

FINAL AUDIT REPORT

CB Registration No.WQS-PGFS-2735-1
 PrimusGFS ID #245586 - Cert:3
 Audited by WQS, LLC.

PrimusGFS Version 3.1

Operation Type:Farm
 Audit Report Summary

[Ver en Español](#)

Organization:	Moultrie Melon Company Contact(s): Kelli Bozeman Sam Watson Address: 356 Funston Doerun Road 31768 Location: Moultrie, Georgia, United States Phone Number: 229-873-9912											
Operation:	Packing Shed Farm Contact(s): Kelli Bozeman Location: 356 Funston Doerun Rd Moultrie, Georgia 31768, United States											
Shipper:	Moultrie Melon Company											
Operation Type:	Farm											
Audit Type:	Announced Audit											
Audit Executive Summary:	Audit of irrigated vegetable farm, irrigation is supplied by a drip system with the water sourced from a deep well. During the inspection the farm was producing bell pepper, eggplant, squash and cucumbers. Approximately 30 people are involved with the production of the crop. Adjoining property is a packing facility, cultivated lands, highway and some native woods.											
Date Documentation Review Started:	30 Sep 2021 08:00											
Date Documentation Review Finished:	30 Sep 2021 10:00											
Total Amount of Time on the Documentation Review:	2.00 Hours											
Date Visual Inspection Started:	30 Sep 2021 10:00											
Date Visual Inspection Finished:	30 Sep 2021 11:30											
Total Amount of Time on Visual Inspection:	1.50 Hours											
Addendum(s) included in the audit:	Not Applicable											
Product(s) observed during audit:	Bell Peppers, Cucumber English, Eggplant / Aubergine, Pickle Cucumbers, Squash											
Similar product(s)/process(es) not observed:	Chili Pepper											
Product(s) applied for but not observed:	None											
Auditor:	Kevin Kelley (WQS, LLC.)											
Preliminary Audit Score:	97%											
Final Audit Score:	97%											
Certificate Valid From:	03 Nov 2021 To 02 Nov 2022											
GPS Coordinates:	<table border="1"> <thead> <tr> <th>Latitude</th> <th>Longitude</th> </tr> </thead> <tbody> <tr> <td>31° 14' 38"</td> <td>83° 54' 51"</td> </tr> <tr> <td>31° 14' 38"</td> <td>83° 54' 46"</td> </tr> <tr> <td>31° 14' 20"</td> <td>83° 54' 40"</td> </tr> <tr> <td>31° 14' 43"</td> <td>83° 54' 37"</td> </tr> </tbody> </table>	Latitude	Longitude	31° 14' 38"	83° 54' 51"	31° 14' 38"	83° 54' 46"	31° 14' 20"	83° 54' 40"	31° 14' 43"	83° 54' 37"	Click here to see map
Latitude	Longitude											
31° 14' 38"	83° 54' 51"											
31° 14' 38"	83° 54' 46"											
31° 14' 20"	83° 54' 40"											
31° 14' 43"	83° 54' 37"											

[View Certificate](#)

[Corrective Action Activity](#)

Which input(s) are used in the growing operation?

Subcategory Name	Description
Inorganic Fertilizers	e.g., ammonium nitrate, ammonium sulfate, chemically synthesized urea, etc.

Which water source(s) is/are used in the growing operation?

Well	What is this water source used for?	Irrigation, Crop protection sprays, Fertigation
	What type of irrigation is used?	Drip
	Does the water come in contact with the edible portion of the crop?	Yes
	Which product grouping is this water source used for?	Cucurbit Vegetables, Fruiting Vegetables

Information related to the audited operation

What is the maximum number of workers during peak season?	30	Is work being performed at the time of the audit?	No
Adjacent Land:	A packing facility, other croplands, highway and some native woods adjoin this operation.	What work is being performed?	
Operation Size:	65 Acres	Are toilets available at the time of the audit?	Portable Toilet
Cultural Methods	Conventional		

Product information for each product			
Product Group/Product Name	Observed Product	Seasonality	Country of destination for product
Bell Peppers	Observed on the day of audit	From: May To: October	United States
Chili Pepper	Not observed but of a similar risk type to what was observed*	From: May To: October	United States
Cucumber, English	Observed on the day of audit	From: April To: October	United States
Eggplant / Aubergine	Observed on the day of audit	From: April To: November	United States
Pickle Cucumbers	Observed on the day of audit	From: April To: October	United States
Squash	Observed on the day of audit	From: May To: November	United States

AUDIT SCORING SUMMARY	Pre-Corrective Action Review		Post-Corrective Action Review	
Food Safety Management System Requirements	Score:	229	Score:	229
	Possible Points:	229	Possible Points:	229
	Percent Score:	100%	Percent Score:	100%
Module 2 - Farm	Score:	591	Score:	591
	Possible Points:	611	Possible Points:	611
	Percent Score:	96%	Percent Score:	96%
TOTAL	Score:	820	Score:	820
	Possible Points:	840	Possible Points:	840
	Percent Score:	97%	Percent Score:	97%

Non-Conformance Summary By Count	Pre-Corrective Action Non-Conformances	Post-Corrective Action Non-Conformances
Food Safety Management System Requirements	0	0
Module 2 - Farm	2	2
TOTAL	2	2

SECTIONS:

Food Safety Management System Requirements	Module 2 - Farm
Management System	General
Control of Documents and Records	Site
Procedures and Corrective Actions	Ground History
Internal and External Inspections	Adjacent Land Use
Release of Items/Product	Inspection
Supplier Monitoring/Control	Training
Traceability and Recall	Field Worker Hygiene (Applies to on-the-farm workers, not the harvesting workers)
Food Defense	Inorganic Fertilizers
	Well
	Pesticide Usage

FSMS	Management System	
1.01.01	<p>Question: Is there a documented food safety policy detailing the company's commitment to food safety?</p> <p>Auditor Comments: Yes. The food safety policy detailing the company's commitment to food safety is called "Food Safety Program Review". It is signed by Sam Watson, Managing Partner and dated 4/2021. The policy is posted in the manual and at the visitor sign in. This policy provides a clear statement and detailed objective of the company's food safety.</p>	<p>Possible Points: 5 Points Scored: 5 Score: Total Compliance</p>
1.01.02	<p>Question: Is there an organizational chart showing all management and workers who are involved in food safety related activities and documentation (job descriptions) detailing their food safety responsibilities?</p> <p>Auditor Comments: Yes. The "Moultrie Melon Company Organization Chart", dated 4/2021, shows all management and workers involved in food safety related activities. Job descriptions for the 10 members of the team are included with alternates listed.</p>	<p>Possible Points: 10 Points Scored: 10 Score: Total Compliance</p>
1.01.03	<p>Question: Is there a food safety committee and are there logs of food safety meetings with topics covered and attendees?</p> <p>Auditor Comments: Yes. The "Food Safety Committee" meet at least quarterly and the Food Safety Committee meeting minutes record the topics of discussion and the attendees are listed. This committee met most recently on 9/13/21. Some of the topics discussed were "Self Audit", "Schedule Fall GAP Audits", "H2A Workers", "Packing line Maintenance" etc. The owners and senior management are included on this committee. Meetings are required at least quarterly when in operation. Minutes from 2020 and 2021 were available with the last meeting on 9/13/21.</p>	<p>Possible Points: 5 Points Scored: 5 Score: Total Compliance</p>
1.01.04	<p>Question: Is there a training management system in place that shows what types of training are required for various job roles of specific workers, including who has been trained, when they were trained, which trainings they still need to take, and a training schedule?</p> <p>Auditor Comments: Yes. The "Management Verification of Food Safety System" and the "Training Schedule" shows what types of training are required for various job roles, it includes who has been trained with training records.</p>	<p>Possible Points: 5 Points Scored: 5 Score: Total Compliance</p>

