

This document is subject to changes. The current information and status of this operation is posted in the Certification Program website at [PrimusGFS.com](https://PrimusGFS.com)

**FINAL AUDIT REPORT**

CB Registration No. WQS-PGFS-2735-6

PrimusGFS Version 3.2



 Operation Type: Farm  
 Audit Report Summary

PrimusGFS ID #380572 - Cert: 7

Audited by WQS, LLC.

[Ver en Español](#)

Organization:	<b>Moultrie Melon Company</b> Contact(s): <a href="#">Kelli Bozeman</a> <a href="#">Sam Watson</a> Address: 356 Funston Doerun Road 31768 Location: Moultrie, Georgia, United States Phone Number: 229-873-9912
Operation:	<b>Thaggard Farm</b> Contact(s): <a href="#">Kelli Bozeman</a> Location: 2842 Mt. Sinai Rd Doerun, Georgia 31744, United States
Shipper:	Moultrie Melon Company
GFSI Audit Scope(s):	BI: Farming of Plants (other than grains and pulses)
Operation Type:	<b>Farm</b>
Audit Type:	<b>Announced Audit</b>
Includes Module 9 – IPM Practices:	Yes
Audit Executive Summary:	The PrimusGFS v3.2 farm audit was conducted on 09/19/2025 at Moultrie Melon Company, covering approximately 32 acres. The operation employs 70 seasonal employees and 2 full-time employees. At the time of the audit, there was no farm activity observed in the growing areas. The farm's primary water source is a deep well, and irrigation is performed using drip irrigation. The current crop in the ground is eggplant and cucumber. Adjacent land use includes roads, row crops, and wooded areas, which were evaluated for potential food safety impacts. This scope includes all production areas, farming activities, and supporting infrastructure relevant to the PrimusGFS v3.2 audit standard.
Date Documentation Review Started:	19 Sep 2025 11:30
Date Documentation Review Finished:	19 Sep 2025 18:15
Total Amount of Time on the Documentation Review:	6.75 Hours
Date Visual Inspection Started:	19 Sep 2025 09:45
Date Visual Inspection Finished:	19 Sep 2025 11:30
Total Amount of Time on Visual Inspection:	1.75 Hours
Addendum(s) included in the audit:	Not Applicable
Product(s) observed during audit:	Eggplant/Aubergine, American Cucumber
Similar product(s)/process(es) not observed:	None
Product(s) applied for but not observed:	None
Auditor:	<a href="#">Jill Chafin Ford</a> (WQS, LLC.)
Preliminary Audit Score:	<b>93%</b>
Final Audit Score:	<b>98%</b>
Certificate Valid From:	27 Oct 2025 To 26 Oct 2026

GPS Coordinates:	Latitude	Longitude	 <a href="#">Click here to see map</a>
	31° 18' 37"	83° 56' 38"	
	31° 18' 55"	83° 56' 25"	
	31° 18' 26"	83° 56' 29"	
 Icon Indicates the operation has met Total Compliance for Module 9 – IPM Practices	<a href="#">Module 9 – IPM Practices</a>		

[FSMA Summary Report](#)
[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?	Cucumbers,Solanacea

Information related to the audited operation

What is the maximum number of workers during peak season?	70	Is work being performed at the time of the audit?	No
Adjacent Land:	The adjacent land around this farm are row crop farms and wooded areas.	What work is being performed?	
Operation Size:	32 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
American Cucumber	Observed on the day of audit	From: May To: December	United States
Eggplant/Aubergine	Observed on the day of audit	From: May To: December	United States

AUDIT SCORING SUMMARY	Pre-Corrective Action Review		Post-Corrective Action Review	
Food Safety Management System Requirements	Score:	226	Score:	245
	Possible Points:	248	Possible Points:	248
	Percent Score:	91%	Percent Score:	98%
Module 2 - Farm	Score:	509	Score:	522
	Possible Points:	534	Possible Points:	534
	Percent Score:	95%	Percent Score:	97%
TOTAL	Score:	735	Score:	767
	Possible Points:	782	Possible Points:	782
	Percent Score:	93%	Percent Score:	98%

Non-Conformance Summary By Count	Pre-Corrective Action Non-Conformances	Post Corrective Action Open Non-Conformances
Food Safety Management System Requirements	3	0
Module 2 - Farm	4	0
TOTAL	7	0

AUDIT SCORING SUMMARY	Pre-Corrective Action Review	Post-Corrective Action Review
Module 9 - IPM Practices	9.01.01: Non-Compliance	9.01.01: Total Compliance
	9.01.02: Total Compliance	9.01.02: Total Compliance
	9.01.02a: Total Compliance	9.01.02a: Total Compliance
	9.01.03: Total Compliance	9.01.03: Total Compliance
	9.01.03a: Total Compliance	9.01.03a: Total Compliance
Module Outcome	Total Compliance Met	

Note: Performance in Module 9 – IPM Practices is independent from the Total Score calculated as part of the PrimusGFS audit. Auditees must score Total Compliance (or above) for each question in Module 9 – IPM Practices in order for the Module Outcome to be displayed as Total Compliance Met as part of your final audit report/certificate

SECTIONS:

Food Safety Management System Requirements	Module 2 - Farm	Module 9 - IPM Practices
Management System	General	IPM Practices
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	
	Questions for All Irrigation/Water Use	
	Pesticide Usage	

