

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

**Laurel Lane Grocery,**

**Appellant,**

**v.**

**Case Number: C0203104**

**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 there is sufficient evidence to support a finding that the permanent disqualification of Laurel Lane Grocery (Laurel Lane or 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 October 24, 2017, 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 April 2017 through September 2017. 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 replied to the charges by letters dated November 3 and November 7, 2018. Appellant denied trafficking and explained the transactions were due to the store accepting SNAP benefits as repayment on credit accounts. Appellant requested a CMP.

After considering the retailer's reply and the evidence, the Retailer Operations Division issued a determination letter dated February 5, 2018. 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.

In a postmarked February 8, 2018, Appellant, through counsel, appealed the Retailer Operations Division's determination and requested an administrative review. The appeal was granted.

### **STANDARD OF REVIEW**

In appeals of adverse actions, the Appellant bears the burden of proving by a clear 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 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 as: “(1) 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, inter alia, 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 on-site investigations, inconsistent redemption data, evidence obtained through a transaction report under an **electronic benefit transfer system**, . . .” (emphasis added)

7 CFR § 278.6(b)(2)(ii) states, inter alia: “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 . . . 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).”

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.”

### SUMMARY OF THE CHARGES

Appellant was charged and determined to be trafficking based on an analysis of EBT transaction data from April 2017 through September 2017. This involved the following SNAP transaction patterns which are indicative of trafficking:

- There were multiple transactions made from individual benefit accounts in unusually short time frames.
- 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 appeal request postmarked February 8, 2018, and subsequent information dated May 18, 2018, Appellant, through counsel, provided the following summarized contentions, in relevant part:

- Appellant apologizes for allowing credit repayments with SNAP benefits.
- The large transactions are due to credit repayments.
- Appellant has taken steps to make sure employees understand the SNAP rules and that credit is not allowed.
- Appellant has posted notices with the rules.
- Appellant denies trafficking and requested that it be reinstated.
- Appellant provided documentation to show that the practice of allowing credit explains the large numbers.
- The agency has raw data with nothing that supports trafficking and nothing refuting the accounts.
- The store functions as a grocery store because of its size and distance to other larger stores.
- It is much bigger and carries more grocery items, has a cold sandwich counter for people to actually provide a quick dinner, and twice as much as the other stores.
- It does not serve the community for EBT to be taken away forever.
- Appellant has been in the location for ten years and has never had any other complaints.
- The store has new written policies, which each employee must read, and accept as part of the employee requirements.
- The store has started a review schedule of the rules and requirements.
- Appellant is starting an employee review monthly meeting that reminds the employees of the rules of SNAP.
- Appellant denies trafficking.

In support of its contentions, Appellant, through counsel, provided the following documents in support of its contentions:

- Eight pages of a document titled "Laurel Lane Groceries EBT Program Review and Classes Sign-in Sheet" for April and May;
- Eight pages of a document titled "Laurel Lane Groceries New Additional Rules"; and
- Eight pages of a document titled "Laurel Lane Groceries EBT Program Review and Classes".

Appellant also provided its original response to the charge letter and the previously submitted documentation of credit accounts.

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 Laurel Lane as a convenience store on August 22, 2008. The case file indicates that in reaching a disqualification determination, the Retailer Operations Division considered information obtained during a September 5, 2017, 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:

- Laurel Lane is approximately 1600 square feet.
- There were no shopping baskets but there was one shopping cart for customer use.
- The store does not offer any promotional specials, packaged, or bulk items.
- The checkout counter was cluttered and limited space.
- There was no fresh meat, poultry, or fish.
- There was packaged deli meat, packaged sausage, one package of bacon, and hot dogs.
- There was limited fresh produce including potatoes, onions, apples, lemons, and limes.
- Dairy included butter, cheese, milk, ice cream, and sour cream.
- Other staple food items included bread, cereal, pasta, rice, eggs, 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 include alcohol, tobacco products, health and beauty aids, paper products, pet food, and cleaning products.