1.01.05	Question: Is there documented management verification review of the entire food safety management system at least every 12 months, including an evaluation of resources, and are there records of changes made?	Possible Points: 10 Points Scored: 10 Score: Total Compliance
	Auditor Comments: Yes. The "Management Verification of Food Safety System" was reviewed by the food safety committee on 4/15/21 and documented on the Food Safety Committee meeting minutes. The committee includes the owners and senior management and they evaluated resources required. The system was updated to meet the requirements of the version 3.1 checklist.	
1.01.06	Question: Where specific industry guidelines or best practices exist for the crop and/or product, does the operation have a current copy of the document?	Possible Points: 3 Points Scored: 3 Score: Total Compliance
	Auditor Comments: Yes. The "Industry Guidelines for Melons, Cabbage and Tomatoes" and the production guidelines for Vegetables was available.	

FSMS	Control of Documents and Records
------	----------------------------------

1.02.01	Question: Is there a written document control procedure (including document control register/record) describing how documents will be maintained, updated and replaced?	Possible Points: 3 Points Scored: 3 Score: Total Compliance
	Auditor Comments: Yes. The written document control procedure is called "Procedures For Updating, Replacing and Monitoring Documents", it describes how documents will be maintained, updated and replaced. The documents have the name of the organization, the version and the date revised. All obsolete versions are controlled and the SOP describes the electronic record keeping system in detail.	
1.02.02	Question: Is there a documented and implemented procedure that requires all records to be stored for a minimum period of 24 months (or greater if legally required) or for at least the shelf life of the product if it is greater than 24 months?	Possible Points: 5 Points Scored: 5 Score: Total Compliance
	Auditor Comments: Yes. The "Procedures For Updating, Replacing and Monitoring Documents" SOP requires all documents and records be kept for a minimum of 2 years. An example observed was for a BOL dated 5/23/19.	
1.02.03	Question: Are both paper and electronic food safety related documents and records created, edited, stored and handled in a secure manner?	Possible Points: 3 Points Scored: 3 Score: Total Compliance
	Auditor Comments: Yes. Paper and electronic documents and records are created, edited, stored and handled in a secure manner. The paper records are kept in the office of the operation and the electronic records are password protected and backed up often. All records reviewed were printed and signed in ink and the electronic records show the date and version, and who made the revision.	
1.02.04	Question: Are records maintained in an organized and retrievable manner?	Possible Points: 3 Points Scored: 3 Score: Total Compliance
	Auditor Comments: Yes. The records are maintained using the PGFS checklist numbering system. The system is updated to the 3.1 version, records can also be accessed using the titles by facility. All records requested were easily found and retrieved during the inspection.	
1.02.05	Question: Are all records and test results that can have an impact on the food safety program reviewed and signed off by a person responsible for the food safety program?	Possible Points: 3 Points Scored: 3 Score: Total Compliance
	Auditor Comments: Yes. All records and test results that can have an impact on the food safety program have been reviewed by the person responsible for the food safety program. The operation has Wash Water, Water Tests and Calibration Records that are signed off by Sam Watson, Managing Partner or Keli Bozeman, Food Safety Coordinator. The various records and test results that can have an impact on food safety are reviewed and signed off by the Managing Partner or Food Safety Coordinator. Example: "Well Water Test", 4/21/21, Kelli Bozeman initialed.	

FSMS	Procedures and Corrective Actions
------	-----------------------------------

1.03.01	Question: Is there a written and standardized procedure for creating Standard Operating Procedures (SOPs) and their content?	Possible Points: 5 Points Scored: 5 Score: Total Compliance
	Auditor Comments: Yes. "Creating A Standard Operating Procedure" is the documented instructions for the creation of SOP's. The operation also has a "SOP Format" and a "Revisions of An SOP". These procedures show what, how often, when, whom and corrective actions.	
1.03.02	Question: Are the written procedures available to relevant users and is a master copy maintained in a central file?	Possible Points: 5 Points Scored: 5 Score: Total Compliance
	Auditor Comments: Yes. Written Procedures are made available to employees, buyers (Upon a Written Request) and reviewers. A master copy is on a electronic file and SOP's and Records are kept at the operation.	
1.03.03	Question: Is there a documented corrective action procedure that describes the required processes for handling non-conformances affecting food safety?	Possible Points: 5 Points Scored: 5 Score: Total Compliance
	Auditor Comments: Yes. The "Corrective Action Procedure", describes the required processes for handling non-conformance affecting food safety. This policy outlines the determination of the cause of a deficiency, the action taken to correct the deficiency and the preventative actions needed for the future. Each SOP has a "Corrective Actions" section that specifically outlines the corrective actions for that SOP.	
1.03.04	Question: Is there an incident reporting system, also known as a Notice(s) of Unusual Occurrence and Corrective Actions Log (NUOCA) ?	Possible Points: 5 Points Scored: 5 Score: Total Compliance
	Auditor Comments: Yes. The "Notice of Unusual Occurrence and Corrective Action" is a form available to document unusual occurrences. This operation has had no examples this season.	

FSMS	Internal and External Inspections	
1.04.01	Question: Is there a documented procedure for how internal audits are to be performed at the operations, including frequency and covering all processes impacting food safety and the related documents and records?	Possible Points: 10 Points Scored: 10 Score: Total Compliance
	Auditor Comments: Yes. The "Periodic Facility Self Audit" SOP documents the inspections including practices, related documents, records and recording system. The internal audits are conducted twice a year. The most recent internal audit for FSMS and Farm was dated 9/29/21, it was signed by Kelli Bozeman, Food Safety Coordinator and Sam Watson, Managing Partner.	
1.04.02	Question: Are there written procedures for handling regulatory inspections?	Possible Points: 3 Points Scored: 3 Score: Total Compliance
	Auditor Comments: Yes. The "Regulatory or Independent Inspection Procedure" informs employees of how to handle an inspection. The procedure requires the inspector to be accompanied at all times, rules on sampling and how to follow up on the inspection.	
1.04.03	Question: Are there records of regulatory inspections and/or contracted inspections, company responses and corrective actions, if any?	Possible Points: 5 Points Scored: 5 Score: Total Compliance
	Auditor Comments: Yes. There has been no regulatory inspections this past season. A PGFS 3rd party audit was conducted on 5/6/21. Company responses and corrective actions are available in the final report.	
1.04.04	Question: Are there documented calibration and/or accuracy verification procedures for measuring and monitoring devices used in the operations that are related to the safety of the product?	Possible Points: 10 Points Scored: 10 Score: Total Compliance
	Auditor Comments: Yes. There is documented calibration procedures named "Thermometer Calibration Procedure", for the thermometers, the frequencies and acceptable ranges are identified. This procedure uses the ice bath method. There is also TeeJet "Sparayer Calibration" procedure from the company.	

1.04.05	Question: Are calibration and/or accuracy verification records maintained and are they consistent with the requirements outlined in the SOP(s) for instruments and measuring devices requiring calibration?	Possible Points: 5 Points Scored: 5 Score: Total Compliance
	Auditor Comments: Yes. The "Thermometer Calibration Log" is the form used to document the calibrations occurring. The thermometers are calibrated annually, most recently on 9/29/21 by Kelli Bozeman, Food Safety Coordinator. In field calibration records are on the spray records.	