FSMS	Management System	
1.01.01	<b>Question:</b> Is there a documented food safety policy detailing the company's commitment to food safety?	<b>Possible Points:</b> 5 <b>Points Scored:</b> 5 <b>Score:</b> Total Compliance
	<b>Auditor Comments:</b> Yes, The company has a documented Food Safety Policy called Food Safety Program Review, which has been signed by SW on May 2025. The policy is posted outside on the central posting board. It outlines the company's commitment to food safety, compliance with regulatory and customer requirements, and continuous improvement.	
1.01.02	<b>Question:</b> 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?	<b>Possible Points:</b> 10 <b>Points Scored:</b> 10 <b>Score:</b> Total Compliance
	<b>Auditor Comments:</b> Yes, The operation has provided an organizational chart showing all management and workers who are involved in food safety related activities, along with documentation such as job descriptions detailing their specific food safety responsibilities. The organizational chart is maintained under document Moultrie Melon Company Company Organizational Chart, and was last reviewed on 09/01/2025. Some of the members include: SW, KB, CU.	
1.01.03	<b>Question:</b> Is there a food safety committee and are there logs of food safety meetings with topics covered and attendees?	<b>Possible Points:</b> 5 <b>Points Scored:</b> 5 <b>Score:</b> Total Compliance
	<b>Auditor Comments:</b> Yes, The company has established a documented food safety committee. Records of meetings were reviewed to confirm that meetings are held at the required frequency of quarterly during season, with minutes documented. Meeting from 05/05/2025 and 08/13/2025 were reviewed. Attendees were SW and KB. Topics discussed were primus audit scheduling, discussing someone to help with audit, Food safety trainings, etc.	

1.01.04	<p><b>Question:</b> 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>Possible Points: 5</p> <p>Points Scored: 5</p> <p>Score: Total Compliance</p>
	<p><b>Auditor Comments:</b> NC, The operation does not have a documented training management system in place at this time.</p>	
	<div> <div> <b>Auditee Comments:</b> Training SOP and Matrix included           <a href="#">View Files</a> </div> <div> <div>CA Accepted?</div> <div>Yes</div> </div> </div> <div> <b>CB/Auditor Review Comments:</b> A training matrix and management system has been created and implemented on 9/22/2025.         </div>	
1.01.05	<p><b>Question:</b> 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?</p>	<p>Possible Points: 15</p> <p>Points Scored: 15</p> <p>Score: Total Compliance</p>
	<p><b>Auditor Comments:</b> Yes, The operation has a documented Management Verification Review Procedure of the Food Safety System. The most recent review of the food safety management system was completed on 09/15/2025 and previous review dated 05/22/2025, within the required 12-month timeframe. Records confirm that resources were evaluated, the system performance was reviewed, and documented evidence of updates is available. Some examples of the topics reviewed were all SOP's, records, corrective actions, customer complaints, etc.</p>	
1.01.06	<p><b>Question:</b> Where specific industry guidelines or best practices exist for the crop and/or product, does the operation have a current copy of the document?</p>	<p>Possible Points: 3</p> <p>Points Scored: 3</p> <p>Score: Total Compliance</p>
	<p><b>Auditor Comments:</b> Yes, The operation maintains current copies of applicable industry guidelines for the crop/product. The guidelines used at this operation are California Leafy Greens, United States Standards for Grades of Cabbage, United States Standards for Grades of Sweet Peppers, FSMA Produce Safety Rule.</p>	
FSMS Control of Documents and Records		
1.02.01	<p><b>Question:</b> Is there a written document control procedure (including document control register/record) describing how documents will be maintained, updated and replaced?</p>	<p>Possible Points: 3</p> <p>Points Scored: 3</p> <p>Score: Total Compliance</p>
	<p><b>Auditor Comments:</b> Yes, The operation has a written procedure in place, titled Procedure for Updating, Replacing, and Maintaining Documents, which outlines how food safety documents are created, maintained, updated, and replaced. KB is responsible for document control. Documents are kept for a minimum of 24 months.</p>	
1.02.02	<p><b>Question:</b> 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?</p>	<p>Possible Points: 5</p> <p>Points Scored: 5</p> <p>Score: Total Compliance</p>
	<p><b>Auditor Comments:</b> Yes, The operation has a written procedure in place, titled Procedure for Updating, Replacing, and Maintaining Documents, which outlines how food safety documents are created, maintained, updated, and replaced. KB is responsible for document control. Documents are kept for a minimum of 24 months.</p>	
1.02.03	<p><b>Question:</b> Are both paper and electronic food safety related documents and records created, edited, stored and handled in a secure manner?</p>	<p>Possible Points: 5</p> <p>Points Scored: 5</p> <p>Score: Total Compliance</p>
	<p><b>Auditor Comments:</b> Yes, The operation maintains both paper and electronic food safety documents and records in a secure manner. Paper records are stored in filing cabinets within the food safety office, accessible only to authorized personnel. Electronic records are maintained on a password-protected server with role-based access controls and routine data backups. Records reviewed during the audit were legible, accurate, and up to date, with no evidence of unauthorized editing or insecure storage practices.</p>	

1.02.04	<b>Question:</b> Are records maintained in an organized and retrievable manner?	Possible Points: 3 Points Scored: 3 Score: Total Compliance
	<b>Auditor Comments:</b> Yes, The operation maintains records in an organized and retrievable manner. Records were stored within the Food Safety office were readily available for the audit.	
1.02.05	<b>Question:</b> Are all records and test results that can have an impact on the food safety program verified by a qualified person independent of the individual(s) completing the records?	Possible Points: 5 Points Scored: 5 Score: Total Compliance
	<b>Auditor Comments:</b> Yes, The operation has a documented verification system in place ensuring that all food safety records and test results are reviewed and signed by a qualified person. All records are verified by KB or SW. Water Test results from 09/16/2025 were signed off. Spray and fertilizer records were also signed off on.	

