

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

Salama Halal & Grocery, Inc,

Appellant,

v.

Case Number: C0201458

Retailer Operations Division,

Respondent.

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 (“ROD”) to impose a permanent disqualification from participating as an authorized retailer in the Supplemental Nutrition Assistance Program (SNAP) against Salama Halal & Grocery, Inc. (“Appellant”).

ISSUE

The purpose of this review is to determine whether the ROD took appropriate action, consistent with Title 7 of the Code of Federal Regulations (CFR) § 278.6(a), (c) and (e)(1)(i), when it imposed a Permanent Disqualification against Appellant on November 6, 2017.

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

In a letter dated September 5, 2017, the ROD charged Appellant with trafficking, as defined in Section 271.2 of the SNAP regulations. This charge was based on a series of SNAP transaction patterns that “establish clear and repetitive patterns of unusual, irregular, and inexplicable activity for your type of firm.” This letter of charges states: “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 ROD’s charges in writing. The record reflects that the ROD received and considered the information provided prior to making a determination. The ROD determined that Appellant’s contentions did not outweigh the evidence that the store was trafficking. Based on the preponderance of evidence, the ROD concluded that trafficking is the most probable explanation for the questionable transactions listed in the charge letter attachments.

The ROD issued a determination letter dated November 6, 2017. This letter informed Appellant that it was 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. The letter also states the ROD considered Appellant’s eligibility for a trafficking civil money penalty (CMP) according to the terms of Section 278.6(i) of the SNAP regulations. The ROD determined that Appellant was not eligible for the CMP because Appellant had not submitted sufficient evidence to demonstrate that it had established and implemented an effective compliance policy and program to prevent SNAP violations.

On November 15, 2017, Appellant, through counsel, appealed the ROD’s determination 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(a) and (e)(1)(i) 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 engaged in trafficking of SNAP benefits.

7 CFR § 278.6(a) states, in part:

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(a) states, in part:

Any firm considered for disqualification ... under paragraph (a) of this section... shall have full opportunity to submit to FNS information, explanation, or evidence concerning any instances of noncompliance before FNS makes a final administrative determination. The FNS regional office shall send the firm a letter of charges before making such determination. The letter shall specify the violations or actions which FNS believes constitute a basis for disqualification The letter shall inform the firm that it may respond either orally or in writing to the charges contained in the letter within 10 days of receiving the letter . . .

7 CFR § 278.6(c) reads, in part:

The letter of charges, the response, and any other information available to FNS shall be reviewed and considered by the appropriate FNS regional office, which shall then issue the determination. In the case of a firm subject to permanent disqualification under paragraph (e)(1) of this section, the determination shall inform such a firm that action to permanently disqualify the firm shall be effective immediately upon the date of receipt of the notice of determination from FNS, regardless of whether a request for review is filed in accordance with part 279 of this chapter.

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 7 CFR § 271.2, 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”

Also at 7 CFR § 271.2, eligible food is defined as:

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 § 278.6(b)(2)(ii) states, in part:

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(b)(2)(iii) states:

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.

SUMMARY OF CHARGES

The charges under review were based on an analysis of SNAP Electronic Benefit Transfer (EBT) transaction data during the period from January 2017 through June 2017. This analysis identified the following patterns of SNAP transaction activity that indicate trafficking:

- An inordinate number of transactions ending in same-cents values;
- Multiple transactions made from the same accounts in unusually short time frames; and,
- Excessively large transactions.

The attachments enclosed with the charge letter specify the questionable and unusual SNAP transactions indicative of trafficking which were conducted at Appellant during the review period.