FSMS	Release of Items/Product
-------------	---------------------------------

1.05.01	Question: Is there a written procedure for handling on hold and rejected items?	Possible Points: 5 Points Scored: 5 Score: Total Compliance
	Auditor Comments: Yes. The "Rejected or On-Hold Products or Goods Procedure", explains how items that have been rejected or placed on hold should be handled and the position required and the procedure to document the separation, identification, reason and the release of items.	

1.05.02	Question: Are there records of the handling of on hold and rejected items kept on file?	Possible Points: 5 Points Scored: 5 Score: Total Compliance
	Auditor Comments: Yes. The operation has an "Rejected or On Hold Products or Goods" log available that show the date, reason and the person responsible for any items placed on-hold. This operation has not had to place any items on hold during the past season.	

1.05.03	Question: Is there a documented product release procedure available?	Possible Points: 5 Points Scored: 5 Score: Total Compliance
	Auditor Comments: Yes. The "Product Release Procedure" includes the procedures for this operation to release product. An employee of the operation signs the release of product.	

1.05.04	Question: Are there records of product releases kept on file?	Possible Points: 5 Points Scored: 5 Score: Total Compliance
	Auditor Comments: Yes. The "Motor Carrier Straight Bill of Lading" is available and kept electronically and physically. Each ticket is signed off by an employee and the driver who transports the product. An example reviewed dated 9/17/21 had the type, amount, price and destination, it was signed by the carrier driver and an employee of Moultrie Melon. Example: 9/17/21, Wiers Farm, Squash, Eggplant, Cucumbers, 1086 boxes, Moultrie Melon.	

1.05.05	Question: Is there a documented procedure for dealing with customer and buyer food safety complaints/feedback along with records and company responses, including corrective actions?	Possible Points: 10 Points Scored: 10 Score: Total Compliance
	Auditor Comments: Yes. The "Complaint Policy" is the procedure that does meet the requirements of dealing with customer complaints. The "Trouble Tickets" records the complaints/feedback including company responses and any corrective actions if applicable. No Examples have occurred this season.	

FSMS	Supplier Monitoring/Control
-------------	------------------------------------

1.06.01	Question: Is there a list of approved suppliers and service providers?	Possible Points: 5 Points Scored: 5 Score: Total Compliance
	Auditor Comments: Yes. The "Approved Supplier List" updated most recently on 9/9/21, shows the approved product and service suppliers. Three examples of providers are, Pratt Industries for corrugated packaging, Grist Pallets and Georgia Pacific for boxes.	

1.06.02	Question: Are there current written food safety related specifications for all incoming products, ingredients, materials (including primary packaging), services provided on-site, and outsourced services?	Possible Points: 5 Points Scored: 5 Score: Total Compliance
	Auditor Comments: Yes. There are current written food safety related specifications for incoming products, ingredients, materials (including packaging), and services. The organization has product descriptions for raw product and ingredients. Specifications are available for packaging containers and chemicals and fertilizers have labels and guaranteed analysis. Services providers have contracts, licenses and insurance certificates.	
1.06.03	Question: Is there a written procedure detailing how suppliers and service providers are evaluated, approved, and include the ongoing verification activities including monitoring? Note that supply chain preventive controls and supply-chain-applied controls are also mentioned in Module 7.	Possible Points: 5 Points Scored: 5 Score: Total Compliance
	Auditor Comments: Yes. The "Supplier Approval Program" describes the way suppliers and service providers are evaluated and approved, including a risk assessment. The procedure describes monitoring, emergency temporary status and ongoing verification.	
1.06.04	Question: Does the organization have documented evidence to ensure that all incoming products, ingredients, materials, services provided on-site and outsourced service suppliers comply with the approval requirements and that all supplier verification activities (including monitoring) are being followed, as defined in the supplier approval procedure?	Possible Points: 15 Points Scored: 15 Score: Total Compliance
	Auditor Comments: Yes. All providers have the appropriate documentation as required by the "Supplier Approval Program". The organization has Letter's of Guarantee, Contracts, licenses, Insurance Certificates and specifications for their suppliers. Example: Georgia Pacific, has a 3rd party packaging certificate that is ANSI Accredited for ISO/IEC 17065. The certificate expires on 1/12/22. Grist Pallets has a letter of guarantee dated 5/30/21 and Pratt Industries has a 3rd party audit from SAI Global that expires 6/19/22.	
1.06.05	Question: Where food safety related testing is being performed by external laboratory service providers, are these licensed and/or accredited laboratories (e.g., ISO 17025 or equivalent, national and local regulations, etc.)?	Possible Points: 5 Points Scored: 5 Score: Total Compliance
	Auditor Comments: Yes. An external laboratory performs the water testing for this operation. "Waters Agricultural Laboratories", has a ANAB, ISO/IEC 17025:2017 Certificate for "Testing" that expires on 8/1/2022.	

FSMS	Traceability and Recall
------	-------------------------

1.07.01	Question: Is there is a document that indicates how the company product tracking system works, thereby enabling trace back and trace forward to occur in the event of a potential recall issue?	Possible Points: 10 Points Scored: 10 Score: Total Compliance
	Auditor Comments: Yes. The "Product Tracking System For Grower/Packer" SOP indicates how the company product tracking system works. The system has a Flow Chart to accomplish the trace back and trace forward. The SOP is written and has a flow diagram to describe this process.	
1.07.02	Question: Does the organization have a documented recall program including procedures, recall team roles and contact details, external contact listings, requirement for recall effectiveness checks, explanation of different recall classes and handling of recalled product?	Possible Points: 15 Points Scored: 15 Score: Total Compliance
	Auditor Comments: Yes. The organization does have a written procedure describing how to perform product recall, it is part of the "Traceback and Product Recall Program". It has the recall team roles and contact details updated on 4/2021. The FDA recall classes are identified in the procedure.	
1.07.03	Question: Is testing of recall procedures (including traceback) performed and documented at least every six months, and the company can demonstrate the ability to trace materials (one step forward, one step back) effectively?	Possible Points: 10 Points Scored: 10 Score: Total Compliance
	Auditor Comments: Yes. Testing for this operation was dated 9/18/21. The mock recall took 10 minutes to identify where all product had been sent. The recall uses a P.O. # System and Ag Tag software to facilitate traceback. The organization had another mock recall dated 4/29/21, they were able to identify where all of a lot were produced and where the product was sent within 10 minutes.	

