversed. This means that 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 AND REGULATIONS

The controlling law in this matter is found in the Food and Nutrition Act of 2008, as amended (7 U.S.C. § 2018), and promulgated through regulation under Title 7 CFR Part 278. In particular, 7 CFR § 278.1(k) provides the authority upon which FNS shall deny the authorization of any firm applying for participation in SNAP if it fails to meet established eligibility criteria.

7 CFR § 278.1(k)(2) reads, in relevant part:

FNS shall deny the application of any firm if it determines that:

(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

7 CFR § 271.2 defines a retail food store as:

(1) An establishment or house-to-house trade route that sells food for home preparation and consumption normally displayed in a public area, and either offers for sale qualifying staple food items on a continuous basis, evidenced by having no fewer than *[three]** different varieties of food items in each of the four staple food categories with a minimum depth of stock of three

* As currently implemented. See SNAP Retailer Policy and Management Division Policy Memorandum 2018-04 for additional information regarding the enhanced retailer standards, which were implemented on January 17, 2018. This memorandum can be found on the FNS public website at <https://www.fns.usda.gov/snap/retailer-eligibility-clarification-of-criterion>.

stocking units for each qualifying staple variety, including at least one variety of perishable foods in at least *[two]** such categories (Criterion A) as set forth in § 278.1(b)(1) of this chapter, or has more than 50 percent of its total gross retail sales in staple foods (Criterion B) as set forth in § 278.1(b)(1) of this chapter as determined by visual inspection, marketing structure, business licenses, accessibility of food items offered for sale, purchase and sales records, counting of stockkeeping units, or other inventory or accounting recordkeeping methods that are customary or reasonable in the retail food industry as set forth in § 278.1(b)(1) of this chapter...

7 CFR § 271.2 defines staple food as:

...food items intended for home preparation and consumption in each of the following four categories: Meat, poultry, or fish; bread or cereals; vegetables or fruits; and dairy products... Hot foods are not eligible for purchase with SNAP benefits and, therefore, do not qualify as staple foods for the purpose of determining eligibility under § 278.1(b)(1) of this chapter. Commercially processed foods and prepared mixtures with multiple ingredients that do not represent a single staple food category shall only be counted in one staple food category. For example, foods such as cold pizza, macaroni and cheese, multi-ingredient soup, or frozen dinners, shall only be counted as one staple food item and will be included in the staple food category of the main ingredient as determined by FNS. Accessory food items include foods that are generally considered snack foods or desserts such as, but not limited to, chips, ice cream, crackers, cupcakes, cookies, popcorn, pastries, and candy, and other food items that complement or supplement meals, such as, but not limited to, coffee, tea, cocoa, carbonated and uncarbonated drinks, condiments, spices, salt, and sugar. Items shall not be classified as accessory food exclusively based on packaging size but rather based on the aforementioned definition and as determined by FNS. A food product containing an accessory food item as its main ingredient shall be considered an accessory food item. Accessory food items shall not be considered staple foods for purposes of determining the eligibility of any firm.

7 CFR § 278.1(b)(1)(i) states, in part:

An establishment...will effectuate the purposes of the program if it sells food for home preparation and consumption and 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 § 278.1(b)(1)(ii) states, in part:

In order to qualify under [Criterion A] firms shall:

(A) 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 with a minimum depth of stock of three stocking units for each qualifying staple variety and at least one variety of perishable foods in at least *[two]** staple food categories. Documentation to determine if a firm

* As currently implemented. See SNAP Retailer Policy and Management Division Policy Memorandum 2018-04 for additional information regarding the enhanced retailer standards, which were implemented on January 17, 2018. This memorandum can be found on the FNS public website at <https://www.fns.usda.gov/snap/retailer-eligibility-clarification-of-criterion>.

stocks a sufficient amount of required staple foods to offer them for sale on a continuous basis may be required in cases where it is not clear that the firm has made reasonable stocking efforts to meet the stocking requirement. Such documentation can be achieved through verifying information, when requested by FNS, such as invoices and receipts in order to prove that the firm had ordered and/or received a sufficient amount of required staple foods up to 21 calendar days prior to the date of the store visit...

(B) Offer for sale perishable staple food items in at least *[two]** staple food categories. Perishable foods are 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; and

(C) *[Offer a variety of staple foods which means 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. Similar processed food items with varying ingredients such as, but not limited to, sausages, breakfast cereals, milk, sliced breads, and cheeses, and similar unprocessed food items, such as, but not limited to different varieties of apples, cabbage, tomatoes, or squash shall not each be considered as more than one staple food variety for the purpose of determining variety. Multiple ingredient food items...such as...cold pizza, macaroni and cheese, soup, or frozen dinners, shall only be counted as one staple food variety each and will normally be included in the staple food category of the main ingredient as determined by the FNS.]**

7 CFR § 278.1(b)(1)(iii) states, in part:

In order to qualify under [Criterion B] firms must have more than 50 percent of their total gross retail sales in staple food sales. Total gross retail sales must include all retail sales of a firm, including food and non-food merchandise, as well as services, such as rental fees, professional fees, and entertainment/sports/games income...