The highest priced items noted on the day of the store visit were beef jerky - \$7.29, country crock butter - \$5.99; hickory sausage - \$6.99; and salami - \$5.29. 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. 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 14 sets of transactions conducted by 13 households **5 U.S.C. § 552 (b)(6) & (b)(7)(C).** **5 U.S.C. § 552 (b)(6) & (b)(7)(C).**

The SNAP transactions noted in the charge letter are questionable not because they exceed any limits for use, but 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 legitimate 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, or significant bulk items for sale. The transactions are too large to consist of a forgotten item or two.

The Retailer Operations Division determined that households that are conducting rapid, repetitive, and large transactions at Appellant are frequently shopping at better-stocked and more competitively-priced grocery stores, sometimes on or about the same day they shopped at Appellant. Based on the shopping patterns of these SNAP customers, transportation to other stores did not appear to be an issue and customers do not appear to rely on Appellant for all of its grocery needs.

Appellant informed the Retailer Operations Division that many of these transactions were due to repayments on credit accounts. When a retailer claims it maintains credit accounts to explain irregular SNAP transactions and data patterns, FNS requires a level of detail regarding the legitimacy of the claim. This is because retailers have often made false admissions of credit in an attempt to obtain a lesser penalty after committing more egregious violations such as trafficking. Credit transactions must be accounted for with substantive evidence such as the dates credit was extended, to whom, for what amount, and for what items.

Appellant submitted documentation to support a limited number of credit repayments. However, most of the SNAP transactions listed are still questionable. **5 U.S.C. § 552 (b)(6) & (b)(7)(C).** It is curious why a household would travel to

Appellant to pay off a credit account, leave the store,  
**5 U.S.C. § 552 (b)(6) & (b)(7)(C)** It is not plausible. Moreover, in eight of the transaction sets, the second and/or third transactions were greater than the first transaction, which would be presumably the alleged repayment on credit accounts.

While there are legitimate reasons why a SNAP household may shop at a given store multiple times in a day, the repetitive transactions cited in Attachment 1 is not normal shopping behavior at a convenience store. In the absence of any other reasonable explanation, the irregular transaction patterns are more likely than not to be a result of trafficking in SNAP benefits.

**Charge Letter Attachment 2: Excessively large purchase transactions were made from recipient accounts.** This attachment lists 187 SNAP transactions  
**5 U.S.C. § 552 (b)(6) & (b)(7)(C)**. Appellant did not stock a profusion of high dollar staple food items and had no fresh unprocessed meat and limited fresh produce. Therefore, the substantial number of high dollar purchases calls into question the legitimacy of these transactions.

**5 U.S.C. § 552 (b)(7)(E)**. As noted earlier, there is no evidence that the firm would be likely to have SNAP redemption patterns that differ considerably from similar-sized competitors. The store photographs indicate that the store carries limited staple food stock, has no fresh meat and limited fresh produce. There is no compelling reason for customers to consider Appellant as a first choice destination to fulfill large purchases of food, or to make cumulative purchases **5 U.S.C. § 552 (b)(7)(E)** resulting in large amounts.

The Retailer Operations Division compared Appellant to two nearby convenience stores. Appellant's average SNAP transaction dollar amount was greater than the other two stores. **5 U.S.C. § 552 (b)(7)(E)**.

**5 U.S.C. § 552 (b)(7)(E)**

Appellant contends that most of the large transactions are the result of the firm allowing a few of its SNAP customers to shop on credit and then pay the store back when the household's benefit allotment is replenished. As indicated previously, credit transactions must be accounted for with substantive evidence such as to the dates credit was extended, to whom, for what amount, and for what items. Although the evidence submitted supports that Appellant may be extending credit to some SNAP households; the evidence does not support that **each** of these large SNAP transactions are for the repayment of credit accounts. Thus, the Retailer Operations Division properly determined that the evidence submitted by the Appellant was insufficient to justify the irregular transactions cited in Charge Letter Attachment 2. Credit accounts will be addressed in more fully in the next section.