FSMS	Food Defense
------	--------------

1.08.01	Question: Is there a written food fraud vulnerability assessment (FFVA) and protection plan for all types of fraud, including all incoming and outgoing products?	Possible Points: 5 Points Scored: 5 Score: Total Compliance
	Auditor Comments: Yes. The "Food Fraud and Vulnerability Assessment Tool" was used for all types of fraud, including all incoming and outgoing products. The assessment was reviewed on 4/14/20 by Kelli Bozeman, Food Safety Coordinator.	
1.08.02	Question: Does the company have a documented food defense plan based on the risks associated with the operation?	Possible Points: 5 Points Scored: 5 Score: Total Compliance
	Auditor Comments: Yes. The "Food Defense Plan and Security Measures" is based on the risks associated with this operation. Adjacent Land, Water Supply and Previous Land Use were evaluated as part of this plan.	
1.08.03	Question: Are records associated with the food defense plan and its procedures being maintained, including monitoring, corrective action and verification records (where appropriate)?	Possible Points: 5 Points Scored: 5 Score: Total Compliance
	Auditor Comments: Yes. Records for daily monitoring of the facility, farms, water and swab testing, camera surveillance and employee training is documented to include requirements of the "Food Defense Plan and Security Measures".	
1.08.04	Question: Is there a current list of emergency contact phone numbers for management, law enforcement and appropriate regulatory agencies?	Possible Points: 3 Points Scored: 3 Score: Total Compliance
	Auditor Comments: Yes. A current "Emergency Procedures" SOP included a list of Emergency Contacts (dated 4/14/21) which is posted at the office and in the Food Defense Plan. The list includes management, law enforcement, fire departments and local hospital.	
1.08.05	Question: Are visitors and contractors to the company operations required to adhere to food defense procedures?	Possible Points: 3 Points Scored: 3 Score: Total Compliance
	Auditor Comments: Yes. The food defense procedures on the "Visitor Log", is available as a requirement of visitor sign in.	
FARM	General	
2.01.01	Question: Is there a designated person responsible for the operation's food safety program?	Possible Points: 10 Points Scored: 10 Score: Total Compliance
	Auditor Comments: Yes. Sam Watson, Managing Partner is designated the person responsible for the operation's food safety program.	
2.01.02	Question: If the operation is growing under organic principles, is there written documentation of current certification by an accredited organic certification organization? Informational Gathering Question.	Possible Points: 0 Points Scored: 0 Score: N/A
	Auditor Comments: N/A. This operation is not growing under organic principles.	
2.01.03	Question: Does the operation have a written food safety hygiene and health policy covering at least worker and visitor hygiene and health, infants and toddlers, animal presence in growing and storage areas, fecal matter, dropped product, blood and bodily fluids?	Possible Points: 15 Points Scored: 15 Score: Total Compliance
	Auditor Comments: Yes. The "Employee Policies and Education Outline" SOP and "Company Policies and Procedures", does cover the worker and visitor hygiene and health. It also prohibits infants and toddlers, animals, fecal matter, dropped product and bodily fluids. Workers are provided the rules in their worker training and the training is documented on the Training Log.	

2.01.04	<p>Question: Are the necessary food defense controls implemented in the operation?</p> <p>Auditor Comments: Yes. The farm is posted no trespassing. Water sources and the perimeter are inspected periodically. Worker training includes food defense procedures.</p>	<p>Possible Points: 5 Points Scored: 5 Score: Total Compliance</p>
<p>FARM Site</p>		
2.02.01	<p>Question: Is there a map that accurately shows all aspects of the operation, including water sources and fixtures used to deliver water used in the operation?</p> <p>Auditor Comments: Yes. A map called "Packing Shed Farm 4/20/21" Zones 1-7, is available. The map has the perimeter, wells, risers, fields, and blocks labeled.</p>	<p>Possible Points: 5 Points Scored: 5 Score: Total Compliance</p>
2.02.02	<p>Question: Are growing areas adequately identified or coded to enable trace back and trace forward in the event of a recall?</p> <p>Auditor Comments: Yes. The map has the farms and zones identified using a numeric system. The map used is in sufficient detail to enable trace back, the fertilizer logs and pesticide logs are tied to this coding system.</p>	<p>Possible Points: 15 Points Scored: 15 Score: Total Compliance</p>
2.02.03	<p>Question: Is the exterior area immediately outside the growing area, including roads, yards and parking areas, free of litter, weeds and standing water?</p> <p>Auditor Comments: Yes. The property is in a rural area surrounded by cropland and natural woods. The farm was free of litter, weeds or standing water during the inspection.</p>	<p>Possible Points: 5 Points Scored: 5 Score: Total Compliance</p>
2.02.04	<p>Question: Are control measures being implemented for the outside storage of equipment, pallets, tires, etc. (i.e. out of the mud, stacked to prevent pest harborage, away from the growing area)?</p> <p>Auditor Comments: Yes. Control measures are in place for the outside storage of equipment, pallets, tires, etc., the farm was neat and tidy with all storage away from the growing area. Nothing was observed in the mud or stacked in a way to allow pest harborage.</p>	<p>Possible Points: 5 Points Scored: 5 Score: Total Compliance</p>
2.02.05	<p>Question: Are garbage receptacles and dumpsters kept covered or closed?</p> <p>Auditor Comments: Yes. The garbage dumpsters and garbage cans were observed covered during the inspection.</p>	<p>Possible Points: 5 Points Scored: 5 Score: Total Compliance</p>
2.02.06	<p>Question: Where soil, substrates or fertilizer (e.g., compost) are stored or handled, are measures in place to ensure seepage and runoff is collected or diverted and does not reach growing areas, product, or any of the water sources? A ZERO POINT DOWN SCORE IN THIS QUESTION RESULTS IN AN AUTOMATIC FAILURE OF THE AUDIT.</p> <p>Auditor Comments: Yes. This operation did not have any runoff or seepage of any soil, substrates or fertilizer. The only item stored was liquid fertilizer that was contained in bulk tanks that were sound with no leaks.</p>	<p>Possible Points: 15 Points Scored: 15 Score: Total Compliance</p>
2.02.07	<p>Question: Where there are fill stations for fuel or pesticides, is it evident that the location and/or use is not a risk of contamination to the product, water sources, growing areas, equipment, packaging materials, etc.?</p> <p>Auditor Comments: Yes. The fill stations on this operation were not located close to the growing area. The fertilizer fill station was well away from the growing area.</p>	<p>Possible Points: 15 Points Scored: 15 Score: Total Compliance</p>

2.02.08	Question: Is the audited area free from animal presence and/or animal activity (wild or domestic)? If Yes, go to 2.02.09.	Possible Points: 15 Points Scored: 0 Score: No									
	Auditor Comments: No. The audited area had some deer tracks observed during the inspection.										
<table border="1" style="width: 100%;"> <tr> <td colspan="3">Auditee Comments:</td> </tr> <tr> <td style="width: 60%;"></td> <td style="width: 10%; text-align: center;">CA Accepted?</td> <td style="width: 30%;"></td> </tr> <tr> <td>CB/Auditor Review Comments: No CAs submitted.</td> <td style="text-align: center;">No</td> <td> Possible Points: 15 Points Scored: 0 </td> </tr> </table>			Auditee Comments:				CA Accepted?		CB/Auditor Review Comments: No CAs submitted.	No	Possible Points: 15 Points Scored: 0
Auditee Comments:											
	CA Accepted?										
CB/Auditor Review Comments: No CAs submitted.	No	Possible Points: 15 Points Scored: 0									

2.02.08a	Question: Is there any evidence of fecal matter in the audited area?	Possible Points: 15 Points Scored: 15 Score: Total Compliance
	Auditor Comments: TC. There was no evidence of fecal matter observed during the inspection.	

2.02.08b	Question: Is the fecal matter found in the audited area, a systematic event (not sporadic)? ANY DOWN SCORE IN THIS QUESTION RESULTS IN AN AUTOMATIC FAILURE OF THE AUDIT.	Possible Points: 0 Points Scored: 0 Score: N/A
	Auditor Comments: N/A. No fecal matter was observed.	

2.02.09	Question: Is the audited area free of evidence of infants and toddlers?	Possible Points: 10 Points Scored: 10 Score: Total Compliance
	Auditor Comments: Yes. There was no evidence of infants or toddlers in the audited area during the inspection.	