7 CFR § 278.1(k)(2) states, in part:

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.

7 CFR § 278.1(b)(6) states:

Need for access. FNS will consider whether the applicant firm is located in an area with significantly limited access to food when the applicant firm fails to meet Criterion A per paragraph (b)(1)(ii) or Criterion B per paragraph (b)(1)(iii) of this section so long as the applicant firm meets all other SNAP authorization requirements. In determining whether an applicant is located in such an area, FNS may consider access factors such as, but not limited to, the distance from the applicant firm to the nearest currently SNAP authorized firm and transportation options. In determining whether to authorize an applicant despite its failure to meet Criterion A and Criterion B, FNS will also consider factors such as, but not limited to, the

* As currently implemented. See SNAP Retailer Policy and Management Division Policy Memorandum 2018-04 for additional information regarding the enhanced retailer standards, which were implemented on January 17, 2018. This memorandum can be found on the FNS public website at <https://www.fns.usda.gov/snap/retailer-eligibility-clarification-of-criterion>.

extent of the applicant firm's stocking deficiencies in meeting Criterion A and Criterion B and whether the store furthers the purposes of the Program. Such considerations will be conducted during the application process as described in paragraph (a) of this section.

APPELLANT'S CONTENTIONS

The Appellant made the following summarized contentions in its request for administrative review, in relevant part:

- The Appellant was confused about its application being denied because the inspector said the store was good.
- Appellant requests reconsideration of the denial decision due to a number of factors.
- The previous company, Geneva Gas, Inc., was owned by Appellant owner's son. The son had a stroke in September 2017 which left the Appellant solely in charge while his son recuperated. The son ran the day-to-day operations and was familiar with SNAP guidelines. The Appellant, on the other hand, saw product that went out of date and had to calculate profits and losses. If the Appellant had been aware of the SNAP requirements of some core inventory, it would have kept those food items on the shelves continuously to remain in compliance with EBT guidelines.
- The previous company was dissolved due to a legal issue, so the Appellant became the new owner, which made it necessary to apply for a new SNAP license.
- The town where the store is located has many seasonal workers who rely on SNAP benefits to help feed their families. The store has been an advocate for the EBT program for roughly a decade or more. The Appellant feels like it is failing its customer base by not being able to provide this service.
- Appellant hopes that the denial decision is reconsidered and that FNS will send the inspector out again. The store has been stocked with the items that were in dispute on the inspector's report.

In support of these contentions, the Appellant submitted 11 pages of inventory invoices from various wholesale firms, including Coca-Cola Beverages Florida LLC, Frito-Lay, Pepsi Beverages Company, Dandee Foods, MDK Distributors Inc., The H.T. Hackney Co., John T. Scott Distributing Inc., and Borden Dairy Company. The receipts are dated between May 31, 2018, and July 19, 2018.

The preceding may represent only a brief summary of the Appellant's contentions presented in this matter. However, in reaching a final decision, full attention was given to all contentions presented, including any not specifically summarized or explicitly referenced herein.

ANALYSIS AND FINDINGS

It is important to clarify for the record that the purpose of this review is to either validate or invalidate the earlier determination of the Retailer Operations Division. Thus, this review is limited to consideration of the relevant facts and circumstances as they existed at the time of the contractor's store visit and at the time the Retailer Operations Division rendered its decision.

After reviewing the contractor's store visit report and photographs as well as evaluating the contentions submitted by the Appellant, it is the determination of this review that the Appellant firm does not carry, on a continuous basis, sufficient staple food inventory to be eligible for SNAP participation.

According to the denial letter, the firm was lacking sufficient inventory in the dairy staple food category. As best as this review can determine, the only dairy items in the store on the day of the contractor's visit were several units of milk and one package of margarine. There is no evidence that other dairy products were stored elsewhere or were temporarily relocated. In order for a firm to be eligible under Criterion A, it must offer for sale no fewer than **three** different varieties of food items in each of the four staple food categories with a minimum depth of stock of three stocking units for each variety.