APPELLANT'S CONTENTIONS

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

- Appellant denies the allegations;
- Same-cents transactions are because customers purchase halal meat and food items by fixed-dollar amounts. Meat is sold in \$10 and \$20 bags;
- Same cents transactions are because Appellant sells rice in large quantities **5 U.S.C. § 552 (b)(6) & (b)(7)(C)**;
- Appellant caters to the Somali community;
- Transactions over a two-day period are not rapid;
- Back-to-back transactions are because customers purchase amounts they can carry home;
- Back-to-back transactions are because on seven occasions the store split one transaction into two transactions to train staff;
- Large transactions are the result of purchases for large families;
- Disqualification would pose a severe hardship to Appellant and SNAP participants in the community; and,
- The disqualification is arbitrary.

In support of its contentions, Appellant provided the following documentation:

- A six-page article on goat meat sales;
- Eight store pictures;
- 55 pages of invoices; and,
- A two-page article about an administrative review reversing a determination of two Somali retailers.

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

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. Based on this empirical data, and in the absence of any reasonable explanations for such transaction patterns, a conclusion can be drawn by a preponderance of evidence that trafficking is the most likely explanation for "unusual, irregular, and inexplicable" transactions and patterns cited in the letter of charges is trafficking. Transactions with these patterns sometimes have valid explanations that support the idea that they were the result of legitimate purchases of eligible food items. This is why opportunities are given to charged retailers to explain the questionable transactions cited. In this case, the ROD determined that Appellant's responses did not outweigh the evidence. Evidence relied upon by the ROD was considered in this administrative review, including SNAP transaction data, store visit observations, location and characteristics of competitor firms, and household shopping patterns. The issue in this review is whether, through a preponderance of evidence, is it more likely true than not true that questionable transactions were the result of trafficking.

Regarding Appellant's denial of violations, this review examines the relevant information regarding the determination. Once the ROD establishes trafficking occurred, Appellant bears the burden of providing relevant evidence to support a conclusion, considering the record as a whole, that that it did not engage in trafficking. If this is not demonstrated, the case will be sustained. Without supporting evidence and rationale, assertions that the firm has not violated program rules do not constitute valid grounds for overturning the determination.

Store Characteristics

In reaching a disqualification determination, the ROD considered information obtained during a July 8, 2017 store visit conducted by a USDA contractor to observe Appellant's operation, stock, and facilities. This store visit information was used to ascertain if there were justifiable explanations for the firm's irregular SNAP transaction patterns. The store visit report documented the following store size, description, and characteristics:

- Store size is approximately 1,400 square feet with no food stored outside of public view. It is in an urban, residential area;
- Available inventory of SNAP-eligible food items showed stock composed predominantly of inexpensive items, which is typical of a small grocery store;
- Only one cash register and one electronic SNAP terminal device;
- Two shopping carts and no hand baskets;
- No scanners or conveyor belts;
- No evidence of a wholesale business such as posted prices or separate entrances for wholesale customers;
- Halal meat; and,
- No meat or seafood specials or bundles.

The store's checkout counter space area had one register and a clear area of about 2' x 5' which would be insufficient for very large purchases and making it impractical to process more than one customer at a time.

There was no indication that SNAP households were inclined to visit the store regularly to purchase very large quantities of grocery items. The available food was primarily of a low-dollar value and with a few exceptions there was no hint that the firm sold items in bulk. Given the available inventory, there was no sign that Appellant would be likely to have SNAP redemption patterns that differed significantly from those of similarly-sized competitors catering to the Somali community.

Same-Cents Transactions

An interesting characteristic of questionable transactions is that many of them end in a same-cents value. Sets of repeating digits are highly unorthodox and do not regularly occur in legitimate transactions; such transaction structuring is a common hallmark of trafficking activity. In the absence of any compelling rationale to the contrary, these patterns strongly indicate that the firm is trafficking in SNAP benefits.

Attachment 1 to the charge letter documents transactions ending in same-cents values. A review of the store visit record indicates that the store did not promote any specials that could explain the pattern of large numbers of transactions ending in these values. This attachment includes 136 same-cents transactions **5 U.S.C. § 552 (b)(6) & (b)(7)(C)**.

