



STATE OF WASHINGTON

OFFICE OF CORRECTIONS OMBUDS

PO Box 43113 • Olympia, Washington 98504-3113 • (360) 664-4749

August 30, 2019


Steve Sinclair, Secretary
Department of Corrections (DOC)

Office of Corrections Ombuds (OCO) Systemic Issue Status Report

Attached is the official report regarding OCO's systemic work to address concerns regarding the quality of the food served to the incarcerated population in the Department of Corrections. This should be considered a status report rather than a final report as the work will continue. We appreciate the opportunity to work collaboratively with DOC to amend current policies and practices to better ensure that all incarcerated persons' health, safety, and rights are protected while they are within state confinement.

Any member of the public who wishes to report a concern to OCO is welcome to contact the office at (360) 664-4749 or at the address above. All concerns are logged into the OCO database and used as part of its overall reporting to policymakers and analysis of issues within DOC.

Sincerely,


Joanna Carns
Director

cc: Governor Inslee

**OCO SYSTEMIC ISSUE STATUS REPORT
REPORT PREPARED BY JOANNA CARNS, OCO DIRECTOR**

Summary of Complaint/Concern

In late October 2018, OCO Director Joanna Carns conducted her first site visit to the Washington State Penitentiary (WSP). During that site visit, she met with groups of incarcerated individuals across the facility who were the “tier representatives.” These groups relayed that in April 2018 there had been a mass food strike at WSP involving more than half the population to protest the poor quality of the food. They further relayed that although multiple meetings had been held with DOC staff, including Correctional Industries (CI) staff responsible for the food, they were still dissatisfied and may attempt an additional food strike.

In addition to the concerns presented by the incarcerated individuals, members of the family council for family members of incarcerated persons separately relayed concerns regarding the food provided across the Department of Corrections (DOC), not just WSP. Specifically, they relayed that the food was unhealthy and causing illness, and that DOC was not following Governor Inslee’s Executive Order 13-06 that required more healthy options, such as additional fresh fruit and vegetables, to be included in the menu provided to the incarcerated population.

Based on the concerns presented to OCO and the possibility of another large scale facility disturbance, OCO initiated a systemic review of the food provided to the incarcerated population.

OCO Statutory Authority

- Per RCW 43.06C.005, OCO was created to assist in strengthening procedures and practices that lessen the possibility of actions occurring within DOC that may adversely impact the health, safety, welfare, and rehabilitation of incarcerated persons, and that will effectively reduce the exposure of DOC to litigation.
- Per RCW 43.06C.040, OCO has the authority to receive, investigate, and resolve complaints related to incarcerated persons’ health, safety, welfare, and rights.

OCO Actions

- In an effort to better understand the concerns at WSP, OCO initiated a survey of every incarcerated person at WSP that attempted to capture the concerns regarding the food. OCO received responses from over half of the population. More information on the survey, including more detailed findings, are produced in a separate report on OCO’s website. This status report will discuss only the primary findings and results.
- OCO met with both WSP administrative staff and CI staff at WSP in late April to discuss the survey findings. Prior to the meeting, three copies of the survey report were sent to each incarcerated tier representative with instructions to pass them out to other incarcerated people on the tier and discuss the findings. OCO Assistant Ombuds for the

Eastern Division, Matthias Gyde, met again with each group to discuss the report findings and obtain additional feedback.

- OCO attended a statewide meeting of the Food Service Managers and discussed the concerns. OCO also initiated an anonymous, informal survey of the Food Service Managers and provided the information to CI leadership.
- OCO has held regular meetings with CI administrators who oversee food services to address issues of concern.

OCO Findings

This report will be broken into several sections for ease of reading. First, background information will be provided for any readers unfamiliar with the issues involved in this review. Following that, the report will be broken into key issues of concern and provide information on how each item has been addressed or will be addressed by OCO and/or DOC moving forward.

Background

A couple points of information may be helpful for any citizens unfamiliar with the issues presented in this report.

