



FOOD SAFETY AUDIT REPORT

#12714

Taylor Warehouse Corp.
2875 E Sharon Road
Cincinnati, OH 45241

By

BRAD S. FISHER

Food Safety Auditor

February 4, 2002

AIB International

1213 Bakers Way • PO Box 3999 • Manhattan, KS 66505-3999
(785-537-4750) • (800-633-5137) • Fax (785-537-1493)

<http://www.aibonline.org/>

TABLE OF CONTENTS

Rating-----	Page 1
Rating Analysis-----	Page 2
Factual Observations and Specific Recommendations -----	Page 3

BSF:cjv

RATING

A food safety audit was conducted at this facility on February 4, 2002. The writer was accompanied throughout the survey by Mr. Rex Taylor, President; Mr. Tim Paff, Facility Manager; and Mr. Rick Johnson, Product Safety Manager.

At the conclusion of the survey, a meeting was held to discuss the observations, recommendations, and rating with Mr. Taylor, Mr. Paff, Mr. Johnson.

Excellent cooperation was received by the writer, and on some occasions, the items were immediately corrected.

Based on the observations made, the information obtained, and the criteria set forth in the *AIB Consolidated Standards for Food Distribution Centers*, the overall food safety level of this facility was considered to be:

SUPERIOR (945)

The “serious” or “unsatisfactory” items are shaded, boxed, and bolded in the text of the report. Refer to the definitions in the AIB Consolidated Standards.

The “improvements needed” items are designated in bold type and require prompt attention.

The AIB International states that the report as given herein is to be construed as its findings and recommendations as of the date of this report. The AIB International accepts no responsibility and does not assume any responsibility for the food safety program in effect with (customer). That further AIB International is only making report of the food safety conditions of (customer) as of the date of this report and assumes no responsibility or liability as to whether (customer) carries out the recommendations as contained in this report or does not carry out the recommendations as contained in this report.

RATING ANALYSIS

DATE OF SURVEY: February 4, 2002

TYPE OF AUDIT: Announced

OVERALL RATING: **SUPERIOR**

ADEQUACY OF FOOD SAFETY PROGRAM	-175
PEST CONTROL	-195
OPERATIONAL METHODS AND PERSONNEL PRACTICES	-195
MAINTENANCE FOR FOOD SAFETY	-190
CLEANING PRACTICES	<u>-190</u>
TOTAL:	945

FACTUAL OBSERVATIONS AND SPECIFIC RECOMMENDATIONS

ADEQUACY OF FOOD SAFETY PROGRAM

1. A functional organizational chart was maintained that indicated the responsibility and authority for ensuring the facility's compliance to federal, state, or any other appropriate regulatory law or guideline had been assigned to a competent supervisory-level person. This was last updated in January 2002.
2. The departments responsible for implementing the distribution center's food safety programs had established written procedures and maintained outlines delineating the specific responsibilities of each department member. This information was provided from the standard operating procedure for the sanitation and food safety program.
3. A quality manual had been developed since the last survey that included a quality and mission statement as well as some of the standard operating procedures for the warehouse. It was suggested to also include a sign-off of senior management to verify accountability of these programs.
4. Training for new and current employees was conducted in a systematic and formal manner. All new employees were given Good Manufacturing Practices (GMPs) and safety training. In addition, refresher training was provided annually with documentation maintained. In addition, informal GMP training was conducted weekly. In addition, to this training, GMPs, food safety information, and other communication were provided in the employee's weekly paychecks. The GMPs were also posted throughout key areas of the facility to help remind personnel. Some of these programs were new since the last survey and training had been provided with these new programs as well.
5. The distribution center had established a formal food safety committee. This committee had a multidisciplinary membership. Food safety committee inspections were conducted at least monthly. These inspections included a similar rating to the AIB Standards. Written inspection reports and reports of follow-up corrections were on file.
6. This distribution center appeared to maintain and support an adequate budget, including the timely and proper acquisition of appropriate tools, materials, equipment, monitoring devices, chemicals, and pest control materials.