5 U.S.C. § 552 (b)(7)(E).

A number of households whose transactions were cited in other attachments to the charge letter also consistently made transactions that ended in same-cents values. Transactions appearing in more than one attachment to the charge letter are more suspicious as they display multiple patterns common to trafficking transactions.

Appellant contends that same-cents transactions are because customers prefer halal meat to be sold in fixed-dollar amounts. Appellant states meat is sold in \$10 and \$20 bags and rice 5 U.S.C. § 552 (b)(6) & (b)(7)(C). The article on goat meat provided by Appellant did not mention this preference to purchase meat in fixed-dollar amounts. The ROD found evidence that it is more common for purchasers of halal meat to prefer fresh meat and to prefer a particular cut of meat, such as a leg or shoulder¹. The pictures provided by Appellant show meat purchased in bulk, which Appellant apparently cuts and bags for resale. Price tags on the two bags of meat pictured by Appellant showed each weighed 1.67 pounds and sold for \$5.99 per pound 5 U.S.C. § 552 (b)(6) & (b)(7)(C). 5 U.S.C. § 552 (b)(6) & (b)(7)(C).

Regardless, the prices evident in the store visit photos show a pricing structure typical of small grocery stores, where items are often priced to end in “.x9” cents. 5 U.S.C. § 552 (b)(6) & (b)(7)(C).

Patterns of transactions ending in same-cents amounts indicate that SNAP transaction amounts are contrived. Random data, which legitimate transaction activity approximates, is extremely difficult to produce intentionally; it is very difficult to avoid repetitive patterns when attempting to create the appearance of normal, near-random transactions. That various customers each repeatedly had totals with identical cents values during the review period strains the credibility of Appellant’s declaration that this activity reflected the acceptance of SNAP benefits in exchange for eligible food items. As Appellant has offered no rational explanation for why such patterns might exist, it is reasonable to conclude that these same-cents transactions are the result of trafficking.

Repeat Transactions by the Same Household

Attachment 2 to the charge letter documents the same household conducting back-to-back transactions in unusually short time frames. 5 U.S.C. § 552 (b)(6) & (b)(7)(C).

The record reflects that customers conducting rapid, repetitive, and large transactions at Appellant frequently spent SNAP benefits at better-stocked and more competitively-priced halal grocery stores, sometimes on or about the same day they shopped at Appellant. The Case Analysis Document identifies much larger stores with more reasonable prices located near Appellant. There is no basis for unusually high customer attraction to Appellant, there being no great price advantage, or special or custom services rendered. Oddly, some SNAP households spent considerably less at the larger halal stores that cater to the Somali community than at Appellant, despite their much closer proximity to the larger halal stores.

Appellant contends that back-to-back transactions are because on seven occasions the store split one transaction into two transactions to train staff. It is unusual to train staff in such a manner, particularly as it would inconvenience customers by requiring them to swipe their cards and enter their PINs twice. Appellant has offered no evidence whatsoever that Appellant hired new staff on or near the dates of these suspicious transactions. Appellant has also not provided any

¹ Lee Stivers, *Cultural and Preference Understanding to Develop Halal Niche Markets*, Journal of the National Association of County Agricultural Agents (Sep. 2009).

explanation for why, if such behavior was common during staff training, these patterns would occur solely at Appellant and not at nearby stores. An unsubstantiated argument such as this does not provide a valid basis for dismissing the charges or for mitigating the penalty imposed.

Appellant contends back-to-back transactions are because customers purchase amounts they can carry home. This contention is not supported by the evidence as many of these transactions **5 U.S.C. § 552 (b)(6) & (b)(7)(C)**. It is unlikely that customers could carry home the quantities of food composing such expensive purchases.