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

1.03.01	<b>Question:</b> 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
	<b>Auditor Comments:</b> Yes, The organization had a document named Creating a Standard Operating Procedure details the required structure, content, approval, and revision process for SOPs.	
1.03.02	<b>Question:</b> 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
	<b>Auditor Comments:</b> Yes, the SOP's are available in the main office to all employees.	
1.03.03	<b>Question:</b> Is there a documented corrective action procedure that describes the basic requirements for handling all non-conformances affecting food safety?	Possible Points: 5 Points Scored: 5 Score: Total Compliance
	<b>Auditor Comments:</b> Yes, The operation has a documented corrective action procedure section detailed in the Company Policies and Procedures Document. The policy covers review of non-conformances, root cause determination, corrective and preventive actions, and follow-up validation.	
1.03.04	<b>Question:</b> 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
	<b>Auditor Comments:</b> Yes, A documented NUOCA log is maintained, recording unusual events with date, description, corrective actions, responsible person, and verification. No NUOCA logs to date.	

FSMS	Internal and External Inspections
------	-----------------------------------

1.04.01	<b>Question:</b> 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: 7 Score: Minor Deficiency
	<b>Auditor Comments:</b> Major, The operation has a documented Procedure for Internal Audits however the SOP lacks the frequency of internal audits. FSMS internal was completed on 09/18/2025 and a farm internal completed on 09/18/2025. The operation is missing a pre-season module 2 internal for fall season 2025.	
	<b>Auditee Comments:</b> Internal audit SOP included. Audits will be conducted at least once seasonal before season begins <div>View Files</div>	
	<b>CB/Auditor Review Comments:</b> Internal Audit SOP has been updated to include the frequency requirements for the internal audit program for farm and packinghouse. SOP is missing schedule for FSMS internal audits.	CA Accepted?  Yes

1.04.02	<b>Question:</b> Are there written procedures for handling regulatory inspections?	<b>Possible Points:</b> 3 <b>Points Scored:</b> 3 <b>Score:</b> Total Compliance			
	<b>Auditor Comments:</b> Yes, a Written procedure for Regulatory or Independent Inspection Procedures exists for handling regulatory inspections. It covers accompaniment of inspectors, designated meeting space, sampling/photography rules, follow-up, and corrective actions. Communicated to all key staff and aligned with legal requirements.				
1.04.03	<b>Question:</b> Are there records of regulatory inspections and/or contracted inspections, company responses and corrective actions, if any?	<b>Possible Points:</b> 5 <b>Points Scored:</b> 5 <b>Score:</b> Total Compliance			
	<b>Auditor Comments:</b> Yes, The organization has records of the previous Primus GFS audit conducted on 05/23/2025. Corrective actions were conducted and approved. All corrective actions were reviewed, completed, and closed out appropriately.				
1.04.04	<b>Question:</b> 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?	<b>Possible Points:</b> 10 <b>Points Scored:</b> 10 <b>Score:</b> Total Compliance			
	<b>Auditor Comments:</b> NC, There is no SOP for calibrations of the sprayers.				
	<div><div><b>Auditee Comments:</b> Calibrations are automatic. No real records can be kept except when calibration has been performed. See attached SOP and attached manual.</div><div><div>View Files</div></div></div> <table><tr><td></td><td>CA Accepted?</td></tr><tr><td><b>CB/Auditor Review Comments:</b> A SOP for sprayer calibration has been created.</td><td>Yes</td></tr></table>			CA Accepted?	<b>CB/Auditor Review Comments:</b> A SOP for sprayer calibration has been created.
	CA Accepted?				
<b>CB/Auditor Review Comments:</b> A SOP for sprayer calibration has been created.	Yes				
1.04.05	<b>Question:</b> 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?	<b>Possible Points:</b> 5 <b>Points Scored:</b> 5 <b>Score:</b> Total Compliance			
	<b>Auditor Comments:</b> Yes, Observed a letter from DS with Airtec Sprayers stating that the sprayer was calibrated on August 13 at 15 GPA and 40 GPA. Nutrien provides the service for pre-plant fertilizer applications. A calibration document is provided for their spreaders.				
FSMS	Release of Items/Product				
1.05.01	<b>Question:</b> Is there a documented product release procedure available?	<b>Possible Points:</b> 5 <b>Points Scored:</b> 5 <b>Score:</b> Total Compliance			
	<b>Auditor Comments:</b> Yes, Product Release Procedure is documented within the Company Policies and Procedures SOP. Procedure details on release procedure that is done through the Ag Tag software system.				
1.05.02	<b>Question:</b> Are there records of product releases kept on file?	<b>Possible Points:</b> 5 <b>Points Scored:</b> 5 <b>Score:</b> Total Compliance			
	<b>Auditor Comments:</b> Yes, Product release records are documented on the Bill of Ladings per Product release document name, signed by authorized personnel, and available for review. Example of release reviewed was dated on 09/18/2025 and was releasing Zucchini, eggplant, and S/N Squash for shipment to customer.				
1.05.03	<b>Question:</b> Is there a documented procedure for handling on hold and rejected items?	<b>Possible Points:</b> 5 <b>Points Scored:</b> 5 <b>Score:</b> Total Compliance			
	<b>Auditor Comments:</b> Yes, Documented procedure for On-Hold and Rejected items documented on the Company Policies and Procedures covering handling of on hold/rejected items with clear tagging, segregation, field identification, authorized disposition, and signed release records.				