[Governor's Executive Order 13-06](#): This Executive Order (EO), titled "Improving the Health and Productivity of State Employees and Access to Healthy Food in State Facilities," primarily applies to the state government workplace and wellness programs for state employees. However, it also requires that all state executive agencies adopt a food and beverage service policy that meets the standard of the [Washington State Healthy Nutrition Guidelines](#) based on the [2010 Dietary Guidelines for Americans](#). This portion of the EO also applies to custodial populations, although it specifically exempts food served to special populations with particular health or religious dietary needs identified by DOC.

[Correctional Industries](#): Correctional Industries (CI) is a division within DOC and its staff are DOC staff, although paid by CI revenues. Unlike DOC as a whole, CI is intended to operate similar to a business, employing incarcerated persons to produce products that are then sold to DOC and other state agencies, with the expectation that it is financially self-sustaining (i.e. that revenues are greater than expenditures/losses). In 1995, DOC began transitioning from providing food via the traditional model of individual institutional kitchens to utilizing CI to provide food via a larger scale food factory and warehouse model.

[WSP Food Services](#): Unlike the other facilities, WSP presents a unique challenge to food services due to its facility structure. In 2009 and 2010, the facility transitioned to a newly built 'expansion' designed without dining halls. A decision was made to further remodel the kitchen at the facility and move to a serving model in which WSP would no longer primarily make food. Under the new model, the close and medium custody population would receive their meals in the individual housing units. Based on the outside temperature, the time in transfer, any additional time delays due to re-counts or other operational issues, food could be in an

unappetizing state by the time it reached the incarcerated person. In May 2015, the department tasked CI to manage WSP Food Services. CI modified the serving model (breakfast tray meals, frozen tray meals, bulk fresh & frozen food) using the heated frozen food to create individual tray meals, which then would be placed into heated carts and transferred to the housing units. However, without a significant investment into better heating equipment, this did not result in improving the serving constraints and overall meal quality described above.

Breakfast Boats – In an attempt to increase programming opportunities & achieve cost savings, the incarcerated population receives a “breakfast boat” (called such due to the shape of the cardboard container in which the food is received) composed of cold food items¹ that is picked up by the incarcerated person the night before at the dinner service and held in their cell for consumption the next morning. All facilities utilize breakfast boats, with the five facilities managed by CI using breakfast boats seven days a week and the other facilities using them one day a week to allow the facility kitchen to close for a deep cleaning.

Systemic Issues of Concern

Concern: desire for hot breakfasts instead of breakfast boats

Action/Response: Following the April 2018 disturbance, DOC staff agreed to implement a hot breakfast rather than the cold breakfast boats at WSP, which continues to serve a hot breakfast. DOC requested funds in the 2019 budget for hot breakfasts at all facilities that had transitioned to a cold breakfast boat. The Legislature only partially funded the request at half the amount requested by the DOC. WSP will continue the hot breakfast and CRCC currently has an enhanced breakfast boat² that will transition to a hot breakfast in November 2019. The other facilities with a seven day a week breakfast boat – MCC, WCC, AHCC - are currently paused on transitioning to a hot breakfast pending funding approval by the legislature for the staffing to be able to implement the hot breakfast.

- DOC noted that the implementation of the hot breakfasts at Coyote Ridge Corrections Center has required an additional movement of incarcerated persons to the dining halls, reducing morning yard and programming time, in addition to increased menu and labor costs.

Concern: desire for larger meal portion sizes

Action/Response: The menus are planned to provide 2,600-2,900 daily calories to the incarcerated male population,³ which is within the US Department of Health’s recommended

¹ “Each boat consists of a plastic bag that contains a cardboard box that contains a packet of nonfat dry milk, a plastic bowl containing a tiny serving of cereal, a plastic packet of peanut butter, two plastic packets of jelly, plastic-wrapped bread, plastic-wrapped muffin, and a plastic-wrapped breakfast bar.” Prison Voice Washington, Correcting Food Policy in Washington, accessed at <https://prisonvoicewa.org/content/CorrectingFoodPolicy-2016-10-25.pdf>.