Appellant contends the three transaction sets which occurred over a two-day period were not unusually rapid. While there are legitimate reasons why a SNAP recipient might return to a small grocery store in a short period of time, the examples in Attachment 2 indicate a series of purchases that total to large amounts. SNAP benefits are intended to supplement the food budget for households whose net income is near or below the Federal Poverty Level. It is difficult to believe customers who must rely on SNAP benefits to make ends meet prefer to pay higher prices and spend considerable amounts of their benefits at a small grocery store. Spending sizable portions of one's SNAP benefit allotment in a small grocery store - when there are larger stores at which one also shops that carry more variety of foods at a lower cost - is unreasonable customer behavior. Moreover, households listed in this attachment conducted this strange shopping pattern of making substantial purchases at Appellant multiple times during the review period. Given the common practice of violating retailers breaking up large, suspicious transactions into multiple, smaller transactions to avoid detection, a firm's explanation and evidence for why these transactions **5 U.S.C. § 552 (b)(6) & (b)(7)(C)** in a small grocery store should be both rational and compelling. Appellant's explanation is neither.

Large Transactions

Appellant is correct that large families could make large purchases. However, the food stock and facilities of Appellant as reported in the store visit documentation do not appear sufficient to provide for all of one's food needs. People generally do not spend extremely large sums at such stores. They usually stop at such specialty small grocery stores to pick up some ethnic specialty items. It is rare for a small Somali-oriented grocery store such as Appellant's to have purchases like those included in Attachment 3 to the charge letter. This attachment cites 187 EBT transactions **5 U.S.C. § 552 (b)(6) & (b)(7)(C)**.

5 U.S.C. § 552 (b)(6) & (b)(7)(C).

5 U.S.C. § 552 (b)(6) & (b)(7)(C). Households typically shop to obtain a certain mix of food items, irrespective of the total cost (other than to remain within allotment balances), and do not strive to achieve a particular total. The purchase amount of eligible food items typically approximates a random total. In contrast, firms facilitating trafficking tend to concentrate transactions at particular dollar amounts. In the absence of any compelling rationale to the contrary, the pattern of clustering transactions around certain dollar levels is implausible and indicative of transaction structuring and SNAP-benefit trafficking.

These transactions significantly exceed the state's average SNAP transaction, which was \$21.32 for this type of store during the six months of the review period.

5 U.S.C. § 552 (b)(6) & (b)(7)(C). 5 U.S.C. § 552 (b)(6) & (b)(7)(C).

Additionally, the Case Analysis Document contains a comparison of Appellant's redemption activity during the analysis period to three SNAP-authorized small grocery stores located nearby that carried halal meats and had similar offerings to Appellant. 5 U.S.C. § 552 (b)(7)(E). The Case Analysis Document contains a comparison of Appellant's redemption activity during the analysis period to two SNAP-authorized medium grocery stores located nearby that carried halal meats and had superior offerings to Appellant. Appellant's average transaction was higher than both of these stores, 5 U.S.C. § 552 (b)(7)(E).

Based on the store layout, infrastructure, and available inventory, it is not credible that the Appellant would so frequently conduct large transactions closely resembling those typically found at a supermarket or superstore. It is not plausible that the firm's customers would regularly purchase very large amounts of merchandise, especially since larger, better stocked stores are readily available and in the vicinity of the Appellant firm. Appellant is not set up to process very high-dollar transactions, as indicated by its lack of equipment to facilitate large transactions. There are no legitimate bases for SNAP customers' unusual attraction to the firm such as a superior selection of staple foods, price advantages, package specials, bulk or promotional items, an extensive variety of otherwise unavailable ethnic food items, or special services rendered. Appellant failed to provide convincing evidence to establish the legitimacy of these excessively large transactions, such as itemized cash register receipts. Based on all of these factors discussed in this section, the large volume of transactions for high-dollar amounts is unlikely to indicate a pattern of legitimate food purchases.

