



FOOD SAFETY AUDIT REPORT

#4505

Quick Dry Foods
977 S Northpoint Blvd
Waukegan, IL 60085-8214

TYPE OF AUDIT
ANNOUNCED

INSPECTION DATE

October 8, 2010

AIB International Inc.

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

<http://www.aibonline.org>

RATING

A food safety audit was conducted at this facility on October 8, 2010.

The writer was accompanied throughout the audit by Mr. Keith Larsen, Operations Manager.

At the conclusion of the audit, a meeting was held to discuss the observations, recommendations, and rating.

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

SUPERIOR
(900)

The "Serious" or "Unsatisfactory" items are shaded, boxed, and bolded in the text of the report. Refer to the definitions in the AIB International Consolidated Standards for Inspection.

The "Improvement Needed" items are designated in bold type and require prompt attention.

AIB International Inc. states that this report as dated and provided herein is to be construed as its findings and recommendations, category scores, total score, and rating. A passing score of 700 and above is not a certification of the facility, products or programs. AIB International Inc. does not accept or assume responsibility for the Prerequisite and Food Safety Programs in effect with (customer). AIB International Inc. is only reporting the food safety conditions of (customer) as of the date of this report and assumes no responsibility or liability as to whether (customer) does or does not carry out the recommendations as contained in this report.

RATING ANALYSIS

DATE OF INSPECTION: October 8, 2010

TYPE OF INSPECTION: Announced

OVERALL RATING: **SUPERIOR**

OPERATIONAL METHODS AND PERSONNEL PRACTICES	195
MAINTENANCE FOR FOOD SAFETY	195
CLEANING PRACTICES	190
INTEGRATED PEST MANAGEMENT	160
ADEQUACY OF PREREQUISITE AND FOOD SAFETY PROGRAMS	<u>160</u>
TOTAL:	900

FACTUAL OBSERVATIONS AND SPECIFIC RECOMMENDATIONS

OPERATIONAL METHODS AND PERSONNEL PRACTICES

1. 1.1.0.0 Transports/containers and ingredients were inspected upon receipt for cleanliness, pest activity, structural defects, or other issues that could jeopardize product integrity. Inspection documentation, including rejected shipments, was maintained. No temperature sensitive materials were handled. The writer was told there had been no rejected trailers during the receiving or shipping process; however procedures were in place to document rejections if they occur.
2. 1.2.0.0 Food products were stored and removed from storage to prevent product contamination. Materials were stored off the floor and 18 inches (45 cm) away from the wall to facilitate cleaning, inspection, and pest control activities. For the most part receiving dates were in place on materials; however a pallet of carrot flakes was found with no receiving date. The date was looked up from receiving records. It was recommended that receiving dates should be consistently applied to all materials. (MINOR ISSUE)
3. 1.3.0.0 Storage areas were clean, well ventilated, and dry. Materials in storage were protected against contamination. Packaging materials, toxic chemicals, non-product materials, and R&D materials were segregated.
4. 1.4.0.0 Ingredients, packaging supplies, and other materials were rotated on a "First-In, First-Out" basis or other verifiable method to ensure stock rotation. A formal procedure was in place to reinspect all aged materials during the monthly self-inspection.
5. 1.5.0.0 Pallets were clean, dry, and in good repair. Slip sheets were used for bagged materials and to help protect boxes of materials during shipping.
6. 1.6.0.0 The writer was told no rework was conducted.
7. 1.7.0.0 Release procedures included COAs being maintained on file for all materials and forwarded with shipments.
8. 1.10.0.0 Sampling of incoming raw materials for testing was not conducted at this facility.
9. 1.16.0.0 Trash or inedible waste was stored in properly identified and covered containers.
10. 1.20.0.0 Single-service containers were not used at this facility.

11. 1.22.0.0 No temperature sensitive perishable materials were handled.
12. 1.23.0.0 Incompatible materials were stored under conditions that prevented cross-contamination.
13. 1.24.0.0 Containers and utensils were not used for product handling at this facility. There were no processing rooms at this facility.
14. 1.26.0.0 All shipping vehicles were inspected prior to loading for cleanliness and structural defects that could jeopardize product integrity. Inspection documentation was maintained and included lot code designation, amounts, and the point of distribution to ensure traceability and recall. Security seals were provided and documented for any full truck outbound materials.
15. 1.27.0.0 Adequate hand washing stations were located at appropriate locations and were stocked with single-use towels. "Wash hands" signs were displayed.
16. 1.28.0.0 Washrooms were maintained in an acceptable sanitary condition. "Wash hands" signs were properly displayed.
17. 1.29.0.0 Trained supervisors were in place to monitor compliance with personnel practices. Personnel were observed washing hands appropriately, and good personal hygiene practices were observed.
18. 1.32.0.0 Personnel were not observed eating, drinking, or smoking in unauthorized areas. Personal property was stored in appropriate locations defined by company policy.
19. 1.33.0.0 Effective procedures were in place to ensure that personnel with boils, sores, infected wounds, infections, or other communicable diseases were not permitted to come in contact with food as required by law.
20. 1.34.0.0 All non-facility personnel, including visitors and contractors, followed the facility personnel practices requirements.