² The enhanced breakfast boats include two hard boiled eggs and fluid 1% milk and replaced the muffin with a piece of fruit.

³ See DOC Guidelines for Mainline Meals, accessed at <https://www.doc.wa.gov/information/policies/default.aspx>

guidelines⁴ for men with limited to moderate activity. Menus and any substitutions are reviewed by the DOC Nutritionist to ensure they meet this calorie range.

- Note: The Department of Health recommends 3,000 calories for men who have very active lifestyles, which may apply to many of the men who choose weight lifting and other activity while incarcerated. DOC relayed that incarcerated people who work in a Department of Natural Resources program are provided a larger lunch snack and additional calories for breakfast. Funded in the 2019 budget, DOC will now provide protein enhancements to the lunches for DNR workers – protein enhanced apple muffin, a chocolate protein bar, and trail mix – which expands the total calories to over 3,000. DOC relayed that supplementing food for people who lift weights or otherwise engage in voluntary strenuous physical exercise would promote a disparity based on a choice that not everyone could make (for example, persons with disabilities). If one of the incarcerated population kites medical because of weight loss that negatively impacts their health then health services is obligated to provide a supplemental snack to promote weight gain and good health.
- Note: Additional considerations are that people may not eat every item on the menu due to personal preference or due to poor cooking of the food, which would reduce the overall caloric content. Last, persons held in restrictive housing allege that they do not receive all of the items on the menu, which would also reduce the overall calories provided to them. DOC relayed that if anyone experiences a shortage of food, it is handled either through unit staff notifying the kitchen or through the grievance procedure if the issue cannot be addressed by the former method.

Concern: alleged poor quality of the food product itself

Action/Response: DOC relayed that it purchases only Grade A produce, from the commercial statewide contract vendor, and works with food vendors to find quality, wholesome products. Prior to purchasing or adding a new entrée,, DOC receives samples of the food and tests the product. CI has a food group technical services that pulls samples from the CI warehouse for testing before it is sent out to from the respective food factories to a customer/institution. New CI products must pass a facility trial with the incarcerated population prior to approval for use on DOC menus. (See Attachment A for example of CI sensory report used for the facility trial).

Concern: Correctional Industries has a profit incentive to provide a lower cost product

Action/Response: It is accurate that CI is a self-sustaining entity and must have adequate revenue to cover its operational costs. However, if there is a surplus of funds, it is either returned to the state or reinvested, such as through acquisition of new equipment or back into the program to provide soft skills or other training to the incarcerated individuals. CI salaries do not change based on any surplus funds, nor do staff receive any bonus.

⁴ <https://health.gov/dietaryguidelines/2015/guidelines/appendix-2/>

Concern: desire for more whole muscle protein

Action/Response: DOC relayed that the current protein content of the average daily DOC menu is 100-101g, or 15% of the total calories, which is in line with dietary standards. DOC has evaluated the request for more whole muscle protein and made changes where possible. For example, they have added whole muscle roast beef and pollock and are transitioning to 100% whole muscle chicken. They have also identified that a potential cause of dissatisfaction is with ‘fine grind’ ground beef meat products that do not have a good mouth feel and does now purchase coarser grind ground beef. DOC is also evaluating where the food could be provided in a better format in order to be more satisfying - for example, they will now provide more hamburgers rather than the Salisbury steak & meatloaf. DOC is currently evaluating vendors for whole muscle turkey.