It is noted that on May 24, 2018, the Retailer Operations Division sent the firm a letter requesting additional information from the firm regarding its inventory. In this letter, the Retailer Operations Division asked for invoices or receipts as evidence that the firm normally meets the minimum eligibility requirements. Specifically, the letter requested documentation related to the dairy food category. The letter further stated that in order to be considered, the invoices or receipts must be dated no more than 21 days prior to the date of the contractor's store visit.

On June 1, 2017, the Retailer Operations Division and the Appellant had a telephone conversation in which the owner stated that he last purchased butter three months ago and does not sell yogurt because nobody asks for it. He also stated that he once purchased two or three units of sour cream but they went bad. He then stated that he could place a call to one of his suppliers and have the required products in the store within a week.

This conversation between the Retailer Operations Division and the Appellant highlights the key issue of this case, which is that the firm does not carry, on a continuous basis, a sufficient variety or quantity of dairy products to be eligible under Criterion A. Because the firm stocked only milk and one unit of margarine on the day of the store visit, the firm is not eligible for SNAP authorization. The firm is also not eligible for SNAP participation under Criterion B, as the sale of staple foods does not exceed 50 percent of the firm's total sales. According to the Appellant's SNAP application, 31 percent of the firm's total sales come from the sale of staple foods. However, considering the large number of nonfood items available at the store, including gasoline, lottery tickets, alcoholic beverages, tobacco products, etc., 31 percent is probably a significant overestimation.

As for the inventory invoices provided to the administrative review officer, none of these documents provide a valid basis for reversing the denial determination because all of the invoices are dated at least four weeks after the store visit occurred. As stated earlier, invoices in this case can only be considered if they are dated less than 21 days prior to the date of the contractor's store visit.

With regard to the Appellant owner's other contentions, including a claim that he lacked familiarity with SNAP eligibility requirements when he took over ownership of the store, and an insinuation that local SNAP households will experience some level of hardship if the store is not

able to provide a place where SNAP benefits can be used, such arguments do not provide a valid basis for this review to reverse the Retailer Operations Division's denial determination. A store may only participate in SNAP if it meets minimum eligibility requirements, which 214 BP Gas does not.

Remedial Actions Taken

The Appellant has stated that the store has now been stocked with the items that were in dispute on the inspector's report. At least one of the inventory invoices provided by the Appellant shows additional dairy items that were not in the store on the day of the contractor's visit.

With regard to this contention, it must be restated that this review is limited to consideration of the relevant facts and circumstances as they existed at the time of the contractor's store visit and at the time that the Retailer Operations Division rendered its denial decision. It is not the authority of this review to consider subsequent remedial actions that have been or will be taken so that a store may begin to comply with program requirements. There are no provisions in the SNAP regulations for a reversal of an application denial on the basis of alleged or planned corrective actions implemented subsequent to the finding of a firm's ineligibility.

Therefore, the Appellant's contention that the store has made improvements to its staple food inventory does not provide a valid basis for reversing the Retailer Operations Division's denial determination.

Need for Access

SNAP regulations at 7 CFR § 278.1(b)(6) state that FNS will consider whether or not the Appellant firm is located in an area with significantly limited access to food when the firm fails to meet Criterion A or Criterion B as long as it meets all other eligibility requirements. This Need for Access evaluation also considers other factors, such as distance to the nearest SNAP-authorized firm, transportation options, the extent of the Appellant's stocking deficiencies, and whether or not the Appellant firm furthers the purposes of the program.

The record indicates that the Retailer Operations Division conducted a Need for Access evaluation and determined that the Appellant firm did not qualify for SNAP authorization under this provision. After a review of all available evidence in this case, this review agrees that authorization under the Need for Access provision is not appropriate in this case.

CONCLUSION

Based on the analysis above, it is the determination of this review that the Appellant firm, 214 BP Gas, does not meet eligibility requirements under Criterion A or B outlined in regulations at 7 CFR § 278.1(b)(1). Additionally, the contentions and evidence presented by the Appellant are not sufficient to show that the denial decision made by the Retailer Operations Division should be reversed. Accordingly, the decision by the Retailer Operations Division to deny the application of 214 BP Gas to participate as a retailer in SNAP is sustained.

In accordance with 7 CFR § 278.1(k)(2), the Appellant shall not be eligible to reapply for participation as a retailer in SNAP for a minimum period of six months from June 1, 2018, which is the effective date of the denial.

RIGHTS AND REMEDIES

Applicable rights to a judicial review of this decision are set forth in Section 14 of the Food and Nutrition Act of 2008 (7 U.S.C. § 2023) and in Section 279.7 of the SNAP regulations. 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 owner resides or is engaged in business, or in any court of record of the State having competent jurisdiction. If a complaint is filed, it must be filed within 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.

JON YORGASON
Administrative Review Officer

August 10, 2018