MAINTENANCE FOR FOOD SAFETY

21. 2.1.0.0 Facility boundaries were defined and controlled. Measures were in place to prevent contamination from local activities or neighboring properties that could impact the facility. The facility occupies the end of a multi-unit building with the adjacent unit empty.

22. 2.2.0.0 Outside grounds were maintained in a way that prevents product contamination. Measures included, but were not limited to, managing drainage, litter, weeds, and dust and maintaining waste eliminate pest attraction to the facility.
23. 2.3.0.0 Some measures were taken to maintain facility security. Security strategies included locked doors when the building was unoccupied, surveillance cameras, truck seals, and employee training programs.
24. 2.4.0.0 Adequate space was observed between equipment and structures to facilitate access for cleaning and maintenance activities.
25. 2.5.0.0 Floors, walls, and ceilings throughout the facility were well constructed and maintained. Floor drainage was designed and maintained to allow access for cleaning and to prevent product contamination. There was no evidence of roof leakage.
26. 2.6.0.0 Fixtures, ducts, and pipes were properly installed and maintained to prevent contamination from leaks, condensation, or loose material.
27. 2.7.0.0 Adequate levels of lighting was provided. All lights were unprotected glass. All materials were in sealed containers.
28. 2.8.0.0 Adequate ventilation was provided in the facility. Insect screens were provided on windows or doors used for ventilation to prevent pest entry.
29. 2.9.0.0 Adequate barriers were in place to prevent rodents, insects, and birds from entering the facility. Cracks, crevices, and other pest harborages were eliminated and doors were pest-proofed to prevent pest entry.
30. 2.10.0.0 There were no processing rooms with equipment that required the use and control of food-grade lubricants at this facility.
31. 2.12.0.0 Operations were separated to prevent product contamination. No exposed products were present in the facility.
32. 2.15.0.0 The facility did not have any exposed recoup or processing areas that required a written temporary repair procedure for repair of these surfaces to be defined.
33. 2.16.0.0 There were no food contact surfaces at this facility.
34. 2.17.0.0 No temperature sensitive perishable materials were handled.

- 35. 2.19.0.0 Transporting equipment, such as forklifts and pallet jacks, was maintained to prevent contamination of materials. The forklifts were cleaned during a contracted PM as well as by facility personnel.
- 36. 2.20.0.0 Parts were stored off the floor in a clean environment.
- 37. 2.21.0.0 A Program was in place to monitor water quality; however no records were on file. No water was used for product contact. Back siphonage devices were provided; however the records of testing the devices were understood to be on file with the building owner. It was recommended that a drinking water quality report should be available as well as evidence the backflow prevention devices are checked on an annual basis. (MINOR ISSUE)
- 38. 2.22.0.0 Hand washing facilities provided hot and cold running water.

CLEANING PRACTICES

- 39. 3.1.0.0 Cleaning was done in a way that prevents contamination of raw materials, products, and equipment.
- 40. 3.2.0.0 Food approval documentation was not needed for cleaning chemicals and sanitizers used as there were no food contact surfaces requiring cleaning.
- 41. 3.3.0.0 Adequate cleaning equipment and tools were available and stored away from production and/or storage areas. The writer was told that cleaning tools were separated by use; however this was not a documented program. It was recommended that cleaning tools should be labeled or color coded to designate the intended use. (MINOR ISSUE)
- 42. 3.4.0.0 Daily housekeeping cleaning activities were carried out in a way that prevents contamination. Housekeeping activities were assigned to the appropriate department to maintain work and support areas.
- 43. 3.5.0.0 Deep cleaning of equipment and structures was conducted according to the Master Cleaning Schedule to prevent the development of microorganisms, insects, or foreign material. Periodic cleaning tasks complied with written procedures.