Counsel explains that customers use Appellant as grocery store. It is true that sometimes a firm may have higher than average SNAP transactions amounts due to

the lack of access to other SNAP authorized stores. The Retailer Operations Division determined that there are 42 other authorized stores within a three-mile radius of Appellant, including two super stores and four supermarkets.

The Retailer Operations Division analyzed the shopping patterns of six households identified in the charge letter. All of these households had access to, and shopped at supermarkets and super stores. However, despite this access to better stocked stores, each of the three households conducted excessively large transactions at Laurel Lane 5 U.S.C. § 552 (b)(7)(E) of shopping at a supermarket or super store. There is no legitimate reason 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 staple foods including fresh meat and produce and likely better prices. The transaction history of each of the six households also does not appear to be repayment on credit accounts.

In summary, Appellant's layout, business structure, and food inventory do not support a high percentage of transactions markedly exceeding the average SNAP transaction amount of similar type stores. Government analyses of stores caught in trafficking violations during on-site investigations have found that transactions involving trafficking consistently display particular characteristics or patterns. These patterns include, in part, those cited in the letter of charges. Therefore, based on this empirical data, and in the absence of evidence to legitimize such transaction patterns, a conclusion can be drawn, through a preponderance of evidence that the "unusual, irregular, and inexplicable" transactions and patterns cited in the letter of charges evidence trafficking as the most likely explanation.

## **Credit Accounts**

Counsel argues that the Retailer Operations Division has nothing to refute the credit accounts. Appellant provided three statements from customers that allegedly purchased items on credit and made repayments with SNAP benefits. The Retailer Operations Division analyzed the SNAP transaction history of these households. Amanda, the only household that signed the affidavit, did not match the name of the actual household listed in the State database of SNAP households. 5 U.S.C. § 552 (b)(6) & (b)(7)(C). The first transaction may have been repayment for a credit account, but the other large transactions remain questionable.

The other two individuals who did not sign the affidavit also conducted transactions at Appellant. Some of the transactions may have been repayment on credit accounts but the Retailer Operations Division determined that some of 5 U.S.C. § 552 (b)(6) & (b)(7)(C) transactions remain questionable. For example, on September 2, 2017, this household conducted a small purchase at Appellant and then returned the next day and conducted the larger transaction. It seems unlikely that the repayment on credit did not occur first.



Appellant also provided copies of alleged credit ledgers. These sheets contained just first names and amounts. There were not many dates listed and three were no paid amounts listed. Given the limited information, the Retailer Operations Division was unable to complete further analysis of these accounts.

Appellant also submitted copies of 30 identification cards of individuals with alleged credit accounts. There was credit slips wrapped around the cards that contained dollar amounts. The items purchased were not listed and therefore it could not be determined if eligible food items were purchased. The names of 15 out of the 30 were either cutoff or illegible. Four of the remaining 15 households could not be located in the State SNAP database. Thus, there were eleven households located in the system. Five of the eleven households did not conduct any SNAP transactions at Appellant during the review period. The Retailer Operations Division determined that only four of the eleven households may have repaid credit accounts with SNAP benefits. For example, customer Charles was never out of SNAP benefits when he conducted large transactions at Appellant. Thus, it is not likely that this household needed credit. **5 U.S.C. § 552 (b)(6) & (b)(7)(C)**. Even if Appellant was allowing some credit these transactions completed in September are inconsistent with paying off a credit account.

In summary, there are 75 different SNAP households that conducted the 192 transactions listed in the charge letter attachments. Forty-two of those transactions were completed by one of the legible names provided by the retailer. When reviewing each of these households transaction history it is clear that some of the listed transactions were not credit account payments. Moreover, the Retailer Operations Division determined that Appellant was not able to justify 78% of the listed transactions completed at the subject firm. Although the Retailer Operations Division determined that the some of the transaction conducted by these households are likely to have been repayments on credit accounts, the majority of the SNAP transactions remain questionable.