Invoices

Appellant submitted approximately 55 pages of invoices to establish that the store purchased enough inventory to support the total of its SNAP sales. However, the invoices are insufficient to demonstrate this. Some of the invoices provided did not include Appellant's name or the supplier's name, were outside of the review period, did not include a list of items purchased or included items that are not eligible for purchase with SNAP benefits. Even including some of the questionable invoices, the SNAP-eligible inventory included in the invoices from the review period 5 U.S.C. § 552 (b)(6) & (b)(7)(C). 5 U.S.C. § 552 (b)(6) & (b)(7)(C). However, the total of SNAP transactions during the review period was far higher than this amount. This also does not account for any non-SNAP purchases of food items at Appellant. In sum, the invoices do not explain the questionable transactions at Appellant.

Expensive items

During the July 8, 2017 store visit, Appellant carried a few expensive items 5 U.S.C. § 552 (b)(6) & (b)(7)(C). Appellant provided a photo to support that it sold meat by the case for \$200.06. At the time of the store visit, Appellant did not sell meat by the case. The store

review report documented that the firm did not have meat or seafood specials or bundles. A store visit picture from the August 17, 2017 appears to show the boxes of meat from the same supplier as is pictured in Appellant's photo without bulk price tags. At the time of the July 8, 2017 store visit, Appellant did not carry any goat meat. The total amount of meat pictured in the store visit photos did not seem sufficient to support the large transactions.

While there were occasions when Appellant sold fresh fish and meat, based on evidence from the store visits it is more likely true than not true that the sale of expensive items does not explain the large SNAP transactions that occurred at Appellant. Trafficking is a more likely explanation for the unusual and irregular pattern of high-dollar transactions.

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 to the firm 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 economic hardship to the firm 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.

Summary

Contrary to Appellant's contention, the determination by the Retailer Operations Division was not arbitrary. The ROD determined that Appellant likely trafficked in SNAP benefits. The charges of violations were based on the ROD's assessment that substantial evidence exists that the questionable transactions occurring during the review period displayed patterns inconsistent with legitimate sales of eligible food to SNAP participants. The evidence the ROD considered in support of its determination included:

- The irregular SNAP transaction data of Appellant as compared to similar stores;
- Observations made during an store visit by a USDA contractor, including the inadequacy of the firm's staple food stock to support such large transactions;
- The availability of other SNAP-authorized stores located close to Appellant; and,
- Shopping behaviors of Appellant's customers.

The transaction data and overall firm record demonstrate the patterns of unusual, irregular, and inexplicable SNAP activity for this firm is likely the result of trafficking.

Upon review, Appellant failed to prove by a preponderance of the evidence that the administrative action should be reversed. Appellant provided inadequate explanations for the suspicious transactions and insufficient evidence to legitimize its transaction data. It has not convincingly rebutted the ROD's determination that Appellant most likely trafficked in SNAP benefits. The SNAP regulations are specific with regard to the action that must be taken if personnel of the firm have trafficked, which is that FNS must disqualify the firm permanently. Contrary to Appellant's contention, the determination by the Retailer Operations Division was not arbitrary.

CIVIL MONEY PENALTY

For a firm to have the opportunity to be considered for a civil money penalty (CMP), it must request that FNS consider a CMP in lieu of permanent disqualification and submit supporting documentation within ten days of receipt of the charge letter. Appellant was advised of these provisions in the charge letter of September 5, 2017. The regulations specify that such supporting documentation must demonstrate that the firm had established and implemented an effective SNAP compliance policy and training program prior to the occurrence of violations. A review of the administrative record indicates Appellant did not, at any time, request a CMP. Appellant also did not submit any documentation to support its eligibility for this alternative sanction, before or after the deadline.

In the absence of a request for a CMP and any supporting documentation, a CMP was not assessed by the ROD. 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

The record has yielded no indication of error in the finding by the Retailer Operations Division that Appellant trafficked in SNAP benefits. A review of the evidence supports that it is more likely true than not true that program violations occurred as charged. Based on the discussion above, the determination by the Retailer Operations Division to impose a permanent disqualification against Salama Halal & Grocery, Inc. 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

January 8, 2018