The request from many incarcerated individuals has been for “chicken on the bone,” which is what the incarcerated population received in decades prior and which is an obviously less processed food. DOC stated that it cannot provide a whole breast of chicken to the incarcerated due to the price point. For example, just to add 2 oz of lunch meat per week system-wide would cost an additional \$322,000 annually. The following table provides a sample of items that DOC calculated the costs to add more protein to the menu (see Attachment B for the full table):

Protein	Serving Amount Increase (weekly)	Cost	Annualized	Amount to Serve Population @ 15,000*
Egg	1 each	\$0.04	\$2.24	\$33,540
Roast Beef	1 slice (1.5 oz)	\$0.33	\$4.34	\$65,130
Cheese Slice	1 each	\$0.11	\$5.56	\$83,460
Tuna Salad	1 ounce	\$0.12	\$6.19	\$92,820
Taco Meat	1 ounce	\$0.13	\$6.50	\$97,500
Chicken Tenders	1 ounce (approx.)	\$0.17	\$8.79	\$131,820

*15,000 population reflects those individuals participating in Mainline Fare

Concern: desire for healthier food options, including more fruit and vegetables

Action/Response: The [Washington State Healthy Nutrition Guidelines](#) require a minimum of two cups of a variety of fruits daily, with a preference for fresh and frozen fruits instead of canned. The Guidelines also require a minimum of two and a half cups of vegetables daily, involving a variety of vegetables, especially dark-green, red and orange, and beans and peas. DOC relayed that seven facilities are on a menu that is compliant with the Guidelines for fruits and vegetables (includes those facilities that did not fully transition to CI production and more recently, WSP). Coyote Ridge has had fruit and vegetable changes and will be fully compliant following the

transition to the hot breakfast in November. The last three facilities that did not receive full funding for a hot breakfast (Airway Heights, Washington Corrections Center, and Monroe) are working on menu changes to ensure that they are compliant even without the hot breakfast, with the only gap being one fruit serving per day and certain varieties of vegetables. DOC will continue to ask for funding from the legislature.

Concern: desire for more locally grown produce, rather than commercial

Action/Response: DOC relayed that it does attempt to work with local farmers when possible⁵ but that it can create problems due to inconsistency of product.⁶ In terms of the food grown at the prisons themselves, DOC relayed that the current farm operations are insufficient to meet the needs of the entire institutional population and that the harvest is at most a supplement, but insufficient to make a budgetary impact. Further, the harvest, like any other, is subject to variables such as climate that make it an unreliable source⁷ as opposed to commercial vendors that can ensure a consistent, reliable product. Overall, the large scale needs of modern corrections for consistency and budget effectiveness means that commercial vendors are a better option than either local farmers or self-production within prisons.

Nevertheless, OCO facilitated a series of meetings involving DOC & CI administrators, as well as food service managers to explore utilizing more produce grown in the prison gardens to serve the incarcerated population. Initial feedback from the food service managers was positive. OCO will follow up in the fall to determine outcomes and areas for improvement. OCO is also recommending that DOC consider ways to incentivize the growing and utilization of fresh produce in the menu, such as creating a staff Sustainability Award that could include this as a component.

Concern: DOC is not compliant with Governor Inslee's Executive Order 13-06

Action/Response: As stated above, DOC is now reportedly fully compliant except for the three facilities that require an additional fruit serving and achieving a greater variety of vegetables across the color spectrum.

Concern: menu items that are ill-conceived or prepared

Action/Response: OCO's survey of every incarcerated person at WSP regarding their perception of the food included two questions that asked the person to identify their three favorite menu items and their three least favorite items. The results from this survey allowed OCO and DOC to pinpoint items for improvement. DOC relayed that it had already been working to change the menu to improve or remove items that were not well liked by the incarcerated population prior to

⁵ For example, Washington Corrections Center, Coyote Ridge, and WSP have purchased apples from local growers. Clallam Bay has challenges in growing its own produce and reportedly works with local organic growers.

⁶ For example, apples may come in different sizes in a normal harvest, but DOC is required to provide a specific menu to each individual and that it could cause problems within the incarcerated population itself if people received differently sized fruit.