FARM	Ground History
-------------	-----------------------

2.03.01	Question: Were growing area(s) used for growing food crops for human consumption last season?	Possible Points: 0 Points Scored: 0 Score: Yes
	Auditor Comments: Yes. This growing area has been in vegetable production for several years.	

2.03.02	Question: Has the growing area(s) been used for any non-agricultural functions? If No, go to 2.03.03.	Possible Points: 0 Points Scored: 0 Score: No
	Auditor Comments: No. The growing area has not been used for any non-agricultural functions.	

2.03.02a	Question: If the growing area has been used previously for non-agricultural functions, have soil tests been conducted showing soil was negative or within an appropriate regulatory agency's approved limits for contaminants?	Possible Points: 0 Points Scored: 0 Score: N/A
	Auditor Comments:	

2.03.03	Question: Has the growing area(s) been used for animal husbandry or grazing land for animals? If No, go to 2.03.04.	Possible Points: 0 Points Scored: 0 Score: No
	Auditor Comments: No. The growing area has not been used for animal husbandry or grazing lands. The area has been in vegetables for several years.	

2.03.03a	Question: If the land was used previously for animal husbandry or grazing land for livestock, has a risk assessment been performed?	Possible Points: 0 Points Scored: 0 Score: N/A
	Auditor Comments:	

2.03.04	Question: Has flooding from uncontrolled causes occurred on the growing area(s) since the previous growing season? If No, go to 2.03.05.	Possible Points: 0 Points Scored: 0 Score: No
	Auditor Comments: No. Flooding from uncontrolled cause has not occurred in this growing area.	
2.03.04a	Question: If the growing area(s) and product was affected from the flood waters, is there documented evidence that corrective measures were taken to affected land and product?	Possible Points: 0 Points Scored: 0 Score: N/A
	Auditor Comments:	
2.03.04b	Question: Have soil tests been conducted on the flooded area(s) showing the product and/or soil was negative or within an appropriate regulatory agency's approved limits for contaminants?	Possible Points: 0 Points Scored: 0 Score: N/A
	Auditor Comments:	
2.03.04c	Question: If septic or sewage systems adjacent to the growing area were affected by the flood waters, is there a documented inspection after flooding to ensure they are functioning properly and are not a source of contamination?	Possible Points: 0 Points Scored: 0 Score: N/A
	Auditor Comments:	
2.03.05	Question: Has a documented risk assessment been conducted at least annually for the operation?	Possible Points: 10 Points Scored: 10 Score: Total Compliance
	Auditor Comments: Yes. The "Land Risk Assessment Packing Shed Farm" was completed on 9/15/21, this document assesses the risk of growing on this operation including the adjacent lands, water sources, fertilizers and crop protection chemicals, worker health and hygiene, equipment and other applicable areas.	
2.03.05a	Question: If any risk is identified, have corrective actions and/or preventative measures been documented and implemented?	Possible Points: 0 Points Scored: 0 Score: N/A
	Auditor Comments: N/A. No risk have been identified that require corrective actions and/or preventative measures.	
FARM	Adjacent Land Use	
2.04.01	Question: Is the adjacent land to the growing area a possible source of contamination from intensive livestock production (e.g., feedlots, dairy operations, poultry houses, meat rendering operation)? If No, go to 2.04.02.	Possible Points: 10 Points Scored: 10 Score: No
	Auditor Comments: No. The adjacent land is croplands and native woodlands, none are a possible source of contamination from intensive livestock production.	
2.04.01a	Question: Where there is intensive livestock production on the adjacent land, have appropriate measures been taken to mitigate this possible contamination source onto the growing area (e.g., buffer areas, physical barriers, foundation, fences, ditches, etc.)?	Possible Points: 0 Points Scored: 0 Score: N/A
	Auditor Comments:	
2.04.02	Question: Is there evidence of domestic animals, wild animals, grazing lands (includes homes with hobby farms, and non-commercial livestock) in proximity to the growing operation? If No, go to 2.04.03.	Possible Points: 10 Points Scored: 10 Score: No
	Auditor Comments: No. There is no evidence of domestic or wild animals observed on adjacent land.	
2.04.02a	Question: Have physical measures been put in place to restrain domestic and wild animals, grazing lands (includes homes with hobby farms, and non-commercial livestock) and their waste from entering the growing area (e.g., vegetative strips, windbreaks, physical barriers, berms, fences, diversion ditches)?	Possible Points: 0 Points Scored: 0 Score: N/A
	Auditor Comments:	

2.04.03	Question: Are untreated animal manure piles, compost, biosolids, or non-synthetic amendment stored and/or applied on adjacent land? If No, go to 2.04.04.	Possible Points: 10 Points Scored: 10 Score: No
	Auditor Comments: No. No untreated manure piles, compost, biosolids, or non-synthetic amendments were observed during the inspection.	
2.04.03a	Question: Where present, have physical measures been taken to secure untreated animal manure piles, compost, biosolids, or non-synthetic amendment stored and/or applied on adjacent land?	Possible Points: 0 Points Scored: 0 Score: N/A
	Auditor Comments:	
2.04.03b	Question: If biosolids are stored and/or applied on adjacent land, has the adjacent landowner supplied paperwork confirming the biosolids meet prevailing guidelines, governmental, or local standards?	Possible Points: 0 Points Scored: 0 Score: N/A
	Auditor Comments:	
2.04.04	Question: Is the growing area situated in a higher risk location where contamination could occur from nearby operations or functions (e.g., leach fields, runoff or potential flooding from sewers, toilet systems, industrial facilities, labor camps, etc.)? If No, go to 2.04.05.	Possible Points: 10 Points Scored: 10 Score: No
	Auditor Comments: No. The growing area is in a remote location with croplands and woods surrounding it.	
2.04.04a	Question: Where the growing area is situated in a higher risk location, have appropriate measures been taken to mitigate risks related to nearby operations?	Possible Points: 0 Points Scored: 0 Score: N/A
	Auditor Comments:	
2.04.05	Question: Are there any other potential risks in the adjacent land that could potentially lead to contamination of the growing area?	Possible Points: 10 Points Scored: 10 Score: Total Compliance
	Auditor Comments: Yes. There are no potential risks observed on adjacent land.	
2.04.05a	Question: Have appropriate measures been taken to mitigate risks related to nearby operations?	Possible Points: 0 Points Scored: 0 Score: N/A
	Auditor Comments: N/A. No risks are on nearby operations.	
2.04.06	Question: Is there evidence of human fecal matter in the adjacent land to the audited area? If No, go to 2.05.01.	Possible Points: 15 Points Scored: 15 Score: No
	Auditor Comments: No. Human fecal matter was not observed on the growing area or on adjacent land.	
2.04.06a	Question: Where there is evidence of human fecal matter in the adjacent land, are there adequate controls in place to mitigate risk (e.g., access controls (barriers), distance from the growing area and equipment, crop type and maturity, land condition, etc.)?	Possible Points: 0 Points Scored: 0 Score: N/A
	Auditor Comments:	
FARM Inspection		
2.05.01	Question: Is there documented evidence of the internal audits performed, detailing findings and corrective actions?	Possible Points: 15 Points Scored: 15 Score: Total Compliance
	Auditor Comments: Yes. A PGFS Food Safety Audit Checklist was conducted on 9/29/21 by Kelli Bozeman, Food Safety Manager for the "Food Safety Management System" and the "Good Agricultural Practices: Farm". The checklist includes findings and corrective actions.	