1.05.04	<b>Question:</b> Are there records of the handling of on hold and rejected items kept on file?	<b>Possible Points:</b> 0 <b>Points Scored:</b> 0 <b>Score:</b> N/A
	<b>Auditor Comments:</b> N/A, There have been no on-hold or rejected items to date.	
1.05.05	<b>Question:</b> Is there a documented procedure for dealing with customer and buyer food safety complaints/feedback along with records and company responses, including corrective actions?	<b>Possible Points:</b> 10 <b>Points Scored:</b> 10 <b>Score:</b> Total Compliance
	<b>Auditor Comments:</b> Yes, A documented Complaint Policy is in place covering food safety issues. There are no records of any complaints to date.	

<b>FSMS</b>	<b>Supplier Monitoring/Control</b>
-------------	------------------------------------

1.06.01	<b>Question:</b> 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.	<b>Possible Points:</b> 10 <b>Points Scored:</b> 10 <b>Score:</b> Total Compliance
	<b>Auditor Comments:</b> Yes, Supplier Approval Program details evaluation, approval, monitoring, and suspension/removal. Includes specs, guarantees, audits, performance reviews, and emergency approvals.	
1.06.02	<b>Question:</b> Is there a list of approved suppliers and service providers including justification for use of any emergency (temporary) suppliers or providers?	<b>Possible Points:</b> 10 <b>Points Scored:</b> 10 <b>Score:</b> Total Compliance
	<b>Auditor Comments:</b> Yes, The operation maintains a current Approved Suppliers and Service Providers List that was last reviewed and updated on 05/05/2025. The list covers all inputs and services relevant to food safety for the farm, including raw materials, crop protection, fertilizers, laboratories, etc.. Evidence was reviewed showing suppliers were approved through documented evaluation; examples of suppliers are Dixon Pest Control, Waters Agricultural Lab, Brinson Septic Service and Nutiren AG Services.	
1.06.03	<b>Question:</b> Are there current written food safety related specifications for all incoming products, ingredients, materials (including primary packaging), services provided on-site, and outsourced services?	<b>Possible Points:</b> 10 <b>Points Scored:</b> 10 <b>Score:</b> Total Compliance
	<b>Auditor Comments:</b> Yes, Current food safety related specifications are listed on the Approved Supplier list under documentation/ Evidence of Compliance. Examples are: Waters Agricultural Lab- Certificate of Accreditation. Nutrien Ag- Letter of Guarantee	
1.06.04	<b>Question:</b> 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?	<b>Possible Points:</b> 15 <b>Points Scored:</b> 15 <b>Score:</b> Total Compliance
	<b>Auditor Comments:</b> Yes, The operation maintains a current Approved Suppliers and Service Providers List that was last reviewed and updated on 05/05/2025. The list covers all inputs and services relevant to food safety for the farm, including raw materials, crop protection, fertilizers, laboratories, etc.. Evidence was reviewed showing suppliers were approved through documented evaluation; examples of suppliers are Waters Agricultural Lab - Certificate of Accreditation on File, expiry 08/01/2026, Helena- Letter of Guarantee 01/01/2025 and Nutiren AG Services- Letter of Guarantee 09/17/2025.	
1.06.05	<b>Question:</b> Where food safety related testing is being performed by laboratory service providers, are these licensed and/or accredited laboratories (e.g., ISO 17025 or equivalent, national and local regulations, etc.)?	<b>Possible Points:</b> 5 <b>Points Scored:</b> 5 <b>Score:</b> Total Compliance
	<b>Auditor Comments:</b> Yes, Waters Agricultural Laboratories is utilized by the operation. Waters is accredited by ANAB with the scope of accreditation for ISO/IEC 17025:2017 for Testing, Expiry of 8/1/2026.	

<b>FSMS</b>	<b>Traceability and Recall</b>
-------------	--------------------------------

1.07.01	<b>Question:</b> Is there 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
	<b>Auditor Comments:</b> Yes, The company maintains a documented traceability system. Document named Rach Traceback Procedure last reviewed on 05/05/2025. Trace back to suppliers and trace forward to customers is achieved using the Field Name and Number which is recorded at receiving and follows the product through shipping using the Ag Tag system. The system meets FDA "one step back, one step forward" requirements.	
1.07.02	<b>Question:</b> 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
	<b>Auditor Comments:</b> Yes, The company's documented recall program includes procedures, recall team roles and contacts, customer/supplier listings, recall effectiveness checks, recall class explanations, and handling of recalled product. Contact listings are current, with last revision dated 05/05/2025. Recall team members include the following: SW and KB	
1.07.03	<b>Question:</b> 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
	<b>Auditor Comments:</b> Yes, The organization has documented evidence that recall procedures are tested at least every six months. Organization has conducted 2 mock recalls in the past year. Most recent mock recall was conducted on 09/16/2025 and included amount of Product and scenario being eggplant sent to customer was bruised. The shipment contained 531 boxes of eggplant. It took 10 minutes to conduct the recall using the AG Tag system and all 531 boxes were located.	
<b>FSMS</b> Food Defense		
1.08.01	<b>Question:</b> 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
	<b>Auditor Comments:</b> Yes, The operation conducted a written FFVA on 06/06/2022 and last reviewed on 05/05/2025 covering all incoming and outgoing products. No potential risks were identified.	
1.08.02	<b>Question:</b> Is there a written food defense vulnerability assessment and food defense plan based on the risks associated with the operation?	Possible Points: 5 Points Scored: 5 Score: Total Compliance
	<b>Auditor Comments:</b> Yes, Documented Food Defense Plan last reviewed on 05/05/2025 is based on a Food Defense vulnerability assessment conducted on 06/06/2022 and reviewed on 05/05/2025. Examples of Food Defense measures is alarm systems, video surveillance, incoming product inspections, and no trespassing signs.	
1.08.03	<b>Question:</b> 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
	<b>Auditor Comments:</b> Yes, The operation maintains records associated with the food defense plan and its procedures. These records include preharvest inspections, Monthly well inspections, internal inspections etc.	
1.08.04	<b>Question:</b> 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
	<b>Auditor Comments:</b> Yes, the organization has a up to date list of emergency contacts including numbers for management (SW), Emergency Services (911) and regulatory agencies (FDA). This list is part of the recall program and is posted outside on the central board.	
1.08.05	<b>Question:</b> Are visitors and contractors to the company operations required to adhere to food defense procedures?	Possible Points: 3 Points Scored: 3 Score: Total Compliance
	<b>Auditor Comments:</b> yes, All visitors and contractors are required to sign in upon arrival and follow the operation's food defense policies. Visitor sign-in is located at the front office.	