⁷ For example, DOC relayed that although WSP has a large farm operation, it had mostly produced radishes up until August and that a large portion had to be mulched and re-seeded.

the survey. The following are the items identified as least liked by the incarceration through OCO's survey and DOC's actions in response:

1. Yams/sweet potatoes sausage meal (least liked of all) – DOC reported that they have made the change to move the yams out of the breakfast meal and changed the yams to a different cut which seems to have a more positive response.
2. Spaghetti – DOC identified a processing issue regarding the actual grind of the meat and have changed it to improve the mouth feel of the product. Based on this improvement, they have evaluated all meals across the DOC menu that involve hamburger to change the grind to improve mouth feel.
3. Braised beef – DOC staff stated that this is a kettle item made at the CRCC food factory that is made from raw roast that is cubed, cooked, and then sent out to facilities to warm up. They reevaluated the trimming based on the amount of gristle that was reported in the meat and reworked the flavor profile with different herbs and spices.
4. Meatloaf/Salisbury steak – CI stated that they have significantly reduced this product in favor of what the incarcerated population has asked for – i.e. ground beef patty.
5. Sweet and sour chicken – CI stated that this menu item only occurs once a cycle (28 days) and that they are working on an alternative chicken recipe (apple barbecue chicken) that appears promising.
6. Beef stroganoff noodles - They reevaluated the trimming based on the amount of gristle that was reported in the meat and reworked the flavor profile with different herbs and spices.
7. Fish patty/fish – CI stated that they are now providing a different fish patty since the WSP food survey was taken. The previous one was smaller and breaded and they now provide an unbreaded whole muscle Wild Alaska Pollock Burger that has received better reviews.
8. Beets – CI stated that they have removed the beet salad and replaced it with a fresh tomato/red onion salad

Concern: CI meat includes an unhealthy amount of soy/textured vegetable protein

Action/Response: As further discussed in OCO's survey report, a number of respondents relayed concerns regarding the amount of soy in the DOC menu and the perceived potential negative impact on health or hormones. CI relayed that of those CI protein items supporting the DOC menu provided to the incarcerated population, the single highest protein was only seven percent soy or textured vegetable protein (TVP). [See Attachment C, provided by CI, which details each

protein-bearing food item and the percentage of TVP in that item. Note: Computrition (dietary resource database) doesn't separate out the types of protein only the totals for the food items.] Further, according to the Washington Department of Health's Train the Trainer Curriculum on the Executive Order 13-06, produced for DOC, it is a "myth" that plant-based estrogen found in soy is bad for men and that there are in fact health benefits.⁸ OCO does not have a nutritionist to provide its own evaluation, but the Washington Department of Health is another external office and OCO relies on that department's evaluation.

Concern: inconsistent or lacking quality assurance processes to ensure the meal is palatable and acceptable quality for the end user, the incarcerated person

Action/Response: As relayed earlier in the report, CI provides quality assurance regarding the food product itself in the form of testing at the Food Group Research & Development Lab and by facility trial, with acceptance by the incarcerated testers before it reaches the institution menu. However, CI reported inconsistent quality assurance measures regarding the quality of meal ultimately produced as experienced by the end user, the incarcerated population. Each facility may have its own measure and the measures themselves vary in the depth and breadth of evaluation. For example, according to CI, most food service managers hold informal discussions and receive messaging (kites, kiosk) from the incarcerated populations, nearly all have food representative meetings involving the incarcerated population, and some require executive staff to sample and report on the meal. OCO believes strongly that more formalized processes should be created to ensure regular, documented reporting on the quality of the meal itself. Such processes could include, for example, random satisfaction surveys given to the incarcerated population. OCO also recommends formalizing in policy that an executive level DOC person should be required to taste each of the meals and submit a short report on the quality, temperature, etc of the meal.

WSP Specific Issues

Concern: food is often overcooked, burned, or inedible

Action/Response: As relayed earlier, WSP faces a particular challenge in that all of the food for the close/medium/maximum security custody population is prepared via reheating prepackaged food that it receives from CI's warehouse, served onto trays, and then delivered to the units, to be eaten by the incarcerated person as much as an hour after it was originally reheated. The incarcerated population reported that food is often served to them overheated, burned and/or turned to soggy mush. Following the April 2018 food strike, DOC made the decision to buy a reheating oven for each unit, so that rather than reheating in the kitchen and then serving, the food would be brought directly to the unit and placed in the oven for a single heating/cooking and then immediately delivered to the incarcerated person still hot. Several challenges still remained:

⁸ It should be noted that OCO does not employ a nutritionist or food scientist and it is relying upon DOH's independent evaluation that soy is not harmful to men's health. OCO itself makes no finding or determination regarding this topic.