2.05.02	Question: Are there chemical inventory logs for chemicals, including pesticides and fertilizers?	Possible Points: 0 Points Scored: 0 Score: N/A
	Auditor Comments: N/A. This operation did not have any chemical and fertilizer inventory. Chemical and fertilizer are not stored by this operation.	
2.05.03	Question: Are all chemicals stored securely, safely and are they labeled correctly?	Possible Points: 0 Points Scored: 0 Score: N/A
	Auditor Comments: N/A. No chemicals kept on site at this farm. Chemicals are delivered as needed and not stored.	
2.05.04	Question: Are "food grade" and "non-food grade" chemicals used appropriately, according to the label and stored in a controlled manner?	Possible Points: 0 Points Scored: 0 Score: N/A
	Auditor Comments: N/A. No food grade chemicals stored on-site.	
2.05.05	Question: Are the crop, ingredients (including water), food contact packaging and food contact surfaces within accepted tolerances for spoilage and free from adulteration? ANY DOWN SCORE IN THIS QUESTION RESULTS IN AN AUTOMATIC FAILURE OF THE AUDIT.	Possible Points: 15 Points Scored: 15 Score: Total Compliance
	Auditor Comments: Yes. All items observed were within the accepted tolerance for spoilage and free from adulteration.	
FARM	Training	
2.06.01	Question: Is there a food safety hygiene training program covering new and existing workers and are there records of these training events?	Possible Points: 15 Points Scored: 15 Score: Total Compliance
	Auditor Comments: Yes. Numerous trainings occur to train new and existing workers, an example on the "Employee Training Log" was dated 5/6/21 for 17 people for "Food Safety, WPS, GAP Training". The employees signed the log for the training. The training schedule shows other employees will be trained as they are employed.	
2.06.02	Question: Are there written and communicated procedures in place that require food handlers to report any cuts or grazes and/or if they are suffering from any illnesses that might be a contamination risk to the products being produced, and return to work requirements? (In countries with health privacy/confidentiality laws, e.g. USA, auditors can check procedure/policy but not actual records).	Possible Points: 10 Points Scored: 10 Score: Total Compliance
	Auditor Comments: Yes. The "Company Policies and Procedures" and the "General Operation Policies and Procedures" SOP's are communicated both in training and given in writing to employees. The policies require employees to report any cuts or grazes and/or if they are suffering any illnesses that might be a contamination risk to the products being produced. Return to work procedures are available.	
2.06.03	Question: Are there worker food safety non-conformance records and associated corrective actions (including retraining records)?	Possible Points: 0 Points Scored: 0 Score: N/A
	Auditor Comments: N/A. This operation has had no non-conformance by workers.	
FARM	Field Worker Hygiene (Applies to on-the-farm workers, not the harvesting workers)	
2.07.01	Question: Are toilet facilities adequate in number and location? A ZERO POINT (NON-COMPLIANCE) DOWNSCORE IN THIS QUESTION RESULTS IN AUTOMATIC FAILURE OF THIS AUDIT.	Possible Points: 15 Points Scored: 15 Score: Total Compliance
	Auditor Comments: Yes. This operation has 2 portable trailers with two toilets on each trailer. No employees were on-site during the inspection. Records show approximately 30 employees are used in the production of the crop.	

2.07.01a	Question: Are toilet facilities in a suitable location to prevent contamination to product, packaging, equipment, and growing areas?	Possible Points: 15 Points Scored: 15 Score: Total Compliance
	Auditor Comments: Yes. The portable facilities are out of the growing area in a suitable location to prevent contamination to product, packaging, equipment and growing area.	
2.07.01b	Question: Are the catch basins of the toilets designed and maintained to prevent contamination (e.g., free from leaks and cracks)?	Possible Points: 5 Points Scored: 5 Score: Total Compliance
	Auditor Comments: Yes. The portable toilets were all equipped with catch basins that were sound with no leaks.	
2.07.01c	Question: Is there a documented procedure for emptying the catch basin in a hygienic manner and also in a way that prevents product, packaging, equipment, water systems and growing area contamination?	Possible Points: 5 Points Scored: 5 Score: Total Compliance
	Auditor Comments: Yes. The documented procedure from Brinson Septic Service, LLC., was named "Service and Cleaning of Port a Jons". This procedure describes emptying the catch basins in a hygienic manner that prevents contamination to product, packaging, equipment, water systems and the growing area.	
2.07.01d	Question: Are toilets constructed of materials that are easy to clean?	Possible Points: 3 Points Scored: 3 Score: Total Compliance
	Auditor Comments: Yes. The toilets are constructed of molded plastic. The materials were easily cleaned and observed as clean during the inspection.	
2.07.01e	Question: Are the toilet materials constructed of a light color allowing easy evaluation of cleaning performance?	Possible Points: 3 Points Scored: 3 Score: Total Compliance
	Auditor Comments: Yes. The outside of the toilet was brown and the inside of the restroom was creme which allowed for easy evaluation of cleaning performance.	
2.07.01f	Question: Are toilets supplied with toilet paper and is the toilet paper maintained properly (e.g., toilet paper rolls are not stored on the floor or in the urinals)?	Possible Points: 5 Points Scored: 5 Score: Total Compliance
	Auditor Comments: Yes. The toilet was supplied with toilet paper on a roll that was properly hung up.	
2.07.01g	Question: Are the toilet facilities and hand washing stations clean and are there records showing toilet cleaning, servicing and stocking is occurring regularly?	Possible Points: 10 Points Scored: 10 Score: Total Compliance
	Auditor Comments: Yes. The toilet facilities and hand wash stations were clean during the inspection. The Service Records posted in the toilets show the cleaning, servicing and stocking of the toilet facility twice weekly. The most recent cleaning was conducted on 9/29/21.	
2.07.02	Question: Is hand washing signage posted appropriately?	Possible Points: 5 Points Scored: 5 Score: Total Compliance
	Auditor Comments: Yes. Hand washing signs were posted in the restroom and at the hand wash station attached outside the toilet.	
2.07.03	Question: Are hand washing stations adequate in number and appropriately located for worker access and monitoring usage? A ZERO POINT (NON-COMPLIANCE) DOWNSCORE IN THIS QUESTION RESULTS IN AUTOMATIC FAILURE OF THIS AUDIT.	Possible Points: 15 Points Scored: 15 Score: Total Compliance
	Auditor Comments: Yes. There was 2 portable trailers with hand wash stations available, there were no employees on site during the inspection.	