FARM General		
2.01.01	<b>Question:</b> Is there a designated person responsible for the operation's food safety program?	Possible Points: 10 Points Scored: 10 Score: Total Compliance
	<b>Auditor Comments:</b> Yes, SW is responsible for the Food Safety program.	
2.01.02	<b>Question:</b> If the operation is growing under organic principles, is there written documentation of current certification by an accredited organic certification organization?	Possible Points: 0 Points Scored: 0 Score: N/A
	<b>Auditor Comments:</b> N/A, The operation does not grow organics	
2.01.03	<b>Question:</b> 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
	<b>Auditor Comments:</b> Yes there Worker Health and Hygiene Policy that covers Blood policy, return to work procedure, GMP's, infants and toddlers, etc. Last review date is 05/05/2025	
FARM Site		
2.02.01	<b>Question:</b> 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?	Possible Points: 5 Points Scored: 5 Score: Total Compliance
	<b>Auditor Comments:</b> Yes there is a map for the Thaggard farm that includes the well, zones, and adjacent land.	
2.02.02	<b>Question:</b> Are growing areas adequately identified or coded to enable trace back and trace forward in the event of a recall?	Possible Points: 15 Points Scored: 15 Score: Total Compliance
	<b>Auditor Comments:</b> Yes, All farms are identified by farm name and zone number.	
2.02.03	<b>Question:</b> Has a documented risk assessment been conducted at least annually for the operation?	Possible Points: 15 Points Scored: 15 Score: Total Compliance
	<b>Auditor Comments:</b> Yes, There is a land risk assessment conducted on 9/15/2025 that includes the year the property was acquired, the previous crop, flooding risk, water source and adjacent land.	
2.02.03a	<b>Question:</b> 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
	<b>Auditor Comments:</b> N/A, No risk were identified	
2.02.04	<b>Question:</b> Are the necessary food defense controls implemented in the operation?	Possible Points: 10 Points Scored: 10 Score: Total Compliance
	<b>Auditor Comments:</b> Yes, there are no trespassing signs at the farm entrance.	
2.02.05	<b>Question:</b> Is the exterior area immediately outside the growing area, including roads, yards and parking areas, free of litter, weeds and standing water?	Possible Points: 5 Points Scored: 5 Score: Total Compliance
	<b>Auditor Comments:</b> Yes, All exterior areas immediately outside of the growing area are clean and free of litter, weeds and standing water	

2.02.06	<b>Question:</b> 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)?	Possible Points: 0 Points Scored: 0 Score: N/A
	<b>Auditor Comments:</b> N/A, there was no outside storage utilized on the farm.	
2.02.07	<b>Question:</b> Are garbage receptacles and dumpsters kept covered or closed?	Possible Points: 5 Points Scored: 5 Score: Total Compliance
	<b>Auditor Comments:</b> Yes, all garbage cans were covered.	
2.02.08	<b>Question:</b> 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.	Possible Points: 15 Points Scored: 15 Score: Total Compliance
	<b>Auditor Comments:</b> Yes, all fertilizer storage tanks on site were stored in a manner that does not pose a risk of contamination to the water source.	
2.02.09	<b>Question:</b> 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.?	Possible Points: 0 Points Scored: 0 Score: N/A
	<b>Auditor Comments:</b> N/A, there were no fill stations on site.	
2.02.10	<b>Question:</b> Is the audited area free from animal presence and/or animal activity (wild or domestic)? If Total Compliance, go to 2.02.11.	Possible Points: 15 Points Scored: 15 Score: Total Compliance
	<b>Auditor Comments:</b> Yes, there were no signs of animal presence.	
2.02.10a	<b>Question:</b> Is the audited area free from any evidence of animal fecal matter? A ZERO POINT (NON-COMPLIANCE) DOWNSCORE IN THIS QUESTION RESULTS IN AUTOMATIC FAILURE OF THIS AUDIT.	Possible Points: 0 Points Scored: 0 Score: N/A
	<b>Auditor Comments:</b>	
2.02.11	<b>Question:</b> Is the audited area free from any evidence of human fecal matter? ANY DOWN SCORE IN THIS QUESTION RESULTS IN AN AUTOMATIC FAILURE OF THE AUDIT.	Possible Points: 15 Points Scored: 15 Score: Total Compliance
	<b>Auditor Comments:</b> yes, there were no evidence of human fecal matter.	
2.02.12	<b>Question:</b> Is the audited area free of evidence of infants and toddlers?	Possible Points: 10 Points Scored: 10 Score: Total Compliance
	<b>Auditor Comments:</b> Yes, No infants or toddlers were observed in the growing area.	
<b>FARM</b>		
Ground History		
2.03.01	<b>Question:</b> Were growing area(s) used for growing food crops for consumption last season?	Possible Points: 0 Points Scored: 0 Score: Yes
	<b>Auditor Comments:</b> Yes, the growing area was used for vegetable production in prior seasons.	
2.03.02	<b>Question:</b> 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
	<b>Auditor Comments:</b> No, the growing area has not been used for any non agricultural function	