- 44. 3.5.1.7 A minor accumulation of dust was observed on the upper levels of the rack structure. It was apparent that cleaning had occurred on the lower level; however the upper levels out of arms reach, were found with dust accumulations. It was recommended the cleaning should be more thorough. (MINOR ISSUE)
- 45. 3.6.0.0 Maintenance cleaning appeared to be completed in a way that prevented product contamination.
- 46. 3.7.0.0 There were no direct food contact surfaces and utensils in use at this distribution center.

INTEGRATED PEST MANAGEMENT

- 47. 4.1.0.0 **No written description of the facility managed Integrated Pest Management (IPM) Program was on file. It was recommended the facility should have a formal IPM program with written procedures describing all of the facility pest management activities. (IMPROVEMENT NEEDED)**
- 48. 4.2.0.0 **It was recommended the facility should conduct an annual IPM assessment that addresses all areas inside and outside of the facility. The assessment should be documented and include findings and any necessary corrective actions. (IMPROVEMENT NEEDED)**
- 49. 4.3.0.0 The facility did not manage their IPM Program under an alternative guideline.
- 50. 4.4.0.0 No contract was required due to all pest control activities being handled by the Operations Manager.
- 51. 4.5.0.0 Records of seminar attendance that included pest control topics was on file for the Operations Manager; however this person was not licensed by the state. It was recommended the person providing IPM services should be certified by the State of Illinois as a licensed PCO. (MINOR ISSUE)
- 52. 4.6.0.0 Current copies of the pesticide specimen labels and Material Safety Data Sheets (MSDS) were on file for pesticides listed as being applied at the facility. The was verified for the pesticides Tempo SC Ultra, ULD BP-300, and Contrac All Weather Block.

53. 4.7.0.0 Documentation of all pesticides, including rodenticides, applied on the premises included materials applied, registration number, target pest, amount applied, specific area where pesticide was applied, method of application, rate of application or dosage, date and time treated, and applicator's signature. Documentation indicated the applications were made according to label directions.
54. 4.8.0.0 Pesticides and application equipment were stored in a locked and identified cabinet with spill control measures in place.
55. 4.10.0.0 A current site map that lists the locations of interior and exterior pest control devices was on file.
56. 4.11.0.0 **Bait stations were provided for exterior rodent control. The stations were installed around the exterior perimeter of the facility at appropriate intervals. These stations were properly positioned, anchored in place, and properly labeled in compliance with regulatory requirements. One of the five bait stations was found with nothing securing the lid. The stations were checked weekly and were found clean and containing a good supply of fresh bait. It was recommended the bait stations should have the lids secure to maintain tamper resistance. (IMPROVEMENT NEEDED)**
57. 4.12.0.0 Mechanical rodent traps were installed to monitor rodent activity inside the facility and were properly positioned. The randomly examined traps appeared to be properly maintained. Traps were inspected on a weekly frequency.
58. 4.13.0.0 **Insect light traps (ILTs) were used in the facility to aid in monitoring insect activity. The traps were scheduled for weekly cleaning. A record of checking the units was maintained; however activity levels were not recorded. The bulbs were changed annually and dated; however they are not shatter resistant. It was recommended the activity levels should be recorded during every service. It was also recommended the bulbs should be shatter resistant, or included on a documented unprotected glass inventory and checked on a regular basis. (IMPROVEMENT NEEDED)**
59. 4.14.0.0 Pheromone monitoring devices were used to monitor insect activity in this facility. The units were checked on a regular basis and activity levels documented.
60. 4.15.0.0 Bird activity was not noted in or around the facility.
61. 4.16.0.0 Wildlife, including domestic animals, was not observed at the time of the survey.

62. 4.17.0.0 Pest habitats and pest activity were identified and eliminated. No evidence of rodent or insect activity was noted in or around the facility.