2.07.03a	Question: Are the hand wash stations designed and maintained properly (e.g., ability to capture or control rinse water to prevent contamination onto product, packaging, and growing area, free of clogged drains, etc.)?	Possible Points: 5 Points Scored: 5 Score: Total Compliance
	Auditor Comments: Yes. The hand wash stations are designed and maintained properly. They are outside the toilets on the portable trailer and they flow into the catch basins on the trailer.	
2.07.03b	Question: Are hand wash stations clearly visible (e.g., situated outside the toilet facility) and easily accessible to workers?	Possible Points: 5 Points Scored: 5 Score: Total Compliance
	Auditor Comments: Yes. The hand wash stations are located outside the toilets cubicles and easily accessible to workers.	
2.07.03c	Question: Are hand wash stations adequately stocked with unscented soap and paper towels?	Possible Points: 5 Points Scored: 5 Score: Total Compliance
	Auditor Comments: Yes. The hand wash stations were adequately stocked with unscented soap and single use paper towels.	
2.07.04	Question: Are workers washing and sanitizing their hands before starting work each day, after using the restroom, after breaks, before putting on gloves and whenever hands may be contaminated?	Possible Points: 0 Points Scored: 0 Score: N/A
	Auditor Comments: N/A. No workers on site during the inspection.	
2.07.05	Question: Is there no sign of any worker with boils, sores, open wounds or exhibiting signs of foodborne illness working directly or indirectly with food?	Possible Points: 10 Points Scored: 10 Score: Total Compliance
	Auditor Comments: Yes. There was no sign of any worker with boils, sores, open wounds or exhibiting signs of foodborne illness.	
2.07.06	Question: Is jewelry confined to a plain wedding band and watches are not worn?	Possible Points: 5 Points Scored: 5 Score: Total Compliance
	Auditor Comments: Yes. Jewelry observed was confined to a plain wedding band.	
2.07.07	Question: Worker personal items are not being stored in the growing area(s) or material storage area(s)?	Possible Points: 5 Points Scored: 5 Score: Total Compliance
	Auditor Comments: Yes. Workers personal items are not being stored in the growing area or the material storage area. A designated area is available for personal items and most are kept in the transportation bus.	
2.07.08	Question: Is smoking, eating, chewing and drinking confined to designated areas, and spitting is prohibited in all areas?	Possible Points: 5 Points Scored: 5 Score: Total Compliance
	Auditor Comments: Yes. Smoking, eating, drinking and chewing was not observed during the inspection. Procedure prohibits this other than in designated areas. Procedure did prohibit spitting.	
2.07.09	Question: Is fresh potable drinking water readily accessible to workers?	Possible Points: 10 Points Scored: 10 Score: Total Compliance
	Auditor Comments: Yes. Crew leaders provide potable water from packing facility, the water containers were clean and readily available for the workers.	
2.07.09a	Question: Are single use cups provided (unless a drinking fountain is used) and made available near the drinking water?	Possible Points: 5 Points Scored: 5 Score: Total Compliance
	Auditor Comments: Yes. Single use cups are provided at each water keg.	

2.07.10	Question: Are first aid kits adequately stocked and readily available?	Possible Points: 5 Points Scored: 5 Score: Total Compliance
	Auditor Comments: Yes. First aid kits were adequately stocked and available, they are provided to each crew leader and available at the central office on the farm.	
2.07.11	Question: Are there adequate trash cans placed in suitable locations?	Possible Points: 5 Points Scored: 5 Score: Total Compliance
	Auditor Comments: Yes. Adequate trash cans were placed in suitable locations at the restroom facilities and the central office location	
2.07.12	Question: Have any potential foreign material issues (e.g., metal, glass, plastic) contamination issues been controlled?	Possible Points: 5 Points Scored: 5 Score: Total Compliance
	Auditor Comments: Yes. Potential foreign material contamination issues have been controlled during the inspection.	

FARM	Inorganic Fertilizers
------	-----------------------

2.08.06	Question: Is the operation using inorganic fertilizers as an input? (e.g., ammonium nitrate, ammonium sulfate, chemically synthesized urea, etc.) Informational Gathering Question.	Possible Points: 0 Points Scored: 0 Score: Yes
	Auditor Comments: Yes. Inorganic fertilizer is being used by this operation.	
2.08.06a	Question: Is fertilizer being used where the country regulations/guidelines ban the use of such materials (e.g., Californian Leafy Green Commodity Specific Guidelines)? ANY DOWN SCORE IN THIS QUESTION RESULTS IN AN AUTOMATIC FAILURE OF THE AUDIT.	Possible Points: 15 Points Scored: 15 Score: Total Compliance
	Auditor Comments: TC. Fertilizer is not being used that has been banned for any reason.	
2.08.06b	Question: Are there fertilizer use records available for each growing area, including application records?	Possible Points: 15 Points Scored: 15 Score: Total Compliance
	Auditor Comments: Yes. The records of fertilizer use is found on "Fertilizer" Log. An example: 9/13/21, Shed Farm, Zones 1,2,3,5,6,7,8,9, 4-0-8, 10 gallons/acre. Numerous records were reviewed and the appropriate information was available for each application.	
2.08.06c	Question: Are there Certificate(s) of Analysis (CoA), specifications, product label or other documents available for review provided by the supplier stating the components of the material?	Possible Points: 10 Points Scored: 10 Score: Total Compliance
	Auditor Comments: Yes. A guaranteed analysis with all inert ingredients listed was available for 4-0-8 liquid fertilizer from Howard Fertilizer and from Nutrien Ag Solutions for 5-7-22 granular. This operation uses multiple fertilizers and they showed Guaranteed Analysis for them.	

FARM	Well
------	------

2.09.02a	Question: Are generic E.coli tests conducted on the water (taken from the closest practical source of use) at the required and/or expected frequency? A ZERO POINT (NONCOMPLIANCE) DOWN SCORE IN THIS QUESTION RESULTS IN AUTOMATIC FAILURE OF THIS AUDIT.	Possible Points: 15 Points Scored: 15 Score: Total Compliance
	Auditor Comments: Yes. Water tests are available dated 4/21/21, the required frequency is pre-season. Test results were < 1.0 mpr/100ml for Generic E.coli and < 1.0 mpr/100ml for total coliform. All tests were within the established criteria of this operation.	

2.09.02b	Question: Do written procedures (SOPs) exist covering proper sampling protocols which include where samples should be taken and how samples should be identified?	Possible Points: 10 Points Scored: 10 Score: Total Compliance
	Auditor Comments: Yes. The written procedures that cover proper sampling protocols and where and how samples should be labeled are called, "Water Usage" SOP.	
2.09.02c	Question: Do written procedures (SOPs) exist covering corrective measures for unsuitable or abnormal water testing results?	Possible Points: 10 Points Scored: 10 Score: Total Compliance
	Auditor Comments: Yes. The "Water Usage" SOP has a section that covers corrective measures for unsuitable or abnormal water test results.	
2.09.02d	Question: If unsuitable or abnormal results have been detected, have documented corrective measures been performed?	Possible Points: 0 Points Scored: 0 Score: N/A
	Auditor Comments: N/A. No unsuitable or abnormal water test results have been detected for this operation	
2.09.02e	Question: Are there records of any anti-microbial water treatment (e.g. chlorination, U.V., ozone, etc.), and is testing current and available?	Possible Points: 0 Points Scored: 0 Score: N/A
	Auditor Comments: N/A. No water treatment is conducted by this operation.	
2.09.02f	Question: Are records kept for periodic visual inspection and disinfection (if occurring) of the water source and available for review?	Possible Points: 5 Points Scored: 5 Score: Total Compliance
	Auditor Comments: Yes. The "Visual Inspection of Water Source", most recently conducted on 9/27/21 documents the weekly inspections of the water sources on this operation.	
2.09.07	Question: Is dryland farming used in the growing operation?	Possible Points: 0 Points Scored: 0 Score: No
	Auditor Comments: No. This farm is irrigated.	
2.09.08	Question: Is there a documented assessment for each water source covering animal access, upstream contamination/runoff, proper well condition, water treatment, backflow, maintenance, cross contamination from leaching, recirculating water systems, etc., as applicable?	Possible Points: 15 Points Scored: 15 Score: Total Compliance
	Auditor Comments: Yes. The "Water Risk Assessment" SOP is a documented assessment of the well at this location. It was most recently conducted on 9/15/21, and it assessed the applicable issues for this well.	
2.09.09	Question: Are there backflow prevention devices on all main lines, including where chemical, fertilizer and pesticide applications are made?	Possible Points: 10 Points Scored: 10 Score: Total Compliance
	Auditor Comments: Yes. Backflow prevention devices was on the well and the fertilizer application systems.	
2.09.10	Question: If the operation stores water (tank, cistern, container), is the storage container well maintained?	Possible Points: 0 Points Scored: 0 Score: N/A
	Auditor Comments: N/A. No stored water at this operation.	