1. Despite the ovens being a new purchase, they reportedly frequently broke down. CI relayed that this issue has improved. As of August 21, all ovens were operational.
2. The food was still being overcooked or burned due to staff and/or incarcerated pantry workers putting the food in the oven, turning it on, and then some operational delay, such as an institutional recount, would delay those individuals removing the food, so that it would just sit and continue to cook. WSP staff relayed that they were working to reduce recounts.
3. Internal staff disagreement over “whose job it was” to handle the food resulted in necessary items (such as temperature checks) not being done. CI staff have within their job descriptions to heat and handle the food; however, they work in the kitchen and once the trays are placed on the cart to deliver to the units, it becomes unit staff’s responsibility. Unit/custody staff, whose job description typically does not include handling of food, did not want to take on that responsibility. During the April meeting at WSP, staff relayed that significant work had been done to improve communication and teamwork between food services and unit staff.
4. Different items have different cooking temperature needs, but all has to be cooked together on the one tray. CI staff have reportedly worked to tweak the meals to ensure that items with different cooking temperature needs were not placed on the same tray together. For example, CI staff stated that they now thaw frozen burritos the night before so that they cook at the same time as the other items on the tray.

Concern: individual rubber trays are unappetizing and unsanitary

Action/Response: Related to WSP’s operational challenges is that its food service operations requires that food be placed in individual rubber ‘siliconized’ trays for placement in the ovens. These trays must withstand high heat, and meet the security demands of the facility. The incarcerated population has relayed that the trays are unappetizing, unsanitary, and that they retain the smells and flavors from prior meals. However, CI administrators reported that they have extensively researched this issue, working with the vendor under statewide contract and had even bought multiple alternative trays to try. Unfortunately, the alternative trays reportedly melted in the reheating ovens. CI has concluded that the only trays that exist on the market that can withstand the heat and meet the security needs of the facility are the trays that are currently in use. Due to a difference in the ovens and with facility approval, the BAR unit uses the same tray system but a different tray configuration.

Next Steps

- OCO plans to publish this status report to make transparent the conversations and information that it has been gathering. It will also send this report to the tier representatives at WSP and ask for them to provide any feedback or creative suggestions.

- OCO also plans to work with the WSP Family Council to share this report and findings, with a discussion tentatively scheduled for the October family council meeting.
- OCO will relay the findings to the Governor's office and interested legislators for their input and feedback.
- OCO will continue to have regular meetings with CI staff to discuss the issues of concern and feedback from the above parties to develop any collaborative solutions possible.

Attachment A

NEW PRODUCT SENSORY REPORT

The Food Group Values your feedback about new products which may be added to the DOC menu. Please rate the product you are sampling today as outlined below:

ITEM: _____

DATE: _____

LOCATION: _____

MEAL (CIRCLE ONE): BREAKFAST LUNCH DINNER

NAME: _____

Rate from 1 (Low) to 5 (High)

Score 1: I did not like this product and would not eat it if this product was served

Score 2: I might eat this product, but prefer it does not get added to the menu

Score 3: This product is acceptable, OK if added to the menu

Score 4: I liked this product and would like to see it on the menu

Score 5: I really liked this product and would like to see it on the menu more than once