2.03.02a	<b>Question:</b> If the growing area 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	<b>Question:</b> Has the growing area(s) been used for animal husbandry or grazing land for animals in the last 12 months? 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 any animal husbandry or grazing land.	
2.03.03a	<b>Question:</b> 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	<b>Question:</b> Has flooding from uncontrolled causes occurred on the growing area(s) since the previous growth cycle? If No, go to 2.04.01.	Possible Points: 0 Points Scored: 0 Score: No
	Auditor Comments: No, No flooding has occurred on the growing area since the previous season.	
2.03.04a	<b>Question:</b> If the growing area(s) and product was affected from the flood waters, is there documented evidence of a risk assessment and that corrective measures were taken to affected land and product?	Possible Points: 0 Points Scored: 0 Score: N/A
	Auditor Comments:	
2.03.04b	<b>Question:</b> Have soil tests been conducted on the flooded area(s) showing the 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	<b>Question:</b> 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:	
<b>FARM</b>		
Adjacent Land Use		
2.04.01	<b>Question:</b> 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: 0 Points Scored: 0 Score: No
	Auditor Comments: No, the adjacent land is not a source of contamination from intense livestock production	
2.04.01a	<b>Question:</b> 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	<b>Question:</b> Is there evidence of domestic animals and/or wild animals (includes homes with hobby farms, and non-commercial livestock) in proximity to the growing operation? If No, go to 2.04.03.	Possible Points: 0 Points Scored: 0 Score: No
	Auditor Comments: No, there are no evidence of domestic animals or wild animals in proximity to the growing area.	

2.04.02a	<b>Question:</b> Where there are domestic and/or wild animals (includes homes with hobby farms, and non-commercial livestock) have physical measures been put in place to restrain the animals 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	<b>Question:</b> 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: 0 Points Scored: 0 Score: No
	Auditor Comments: No, there are no untreated manure piles, compost, or biosolids, stored on adjacent land	
2.04.03a	<b>Question:</b> 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	<b>Question:</b> 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	<b>Question:</b> 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: 0 Points Scored: 0 Score: No
	Auditor Comments: No, the growing area is not situated at a higher risk location	
2.04.04a	<b>Question:</b> 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	<b>Question:</b> Are there any other potential risks in the adjacent land that could potentially lead to contamination of the growing area?	Possible Points: 0 Points Scored: 0 Score: No
	Auditor Comments: No, there were no other potential risks in adjacent land observed.	
2.04.05a	<b>Question:</b> Have appropriate measures been taken to mitigate risks related to nearby operations?	Possible Points: 0 Points Scored: 0 Score: N/A
	Auditor Comments:	
2.04.06	<b>Question:</b> Is there evidence of human fecal matter in the adjacent land to the audited area? If No, go to 2.05.01.	Possible Points: 0 Points Scored: 0 Score: No
	Auditor Comments: No, there is no evidence of human fecal matter on adjacent land.	
2.04.06a	<b>Question:</b> 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	<b>Question:</b> Is there documented evidence of the internal audits performed, detailing findings and corrective actions?	<b>Possible Points:</b> 15 <b>Points Scored:</b> 10 <b>Score:</b> Minor Deficiency			
	<b>Auditor Comments:</b> MN, See 1.04.01 for non-conformance.				
	<div><div><b>Auditee Comments:</b> Internal Audit SOP included. Audits will be performed at least once seasonally before season begins.</div><div>View Files</div></div> <table><tr><td></td><td>CA Accepted?</td></tr><tr><td><b>CB/Auditor Review Comments:</b> Internal Audit SOP has been updated to include the frequency requirements for the internal audit program. Pre-season internals will be reviewed for compliance at the next scheduled audit.</td><td>Yes</td></tr></table>			CA Accepted?	<b>CB/Auditor Review Comments:</b> Internal Audit SOP has been updated to include the frequency requirements for the internal audit program. Pre-season internals will be reviewed for compliance at the next scheduled audit.
	CA Accepted?				
<b>CB/Auditor Review Comments:</b> Internal Audit SOP has been updated to include the frequency requirements for the internal audit program. Pre-season internals will be reviewed for compliance at the next scheduled audit.	Yes				
2.05.02	<b>Question:</b> Are there chemical inventory logs for chemicals, including pesticides and fertilizers?	<b>Possible Points:</b> 0 <b>Points Scored:</b> 0 <b>Score:</b> N/A			
	<b>Auditor Comments:</b> N/A. This operation orders just in time ordering.				
2.05.03	<b>Question:</b> Are all chemicals (pesticides, sanitizers, detergents, lubricants, etc.) stored securely, safely and are they labeled correctly?	<b>Possible Points:</b> 0 <b>Points Scored:</b> 0 <b>Score:</b> N/A			
	<b>Auditor Comments:</b> N/A. This operation orders just in time ordering.				
2.05.04	<b>Question:</b> 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.	<b>Possible Points:</b> 15 <b>Points Scored:</b> 15 <b>Score:</b> Total Compliance			
	<b>Auditor Comments:</b> Yes, no spoilage or adulteration was observed				
FARM	Training				
2.06.01	<b>Question:</b> Is there a food safety hygiene training program covering new and existing workers and are there records of these training events?	<b>Possible Points:</b> 15 <b>Points Scored:</b> 15 <b>Score:</b> Total Compliance			
	<b>Auditor Comments:</b> Yes, there is Employee Policies and Education Outline Training conducted at the beginning of the season. This training includes but not limited to: clothing, PPE, hand washing, jewelry, food defense, etc. Reviewed 36 employees trainings that were completed on 03/17/2025, 1 from 05/05/2025, 40 from 09/17/2025.				
2.06.02	<b>Question:</b> 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).	<b>Possible Points:</b> 10 <b>Points Scored:</b> 10 <b>Score:</b> Total Compliance			
	<b>Auditor Comments:</b> Yes, there is a Wounds and Sores Policy and a Return to Work Policy stated within the Company Policies and Procedures Policy that requires all cuts and grazes or illness to be reported.				
2.06.03	<b>Question:</b> Are there worker food safety non-conformance records and associated corrective actions (including retraining records)?	<b>Possible Points:</b> 3 <b>Points Scored:</b> 3 <b>Score:</b> Total Compliance			
	<b>Auditor Comments:</b> Yes, SW gave verbal confirmation that worker food safety non-conformance records are being kept in personel files.				
FARM	Field Worker Hygiene (Applies to on-the-farm workers, not the harvesting workers)				
2.07.01	<b>Question:</b> Are toilet facilities adequate in number and location? A ZERO POINT (NON-COMPLIANCE) DOWNSCORE IN THIS QUESTION RESULTS IN AUTOMATIC FAILURE OF THIS AUDIT.	<b>Possible Points:</b> 15 <b>Points Scored:</b> 15 <b>Score:</b> Total Compliance			
	<b>Auditor Comments:</b> Yes, there were 2 sets of toilet (4 total) facilities available at this farm. They were placed outside of the growing area and did not pose any threat of cross contamination.				