FARM	Pesticide Usage
-------------	------------------------

2.10.01	<p>Question: Are there up-to-date records of all pesticides applied during the growing cycle? A ZERO POINT (NON-COMPLIANCE) DOWNSCORE IN THIS QUESTION RESULTS IN AUTOMATIC FAILURE OF THIS AUDIT.</p>	<p>Possible Points: 15 Points Scored: 10 Score: Minor Deficiency</p>									
	<p>Auditor Comments: Mn. This operation records the pesticide applications on the "Clark Crop Consulting Spray Report for Chill C Farms". Numerous application records were reviewed. The time of day was not recorded on the records.</p>										
<table border="1"> <tr> <td colspan="3">Auditee Comments:</td> </tr> <tr> <td></td> <td style="text-align: center;">CA Accepted?</td> <td></td> </tr> <tr> <td>CB/Auditor Review Comments: No CAs submitted.</td> <td style="text-align: center;">No</td> <td> <p>Possible Points: 15 Points Scored: 10</p> </td> </tr> </table>			Auditee Comments:				CA Accepted?		CB/Auditor Review Comments: No CAs submitted.	No	<p>Possible Points: 15 Points Scored: 10</p>
Auditee Comments:											
	CA Accepted?										
CB/Auditor Review Comments: No CAs submitted.	No	<p>Possible Points: 15 Points Scored: 10</p>									
2.10.02	<p>Question: Do records show that pesticides and their use are in compliance with all requirements of label direction, national (e.g., EPA) registration and any federal, state or local regulations and guidelines? ANY DOWN SCORE IN THIS QUESTION RESULTS IN AN AUTOMATIC FAILURE OF THE AUDIT.</p>	<p>Possible Points: 15 Points Scored: 15 Score: Total Compliance</p>									
	<p>Auditor Comments: Yes. An example of a pesticide application: "Treatment", Packing Shed, Around Shed, pepper, Ryan, 9/29/21, Portal, 71711-19, Fenpyroximate, 2 pint/acre, 12 hr, 1 day. All records reviewed were in compliance of label directions.</p>										
2.10.03	<p>Question: Where products are destined for export, do records show that only pesticides approved for use in destination market(s) are used and are in compliance with all requirements of label direction, national (e.g., EPA) registration and any federal, state or local regulations and guidelines? Corrective actions are required if a non-compliance. If corrective actions are not provided and acceptable by the certification body a failure of the audit is scored.</p>	<p>Possible Points: 0 Points Scored: 0 Score: N/A</p>									
	<p>Auditor Comments: N/A. No products are currently being sold outside the U.S.</p>										
2.10.04	<p>Question: Where products are destined for export, are there records showing that pre-harvest intervals and application rates are sufficient to meet MRL entry requirements of the country of export? Records show any non-compliant product is diverted to a market where it meets requirements. Corrective actions are required if a non-compliance. If corrective actions are not provided and acceptable by the certification body a failure of the audit is scored.</p>	<p>Possible Points: 0 Points Scored: 0 Score: N/A</p>									
	<p>Auditor Comments: N/A. No export occurs for this operation.</p>										
2.10.05	<p>Question: For those pesticides that are not registered for use on the target crops in the country of production or if the country does not have, or has a partial legislative framework to cover pesticides, can the grower show that they have registration information, label information, MRL tolerances, etc. for the country of destination? Corrective actions are required if a non-compliance. If corrective actions are not provided and acceptable by the certification body a failure of the audit is scored.</p>	<p>Possible Points: 0 Points Scored: 0 Score: N/A</p>									
	<p>Auditor Comments: N/A. No exports occur for this operation. All chemicals follow label restrictions for the U. S.</p>										
2.10.06	<p>Question: Where harvesting is restricted by pre-harvest intervals, are required pre-harvest intervals on product labels, national (e.g., EPA) registration and any federal, state or local regulations and guidelines being adhered to? ANY DOWN SCORE IN THIS QUESTION RESULTS IN AN AUTOMATIC FAILURE OF THE AUDIT.</p>	<p>Possible Points: 15 Points Scored: 15 Score: Total Compliance</p>									
	<p>Auditor Comments: Yes. On 9/29/21 Portal was applied to pepper. The PHI is 1 day, on 9/30/21 the pepper had not been harvested and would not be harvested for at least another 10 days. The Crop consulting firm and the grower owners are aware of the importance of not breaking a PHI and of following all label requirements.</p>										
2.10.07	<p>Question: Is there a documented procedure for the mixing/loading of pesticides?</p>	<p>Possible Points: 5 Points Scored: 5 Score: Total Compliance</p>									
	<p>Auditor Comments: Yes. There is a documented procedure for mixing/loading of pesticides in the "Pesticide Usage" SOP in the "Mixing Crop Protection Chemicals" section.</p>										
2.10.08	<p>Question: Is there a documented procedure for the application of pesticides?</p>	<p>Possible Points: 5 Points Scored: 5 Score: Total Compliance</p>									
	<p>Auditor Comments: Yes. There is documented application procedure for pesticides in the "Pesticide Usage" SOP in the "Applying Crop Protection Chemicals" section.</p>										

2.10.09	Question: Is there a documented procedure for the rinsing and cleaning of pesticide equipment?	Possible Points: 5 Points Scored: 5 Score: Total Compliance
	Auditor Comments: Yes. There is documented procedure for the rinsing and cleaning of pesticide equipment in the "Pesticide Usage" SOP in the "Crop Protection Equipment Cleaning" section.	
2.10.10	Question: Is there documentation that shows the individual(s) making decisions for pesticide applications are competent?	Possible Points: 15 Points Scored: 15 Score: Total Compliance
	Auditor Comments: Yes. Samuel L. Watson, Managing Partner has a Commercial Pesticide Applicator License from the State of Georgia, number 05570, it expires on 12/28/25.	
2.10.11	Question: Is there documentation that shows that individuals who handle pesticide materials are trained and are under the supervision of a trained person?	Possible Points: 15 Points Scored: 15 Score: Total Compliance
	Auditor Comments: Yes. All individuals who handle pesticides have documented training on their training log and are under the Supervision of Sam Watson, Managing Partner.	
2.10.12	Question: Are pesticides stored without risk of contamination, in a locked, dedicated area with legible labels, and are empty pesticide containers held and disposed of according to their label and/or regulatory instructions?	Possible Points: 0 Points Scored: 0 Score: N/A
	Auditor Comments: N/A. This farm does not store any pesticides at this operation. No empty pesticides containers were observed.	
2.10.13	Question: Is it evident that the equipment used for pesticide applications is in good working order?	Possible Points: 0 Points Scored: 0 Score: N/A
	Auditor Comments: N/A. No spray equipment was observed at this farm.	
2.10.14	Question: Are restricted entry interval (REI) signs posted in the area(s) where pesticide applications occur?	Possible Points: 0 Points Scored: 0 Score: N/A
	Auditor Comments: N/A. No spray had occurred recently that required REI posting. The operation did demonstrate the REI signs and how they are used after an application.	