Attribute	Score
<i>Appearance</i>	
<i>Taste</i>	
<i>Overall</i>	

Comments: _____

Attachment B

Supplemental Protein Costing for DOC Menu

	Serving Amount	Cost	Annualized	Amount to Serve
	<u>Increase (weekly)</u>	_____	_____	<u>Population @ 15,000</u>
Egg	1 each	\$0.04	\$2.24	\$33,540
Roast Beef	1 slice (1.5 oz.)	\$0.33	\$4.34	\$65,130
Cheese Slice	1 each	\$0.11	\$5.56	\$83,460
Tuna Salad	1 ounce	\$0.12	\$6.19	\$92,820
Taco Meat	1 ounce	\$0.13	\$6.50	\$97,500
Fish Nuggets	1 ounce (approx.)	\$0.16	\$8.06	\$120,900
Shredded Cheese	1 ounce	\$0.17	\$8.84	\$132,600
Chicken Tenders	1 ounce (approx.)	\$0.17	\$8.79	\$131,820
Peanut Butter Packet	1 each	\$0.19	\$9.78	\$146,640
Turkey Ham	1 slice (2 oz.)	\$0.41	\$21.48	\$322,140

Assumptions:

1. Fish nuggets & chicken tenders are approximated weight for adding another piece
2. Market value calculated August 2019
3. 15,000 population reflects those individuals participating in Mainline Fare
4. Annualized for the serving size indicated, added once weekly
5. Costing is rounded from 3 decimal points

Attachment C

ITEM #	PRE-COOKED ENTREES, SAUCES (2gl bg)	% TVP
13376	BEEF FAJITA FILLING	0.00%
13334	BROWN GRAVY & BEEF	0.00%
13360	CHICKEN, ALFREDO	0.00%
10101	CHICKEN IN APPLE BARBECUE SAUCE	0.00%
13354	CHILI SAUCE W/MEAT & BEANS	2.19%
10109	GRAVY W/ CHICKEN FOR CASSEROLE	0.00%
13331	ORANGE SAUCE W/CHICKEN	0.00%
10063	SLOPPY JOE BARBECUE SAUCE WITH BEEF	4.44%
13335	SWEET AND SOUR CHICKEN SAUCE (NGA)	0.00%
13338	TERIYAKI SAUCE WITH CHICKEN (NGA)	0.00%
13380	TOMATO SAUCE WITH BEEF	2.23%
10047	TURKEY ALA KING	0.00%
13355	TURKEY CHILI W/ WHITE BEANS (NGA)	0.00%
10122	VEGETABLE STEW W / BEEF	0.00%
	PRE-COOKED ENTREES	
13251	BEEF CRUMBLE, COOKED	7.14%
13630	BEEF MEAT LOAF PATTY, COOKED (100 @ 3.5OZ)	0.00%
10013	BEEF SALISBURY STEAK (100 @ 3.5 OZ)	3.53%
13231	BEEF & TURKEY TACO MEAT W/TVP (2@18LB)	4.25%
10554	EGG & CHEESE BREAKFAST MUFFINS WTURKEY HAM, I/W (50EA)	0.00%
10556	EGG & CHEESE MUFFIN I/W (50EA)	0.00%
	HAND HELDS	
13184	BEEF, CHICKEN TVP SUPER BURRITO	1.60%
13800	BEAN & CHEESE BURRITO	0.00%
13193	BEEF, TURKEY & CHEESE PIZZA WRAP	0.38%
13157	BEEF & TURKEY TACO (BEEF ENCHILADA)	2.19%
13155	CHICKEN ENCHILADA	1.87%
13195	CURED TURKEY & PINNAPPLE WRAP	0.00%
13142	EGG, TURKEY HAM, &CHEESE WRAP	0.00%
13140	TURKEY SAUSAGE, EGG & CHEESE WRAP	0.00%
1137-4	BEEF ,GROUND, PATTIES 80% LEAN 12 LBS (48 @ 4 OZ)	0.00%
	DELI MEATS	
RTE-001B	TURKEY SALAMI, COOKED, SLICED, BULK	0.00%
RTE-003B	TURKEY HAM, COOKED, SLICED, BULK	0.00%
RTE-70B	TURKEY BOLOGNA, COOKED, SLICED, BULK	0.00%
RTE-009B	TURKEY BREAST, COOKED, SLICED, BULK	0.00%

4/22/2019