2.07.01a	<b>Question:</b> Are toilet facilities in a suitable location to prevent contamination to product, packaging, equipment, and growing areas?	<b>Possible Points:</b> 15 <b>Points Scored:</b> 15 <b>Score:</b> Total Compliance
	<b>Auditor Comments:</b> Yes, there were 2 sets of toilet (4 total) facilities available at this farm. They were placed outside of the growing area and did not pose any threat of cross contamination.	
2.07.01b	<b>Question:</b> Are toilet facilities designed and maintained to prevent contamination (e.g., free from leaks and cracks)?	<b>Possible Points:</b> 5 <b>Points Scored:</b> 5 <b>Score:</b> Total Compliance
	<b>Auditor Comments:</b> Yes, all toilet facilities were free of leaks, cracks and light in color.	
2.07.01c	<b>Question:</b> Are toilet facilities constructed of materials that are easy to clean?	<b>Possible Points:</b> 3 <b>Points Scored:</b> 3 <b>Score:</b> Total Compliance
	<b>Auditor Comments:</b> Yes, all toilet facilities were free of leaks, cracks and light in color and constructed of easy to clean materials	
2.07.01d	<b>Question:</b> Are the toilet facility materials constructed of a light color allowing easy evaluation of cleaning performance?	<b>Possible Points:</b> 3 <b>Points Scored:</b> 3 <b>Score:</b> Total Compliance
	<b>Auditor Comments:</b> Yes, one set of toilets were yellow and the other set were light blue.	
2.07.01e	<b>Question:</b> Are toilet facilities 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)?	<b>Possible Points:</b> 5 <b>Points Scored:</b> 5 <b>Score:</b> Total Compliance
	<b>Auditor Comments:</b> Yes, all facilities were properly stocked with toilet paper and maintained properly.	
2.07.01f	<b>Question:</b> Where used, is there a documented procedure for emptying the waste holding tanks in a hygienic manner and also in a way that prevents product, packaging, equipment, water systems and growing area contamination?	<b>Possible Points:</b> 5 <b>Points Scored:</b> 3 <b>Score:</b> Minor Deficiency
	<b>Auditor Comments:</b> NC, Prico Tents and Portable Toilets and Brinson Septic Service are used for portable toilets. There is no documented procedure in place for the emptying of the waste tanks.	
	<div> <b>Auditee Comments:</b> Brinson Septic service provided their procedure for emptying waste tanks <div>View Files</div> </div>	
	<div> <b>CB/Auditor Review Comments:</b> A written procedure from Brinson has been provided however there is no SOP provided from Prico Tents. </div>	<div> CA Accepted?  Yes </div>
2.07.01g	<b>Question:</b> Are the toilet facilities and hand washing stations clean and are there records showing cleaning, servicing and stocking is occurring regularly?	<b>Possible Points:</b> 10 <b>Points Scored:</b> 10 <b>Score:</b> Total Compliance
	<b>Auditor Comments:</b> Yes, all facilities were equipped with service records on the inside of the restrooms. Dates of previous service were 09/07/2025, 09/14/2025 and 09/18/2025.	
2.07.02	<b>Question:</b> Is hand washing signage posted appropriately?	<b>Possible Points:</b> 5 <b>Points Scored:</b> 5 <b>Score:</b> Total Compliance
	<b>Auditor Comments:</b> Yes, there were hand washing signage at each hand wash station and toilet facility.	
2.07.03	<b>Question:</b> Are hand washing stations adequate in number and appropriately located for worker access and monitoring usage? A ZERO POINT (NON-COMPLIANCE) DOWN SCORE IN THIS QUESTION RESULTS IN AUTOMATIC FAILURE OF THIS AUDIT.	<b>Possible Points:</b> 15 <b>Points Scored:</b> 15 <b>Score:</b> Total Compliance
	<b>Auditor Comments:</b> Yes, there are 2 hand washing sinks on each portable trailer with the restrooms. All handwash sinks were located outside of the toilets.	