ADEQUACY OF PREREQUISITE AND FOOD SAFETY PROGRAMS

63. 5.1.0.0 The facility had a documented policy statement outlining its commitment to produce safe and legal products. The policy was signed by senior management and posted in the facility.
64. 5.2.0.0 An organizational chart was not required due to only four persons working at the facility, including the President and the Operations Manager who were responsible for food safety and food defense programs as well as applicable regulatory updates. The facility had a business license issued by the City of Waukegan, Illinois that was valid until December 31, 2010.
65. 5.3.0.0 Based on a review of the facility and related documentation, an appropriate budget and adequate labor support appeared to be in place to maintain the timely acquisition of tools, equipment, monitoring devices, chemicals, and other required resources.
66. 5.4.0.0 Written procedures were established to define step-by-step processes to ensure product safety. The writer was told that all four persons working at the location could cover for each other if someone was absent; however this was not part of a written program. It was recommended the facility should have a written program describing alternates for key food safety and food defense job positions. (MINOR ISSUE)
67. 5.5.0.0 Specific written procedures were on file for providing food safety training to all personnel and contractors. Records of new employee training and annual refresher training were maintained for all personnel. The last general GMP training was conducted in June 2010. Q&A was used to ensure employees understood the training topics.
68. 5.6.0.0 A multidisciplinary Food Safety Committee was established to conduct monthly inspections of the entire facility. Documentation of the monthly inspections included identified observations. Corrective actions were included for some deficiencies. It was recommended the inspection reports should include documented corrective actions and completion dates. (MINOR ISSUE)
69. 5.7.0.0 **It was recommended the facility should have a program to audit food safety and food defense related procedures at least annually. Procedure audit documentation should include identified observations, specific assignments, Corrective Actions, and actual accomplishments. (IMPROVEMENT NEEDED)**

70. 5.8.0.0 **It was recommended the facility should have a written program for evaluating customer complaints. The program should include a plan for quick distribution of complaint information to all departments responsible for implementing Prerequisite and Food Safety Programs as well as follow up, corrective action, and response to customers. Records of complaints should be maintained to show how they were handled according to the program. (IMPROVEMENT NEEDED)**
71. 5.9.0.0 **A written Chemical Control Program that addresses chemicals used in the facility was established. Most elements were in place; however it was found that two materials used for cleaning, 409 and bleach, were not on the chemical inventory list, and no MSDS was on file for the brake fluid stored in a cabinet in the warehouse. The writer was told there were several items with no MSDS on file. It was recommended the inventory list of approved chemicals should be updated to include all chemicals and MSDS should be on file for all materials. (IMPROVEMENT NEEDED)**
72. 5.11.0.0 A documented Allergen Control Program was in place to address the allergens handled or stored at this facility.
73. 5.12.0.0 **The facility had a written policy stating that no glass, brittle plastics, or ceramics were to be used in the facility, except where absolutely necessary. Included in the policy was a procedure to handle any breakage in the facility. It was recommended the facility should develop an inventory of the unprotected glass items and inspect the items on a regular basis to ensure any breakage is identified and corrected. (IMPROVEMENT NEEDED)**
74. 5.13.0.0 A formal documented Cleaning Program that included a Master Cleaning Schedule (MCS) for periodic cleaning assignments as well as a daily housekeeping schedule was developed and implemented in this facility. The MCS specified frequency, responsibility, post-cleaning evaluation techniques, and Corrective Actions. Written cleaning procedures were developed for all equipment, structures, and grounds that impacted handling and storage of food products and packaging materials. It was recommended the post cleaning evaluation should be more thorough to identify and correct issues such as the partially dusty rack that was observed during this inspection. (MINOR ISSUE)
75. 5.14.0.0 A formal Preventive Maintenance Program and work order system was used to prioritize problems in structural and equipment maintenance.

76. 5.15.0.0 Incoming ingredients, packaging, and transports received into the facility were inspected by trained personnel according to established written procedures. Procedures addressed all types of vehicles transporting received materials.
77. 5.16.0.0 A written Regulatory Affairs and Inspections Program was on file. The Program included a list of personnel delegated to accompany all inspectors along with a company policy regarding recording devices, cameras, records, and sample taking. The writer was told there it had been a good number of years since there had been a regulatory inspection of the facility.
78. 5.17.0.0 Evidence of registration under the FDA Bioterrorism Act was on file at the facility. The facility had conducted a Vulnerability Assessment to identify food defense risks and a written food defense / security program was in place.
79. 5.18.0.0 A documented Traceability Program that addressed identification of lot numbers of products, rework/repack, and packaging materials was developed and in place. All finished products were coded and recorded.
80. 5.19.0.0 A written Recall/Withdrawal Program was on file. Distribution records were maintained to identify the initial point of distribution to facilitate segregation and recall of specific lots. A documented mock recall had been conducted on September 1, 2010.
81. 5.20.0.0 A written Program was in place to control nonconforming products, including work-in-progress, finished products, and returned goods. Corrective Actions equal to the seriousness of the risk appeared to be taken.
82. 5.25.0.0 No materials were handled that required a regulated Hazard Analysis Critical Control Point (HACCP) Program. A hazard analysis conducted by the related producing plant had been conducted and no CCPs were identified for storage and distribution.