7. The distribution center had a written Master Cleaning Schedule (MCS) that included the building, equipment, and outside grounds. The schedule indicated the cleaning frequencies and personnel assigned. Daily schedules were in place to ensure the prompt cleaning of any spillage or debris. Documentation was maintained of the daily cleaning as well as the periodic cleaning. Postcleaning evaluations were conducted from visual inspections with documentation maintained.
8. The facility had recently developed cleaning procedures for the building structure, pallets, and other equipment in the warehouse. This included the procedure, tools required, and chemicals required (if necessary). It was suggested to continue to expand these procedures to include all overheads and walls to strengthen the program.
9. There was an inbound procedure (standard operating procedure) for inspections of the products. All inbound products were inspected for any evidence of insects, rodents, or damage. All observations were recorded. Temperature checks were conducted on all refrigerated and frozen products and recorded.
10. **One bird dropping was noted on a case of product located in the pool area. The pallets of product in this area were not entered in the warehouse management system (WMS) due to being stored for a very limited amount of time. No evidence of birds anywhere else inside or outside of the facility was noted. It appeared that this case had been received with this single dropping. The dropping was not on any exposed product or physical carton of the product, only on a corrugated container. A written procedure for how to handle this issue, which was to have a picture taken, the product isolated, the manufacturing facility contacted, and waiting for a disposition, was maintained. These procedures were followed upon finding this issue. However, there was a potential failure of the incoming inspection program with this condition. It was recommended to more closely inspect all materials delivered into the facility. It was also suggested to provide additional communication to all warehouse personnel to more closely inspect product from this specific manufacturer since this may be a reoccurring concern. It was understood that this product was actually received from another warehouse that the manufacture utilized before providing temporary storage at this warehouse. It was further understood that both the warehouse and food manufacturer had been contacted by the end of the survey to properly address this issue. (IMPROVEMENT NEEDED)**

11. An outbound procedure (standard operating procedure) was noted for inspections of all products before shipping. All outbound products were inspected for any evidence of insects, rodents, or damage. In addition, all trailers were pre-cooled, if required, and documentation was maintained.
12. The receiving records included the code, lot, or unit load identity to ensure proper rotation. The temperatures of refrigerated and frozen products were recorded on the receiving documents.
13. A formal recall program was on file. Distribution records were maintained to identify the initial distribution points to facilitate the recall of specific lots. Mock recalls were conducted semiannually with the last two recalls conducted on May 15, 2001 and February 1, 2002.
14. The facility had implemented a Hazard Analysis Critical Control Point (HACCP) program within the last year. No fishery items were stored in the facility; however, a team had been developed to implement this program. This program was reviewed and included prerequisites, flowcharts for all processes, hazard analysis, and a HACCP plan document. The HACCP program determined that there were no critical control points (CCP) at the facility. It was understood that the program would be reviewed when any changes were made or at least annually. The next scheduled review was due in April 2002.
15. The distribution center had an established procedure for handling regulatory inspections that included the delegated personnel responsible for accompanying any inspectors and company policies regarding photographs, records, and sampling procedures. It was understood that the last regulatory inspection was conducted by the Ohio Department of Agriculture on February 1, 2002 with no violations.

PEST CONTROL

16. This facility maintained a contract with Rose Terminix for rodent control on the premises. Service was provided by the Pest Control Operator (PCO) only for the outside bait stations and interior traps. In-house personnel was also licensed and provided service for the interior rodent traps, pheromones traps, insect light traps, and any other insect control that may be needed inside the facility.

17. Regular visits were made by the PCO, and a report was left at the distribution center after each visit. All service records were reviewed since the last survey and the sample labels of the chemicals used in the facility (for both the PCO and in-house personnel) were on file, along with the Material Safety Data Sheets (MSDS). Copies PCO's license as well as the in-house personnel license and insurance certificate were current and also on file. The PCO and in-house personnel properly recorded all pesticide applications per the AIB standards.
18. The time of application was recorded on the service reports from the PCO. It was suggested to also include the time of application on all pesticide applications that were conducted by the in-house personnel to comply with regulatory requirements.
19. Ketch-All and Tin Cat traps were used for interior rodent control. The traps were located at appropriate intervals along the perimeters of the storage areas and monitored monthly by the PCO and on the off-weeks of the PCO by the in-house personnel. Several records were reviewed and the documentation was well maintained.
20. Tamper-resistant bait stations were located around the building's exterior. The stations were fastened in place, and the lids were properly secured. Fresh bait was supplied on a monthly basis.
21. The facility stored pesticides in a locked and labeled cabinet in the maintenance shop. In addition, there was spill material available in case of leaks or accidental damage. The sprayers used were properly labeled and identified.
22. A diagram showing the locations of all rodent control devices was on file and updated as necessary. This map was last updated on October 9, 2001.
23. Electric insect traps (glue board type) were used in this facility for flying insect control. The units were checked and cleaned weekly by the in-house personnel. The units were located on the diagram with the rodent control devices. The ultraviolet light tubes were changed annually in the spring to help provide more efficient ultraviolet light attraction during the peak insect activity seasons.
24. Pheromone traps were used throughout the dry goods warehouse areas for Indian meal moths. These traps were checked weekly by the in-house personnel. No evidence on any of the pheromone traps was noted.
25. Owl decoys were utilized near the dock areas to help with bird control.

26. A trend log was maintained for the interior, exterior, insect light traps, and pheromone traps/units. This was to more easily identify any pest entry concerns.