## **Household Hardship**

Counsel explains that it does not serve the community for EBT to be taken away forever because the store functions as a grocery store because of its size and distance to larger stores. As indicated, the Retailer Operations Division determined that there are 46 other SNAP authorized stores within a one mile radius of Appellant. 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, the regulations at 7 CFR §278.6(f)(1) clearly state 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.

## **No Previous Violations**

Appellant contends that it been at that location for ten years and there have been no previous complaints. However, the record shows that Appellant was sent a warning letter on July 12, 2017, for selling ineligible non-food items in exchange for SNAP benefits. Regardless, a record of participation in the SNAP with no previously documented instance of violations does not constitute valid grounds for dismissal of the current charges of violations or for mitigating the impact of the violations upon which they are based. There is no provision in the Act or regulations that reverses or reduces a sanction based upon a lack of prior violations by a firm and its owners, managers, and/or employees.

## **Corrective Action**

Counsel explained that it has started a review schedule of the rules and regulations as well as a monthly overview meeting. It is important to clarify for the record that the purpose of this review is to either validate or to invalidate the earlier decision of the Retailer Operations Division. This review is limited to what circumstances were at the basis of the Retailer Operations Division action at the time such action was made. It is not within the authority of this review to consider what subsequent remedial actions may have been taken or will be taken in the future so that a store may begin to comply with program requirements. There is no provision in the SNAP regulations for waiver or reduction of an administrative penalty assessment on the basis of corrective actions implemented subsequent to investigative findings of program violations. Therefore, Appellant's contention that it took corrective action and can take additional action to prevent future violations does not provide any valid basis for dismissing the charges or for mitigating the penalty imposed.

## **Evidence**

Counsel contends that the Agency only has raw data and nothing to link the large transactions to trafficking. The charge letter attachments are derived from transaction reports under the electronic benefit transfer system. Specifically, FNS uses 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.]

Appellant must provide a preponderance of evidence 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 did not provide any compelling justifications for the transactions listed on the charge letter attachments. It did not furnish receipts for the questionable transactions or any invoices or evidence of stocking adequate eligible foods to cover the SNAP redemption totals. 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 requested a trafficking CMP in lieu of a permanent disqualification. In support of its request, Appellant submitted the cover of the FNS training guide for retailer along with a flyer of who is eligible for SNAP.

The criteria for a trafficking civil money penalty in lieu of disqualification is established under 7 CFR § 278.6(i) which reads, inter alia:

“In determining the minimum standards of eligibility of a firm for a civil money penalty in lieu of a permanent disqualification for trafficking, 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 §2 78.6(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 ...”

The Retailer Operations Division determined that the documentation submitted by Appellant was not substantial evidence that Appellant met all four criteria required by 7 CFR § 278.6(i). For example, there was none of the following:

- Documentation reflecting the development and/or operation of a policy to terminate the employment of any firm employee found violating the SNAP regulations.
- 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
- Documentation of the development and/or continued operation of procedures for internal review of firm employees’ compliance with SNAP regulations:
- Dated training curricula and records of dates training sessions were conducted; the 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 in initial or follow-up training.

If the firm was conducting regular training sessions and was frequently reviewing SNAP rules and regulations, it would have certainly discovered that offering credit accounts to SNAP customers was strictly prohibited and that any firm engaging in such behavior would be subject to disqualification. Thus, it is unlikely that Appellant had an effective training program in place prior to the violations.

In the absence of any such documentation, a civil money penalty was not imposed in lieu of permanent disqualification by the Retailer Operations Division. The record is clear that Appellant did not submit sufficient evidence to establish that Appellant had an effective compliance program and policy in effect prior to the 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 was deemed correct and proper.

### **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 30, 2018