



FOOD SAFETY SURVEY REPORT

#12714

by
BRAD S. FISHER
Food Safety Auditor
June 19, 2000

REPORT SUBMITTED July 7, 2000

JON R. ANDERSON
DIRECTOR OF AUDIT SERVICES

TABLE OF CONTENTS

Rating -----Page 1

Rating Analysis -----Page 2

Factual Observations and
Specific Recommendations -----Page 3

BSF:rrn

RATING

An announced food safety survey was conducted at this facility on June 19, 2000. 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 the above personnel.

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 (910)

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: June 19, 2000

OVERALL RATING: **SUPERIOR**

ADEQUACY OF FOOD SAFETY PROGRAM	-185
PEST CONTROL	-175
OPERATIONAL METHODS AND PERSONNEL PRACTICES	-185
MAINTENANCE FOR FOOD SAFETY	-180
CLEANING PRACTICES	<u>-185</u>
TOTAL:	910

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. It was recommended to provide a date on the organizational chart and review annually.
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.
3. Good Manufacturing Practices (GMP) training for new and current employees was conducted in a systematic and formal manner. Refresher training was provided annually. All documentation was maintained and on file.
4. The distribution center had established a formal food safety committee. This committee had a multidisciplinary membership. Food safety committee inspections were conducted twice per month. Written inspection reports and reports of follow-up corrections were on file.
5. This distribution center maintained and supported an adequate budget, including the timely and proper acquisition of appropriate tools, materials, equipment, monitoring devices, chemicals, and pest control materials.
6. The distribution center had a written Master Cleaning Schedule (MCS) that included the building, equipment, and outside grounds. The schedule indicated cleaning frequencies and personnel assigned. Daily schedules were in place to ensure prompt cleaning of any spillage or debris. The weekly MCS was on a separate document. It was recommended to provide weekly cleaning on the main MCS to consolidate records and provide easier review.
7. 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.

8. All inbound products were inspected for evidence of damage. All observations were recorded. Temperature checks were conducted on all refrigerated and frozen products and recorded. The outbound inspection program consisted of inspections for evidence of insect activity, rodents, odors, foreign material, and damage. It was recommended to provide this same detail on all incoming materials, including equipment.
9. A formal recall program was on file. Distribution records were maintained to identify the initial distribution points to facilitate the recall of specific lots. The recall program was tested twice per year with the last tests conducted on May 31 and June 14, 2000.
10. 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 and records and sampling procedures.

PEST CONTROL

11. This facility maintained a contract with Rose Terminix for rodent control on the premises. Service was provided by the pest control operator (PCO) for all interior traps and outside bait stations. In-house personnel was also licensed and provided service for insect control. Regular visits were made by the PCO, and a report was left at the distribution center after each visit. Sample labels of the chemicals used in the facility were on file, along with Material Safety Data Sheets (MSDS), except as noted in the survey. Copies of the PCO's license, as well as the in-house personnel licenses, and insurance certificate were also on file. The PCO and in-house personnel properly recorded all pesticide applications.
12. **All pesticides were reviewed since the last audit and there was no label or MSDS for "round-up". It was recommended to provide these documents to assure proper application of the herbicide and safety of the plant personnel. It was also recommended to maintain these records on file for at least the amount of time between AIB audits. (IMPROVEMENT NEEDED)**
13. Ketch-All traps were used for interior rodent control. The traps were located at appropriate intervals along the perimeters of the storage areas and monitored once per month by the PCO and once per month by in-house personnel. It was recommended to monitor all traps weekly to prevent any concerns with the decomposition of rodents. f

14. 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 at least a monthly basis.
15. A diagram showing the locations of all rodent control devices was on file and updated as necessary. The facility also provided a rodent trap log to assist in indicating any trends to improve the rodent control program.
16. Electric insect traps were used in this facility for flying insect control. It was understood that these units were monitored weekly, but documentation indicated twice per month. It was recommended to monitor and document weekly in the summer months and monthly in the winter months. The units were located on the diagram with the rodent control devices. It was further recommended to change the bulbs annually to improve insect attraction from the ultraviolet lights. It was suggested to change the bulbs at the beginning of the warm months for better control.
17. The facility monitored Indian meal moths with pheromone traps. These were periodically monitored, documented, and included on the diagram with the rodent control devices.
18. Pesticides and application equipment were stored in a properly labeled and locked cabinet. Storage was maintained in an area away from product storage.
19. No evidence of bird activity was noted in or around the facility at the time of the survey. Owl decoys were utilized near the dock areas to assist in bird control. It was recommended to move these periodically to strengthen the bird control program.