OPERATIONAL METHODS AND PERSONNEL PRACTICES

27. All damaged or soiled materials were rejected at the time of receipt, and any materials shipped in dirty or infested trailers or containers were also rejected at the time of receipt.
28. All storage was neat and orderly and at least 18 inches away from the outside walls. Pallet racking was used to maintain storage conditions. Each pallet of merchandise was identified with the appropriate information to ensure "first-in, first-out" rotation.
29. All perishable materials were stored at or below 40°F, and the frozen materials were at or below 0°F. Recording and indicating thermometers were in place to monitor the temperatures. The facility was equipped with an alarm system in the event of a power problem. The refrigerated and frozen storage areas were fitted with quick-opening doors to maintain proper temperatures.
30. The indicating thermometers of the three coolers and one freezer was as follows:

a.	Cooler 80	27°F
b.	Cooler 90	32°F
c.	Cooler 100	37°F
d.	Freezer 500	-6°F
31. Temperatures were taken twice each day on all coolers and the freezer. In addition, the temperatures of the refer trailers on the premises were taken daily. Some of this documentation was reviewed and found to be well maintained.
32. All toxic chemicals, including the cleaning solutions, maintenance compounds, and nonfood-related materials, were completely segregated from all food ingredients and packaging materials.
33. All rubbish and waste materials were properly stored in a suitable compactor/dumpster outside the facility, which was emptied as necessary. The area was generally well maintained and free of excessive spillage.

34. All damaged goods were removed to an identified recoup area for repacking or eventual disposal. All damage was removed to suitable disposal weekly.
35. The lavatories were maintained in a sanitary manner and were free of insects, rodents, and mold. Hot and cold running water, soap, and hand towels were provided. "Wash Hands" signs were posted in all of the rest rooms and the lunchroom.
36. All employees appeared to be practicing good personal hygiene habits. Eating, drinking, and smoking were restricted to the designated nonfood storage areas of the facility.
37. The facility had recently developed a glass policy. This program stated that no glass was to be brought into the facility by personnel. It also stated on how to clean-up any broken glass in the warehouse. It was suggested to expand this program to also include brittle plastics as well as how to dispose of the glass/brittle plastic if broken. In addition, it was suggested to provide an inventory of all essential glass/brittle plastics and audit on a determined frequency to help prevent any foreign material concerns.
38. An unlabeled gallon container was noted inside the cabinet in building #1. This container was stored with many other cleaning chemicals. It was determined the chemical was a floor stripper chemical. It was suggested to label this container to help prevent any food safety concerns.

MAINTENANCE FOR FOOD SAFETY

39. The distribution center had a preventive maintenance and work order system in place to prioritize the elements of identified structural, equipment, or utensil maintenance that could cause food adulteration.
40. The floors, walls, and ceilings throughout the facility were of sound construction and well maintained. No roof leakage was evident.
41. The 100 cooler had been redesigned since the last survey to include additional insulation and sealing to help prevent any condensation concerns.
42. A calibration program was noted for all coolers and the one freezer. This program consisted of in-house personnel calibrating their thermometers as well as an outside service calibrating the cooler units on a semiannually basis. This program was documented and well maintained.

43. Eighteen-inch borders were in place around the perimeters and interior walls to aid in the detection of rodent activity.
44. Adequate lighting was provided in all areas and some of the fluorescent lights had covers provided. No lights were directly over the recoup area. However, it was recommended to provide lightbulbs, fixtures, mirrors, dock lights, or other glass suspended over the general stock storage to be of the safety type or otherwise protected to prevent accidental breakage. It was understood that any new lights that may be replaced or installed would be provided with Shatter-Shield bulbs and/or plastic light covers.
45. Some minor damage was on two of the vertical dock cushions at dock #6. It was suggested to repair these cushions to help prevent any bird or other pest harborage concerns.
46. Some minor areas were noted in both building #1 and #3 that had damage at the floor expansion joints. A program was in place to seal these areas and many areas had been sealed since the last survey. However, it was suggested to inspect and seal some of the larger expansion joints to help prevent any insect and wood chips from harboring or collecting in these areas.

CLEANING PRACTICES

47. The floor areas were cleaned on a regular schedule to eliminate food residues and maintain a good cosmetic appearance.
48. The overhead areas were cleaned frequently enough to prevent insects or filth from contaminating the food products in storage.
49. The pallet racks and storage shelves were cleaned frequently enough to remove spillage and dirt buildups and to prevent pest development, except as noted in the survey.
50. The painted perimeters were cleaned and mopped at least monthly to maintain a good appearance.
51. The facility grounds were well maintained and were free of miscellaneous trash and debris.
52. The trash compactor area was maintained in an acceptably sanitary condition.
53. Pallet storage was off the ground and at least 18 inches from the building to prevent pest harborages.

54. A minor flour spill from a broken bag was located in building #2, row #42, slot #1. In addition, there was some minor webbing between some of these bags on this pallet. No insect trails were noted; however, it was suggested to clean the spill and provide more frequent cleaning to help prevent webbing.