OPERATIONAL METHODS AND PERSONNEL PRACTICES

20. All damaged or soiled materials and any materials shipped in dirty or infested trailers or containers were rejected at the time of receipt.
21. All storage was neat, orderly, and at least 18 inches away from the outside walls, except as noted in the survey. 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.

22. Some pallets in the building #3 non-food storage area were not easily accessible. Storage was 18 inches from the wall, but some rows between the pallets were not accessible. It was recommended to provide 14 inches between every two rows for inspection and cleaning.
23. 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.
24. All toxic chemicals, including the cleaning solutions, maintenance compounds, and nonfood-related materials, were completely segregated from all food ingredients and packaging materials. There was designated storage racking for nonfood items. One pallet of mustard was stored in this area, but no chemicals were above this product. It was recommended to completely segregate chemicals from food product to prevent any contamination concerns.
25. A roll of bag liner was stored on the floor at row #3 position #12. These liners were used to contain any product that may be damaged to prevent spillage. It was recommended to provide a storage rack for these liners to prevent any foot-borne contamination concerns.
26. All rubbish and waste materials were properly stored in a suitable dumpster, which was emptied as necessary. The area was generally well maintained and free of excessive spillage.
27. All damaged goods were removed to an identified recoup area for repacking or eventual disposal. All damage was removed to suitable disposal weekly.
28. The lavatories and lockers 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 rest rooms.
29. All employees appeared to be practicing good personal hygiene habits at the time of the survey. Eating and drinking were restricted to the designated nonfood storage areas. Smoking was prohibited in the facility and only outside the warehouse.

MAINTENANCE FOR FOOD SAFETY

30. 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. Major repairs were contracted by outside services and in-house personnel provided minor repairs.
31. The floors, walls, and ceilings throughout the facility were of sound construction and well maintained at the time of the survey. No roof leakage was evident.
32. Small holes were in dock door #9. It was recommended to seal these holes to prevent any insect entry.
33. A small amount of condensation was on the ceiling in cooler #100. This was not over the product. A fan had recently been installed to prevent condensation in this area, and this installation appeared to reduce the amount of liquid. It was suggested to install a gutter-type catch pan on the conduits that collects the condensation and provides a drain line that would connect to the current drain lines of the cooling units. This would prevent any condensation from dripping near the product, as well as prevent any safety concerns.
34. The bottom floor vent on the east wall of the building #3 nonfood area did not have a metal screen for preventing pest entry. A metal cover was on the outside perimeter that was not completely secured. It was suggested to provide a screen such as the other vents provided to prevent any pest entry.
35. The ends of the yellow guardrail on the west wall of the cool room were opened. It was suggested to seal these ends to prevent any pest harborage.
36. Many large floor expansion joints were in buildings #2 and #3. These were clean and free of any insects or other pests. It was suggested to continue with the program of sealing all expansion joints to prevent insect harborages.
37. Adequate lighting was provided in all areas, and some 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.

38. Eighteen-inch borders were in place around the perimeters and interior walls to aid in the detection of rodent activity. The perimeters were very well maintained at the time of the survey.

CLEANING PRACTICES

39. The floor areas were cleaned on a regular schedule to eliminate food residues and maintain a good cosmetic appearance.
40. The overhead areas were cleaned frequently enough to prevent insects or filth from contaminating the food products in storage.
41. The pallet racks and storage shelves were cleaned frequently enough to remove spillage and dirt buildups and prevent pest development, except as noted in the survey.
42. A moderate amount of product spillage was on the pallet at storage rack location #4391-2 . It was recommended to clean the pallet to prevent any pest attraction.
43. The northeast corner in the building #3 nonfood storage needed organized and cleaned. Two old cabinets had been transferred from the sister plant containing a gum wrapper, candy, and a few rodent droppings on the bottom shelf. No evidence of any rodent activity was noted in the facility. It was suggested to clean these cabinets and organize the floor space to improve access to cleaning and monitoring for pest activity.
44. The painted perimeters were cleaned and mopped at least monthly to maintain a good appearance.
45. The facility grounds were well maintained and free of miscellaneous trash and debris.
46. The outside dumpster for cardboard was maintained in an acceptably sanitary condition at the time of the survey.
47. Pallet storage was off the ground and at least 18 inches from the building to prevent pest harborages.