2.07.03a	<b>Question:</b> 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.)?	<b>Possible Points:</b> 5 <b>Points Scored:</b> 5 <b>Score:</b> Total Compliance
	<b>Auditor Comments:</b> Yes, all handwash sink stations were designed and maintained properly. No leaks or cracks were observed.	
2.07.03b	<b>Question:</b> Are hand wash stations clearly visible (e.g., situated outside the toilet facility) and easily accessible to workers?	<b>Possible Points:</b> 5 <b>Points Scored:</b> 5 <b>Score:</b> Total Compliance
	<b>Auditor Comments:</b> Yes, there are 2 hand washing sinks on each portable trailer with the restrooms. All handwash sinks were located outside of the toilets.	
2.07.03c	<b>Question:</b> Are hand wash stations adequately stocked with unscented soap and paper towels?	<b>Possible Points:</b> 5 <b>Points Scored:</b> 5 <b>Score:</b> Total Compliance
	<b>Auditor Comments:</b> Yes, all hand wash stations were properly stocked with unscented soap and paper towels.	
2.07.04	<b>Question:</b> Are total coliforms (TC) and generic E. coli tests conducted on the water used for hand washing at the required and/or expected frequency?	<b>Possible Points:</b> 15 <b>Points Scored:</b> 15 <b>Score:</b> Total Compliance
	<b>Auditor Comments:</b> Yes, Handwash water was tested on 09/16/2025 for Generic E.coli and Total Coliform. Test results were both < 1.0 mpn/100 mL	
2.07.04a	<b>Question:</b> Do written procedures (SOPs) exist covering proper sampling protocols, which include where samples should be taken and how samples should be identified?	<b>Possible Points:</b> 10 <b>Points Scored:</b> 10 <b>Score:</b> Total Compliance
	<b>Auditor Comments:</b> Yes, Preharvest Water Microbiological Testing SOP covers sampling protocol, where and how samples are to be taken, acceptable tolerances and corrective action procedure for out of spec samples.	
2.07.04b	<b>Question:</b> Do written procedures (SOPs) exist covering corrective measures for unsuitable or abnormal water testing results?	<b>Possible Points:</b> 10 <b>Points Scored:</b> 10 <b>Score:</b> Total Compliance
	<b>Auditor Comments:</b> Yes, Preharvest Water Microbiological Testing SOP covers sampling protocol, where and how samples are to be taken, acceptable tolerances and corrective action procedure for out of spec samples.	
2.07.04c	<b>Question:</b> If unsuitable or abnormal results have been detected, have documented corrective measures been performed?	<b>Possible Points:</b> 0 <b>Points Scored:</b> 0 <b>Score:</b> N/A
	<b>Auditor Comments:</b> NA, No unsuitable or abnormal results have been detected.	
2.07.05	<b>Question:</b> 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?	<b>Possible Points:</b> 0 <b>Points Scored:</b> 0 <b>Score:</b> N/A
	<b>Auditor Comments:</b> NA, No field workers present at the time of the audit.	
2.07.06	<b>Question:</b> Are workers who are working directly or indirectly with food, free from signs of boils, sores, open wounds and are not exhibiting signs of foodborne illness?	<b>Possible Points:</b> 0 <b>Points Scored:</b> 0 <b>Score:</b> N/A
	<b>Auditor Comments:</b> NA, no field workers present at the time of the audit.	
2.07.07	<b>Question:</b> Is jewelry confined to a plain wedding band and watches, studs, false eyelashes, etc., are not worn?	<b>Possible Points:</b> 0 <b>Points Scored:</b> 0 <b>Score:</b> N/A
	<b>Auditor Comments:</b> NA, no field workers present at the time of the audit.	

2.07.08	<b>Question:</b> Are worker personal items being stored appropriately (i.e. not in the growing area(s) or material storage area(s))?	Possible Points: 0 Points Scored: 0 Score: N/A
	<b>Auditor Comments:</b> NA, no field workers present at the time of the audit.	
2.07.09	<b>Question:</b> Is smoking, eating, chewing and drinking confined to designated areas, and spitting is prohibited in all areas?	Possible Points: 0 Points Scored: 0 Score: N/A
	<b>Auditor Comments:</b> NA, no field workers present at the time of the audit.	
2.07.10	<b>Question:</b> Is fresh potable drinking water readily accessible to workers?	Possible Points: 0 Points Scored: 0 Score: N/A
	<b>Auditor Comments:</b> NA, no field workers present at the time of the audit.	
2.07.10a	<b>Question:</b> Are single use cups provided (unless a drinking fountain is used) and made available near the drinking water?	Possible Points: 0 Points Scored: 0 Score: N/A
	<b>Auditor Comments:</b> NA, no field workers present at the time of the audit.	
2.07.11	<b>Question:</b> Are first aid kits adequately stocked and readily available?	Possible Points: 5 Points Scored: 5 Score: Total Compliance
	<b>Auditor Comments:</b> Yes, first aid kits are available on every portable toilets. All first aid kits are properly stocked and all within date of expiration. Benedryl cream observed with expiry date 04/2026.	
2.07.12	<b>Question:</b> Are there adequate trash cans placed in suitable locations?	Possible Points: 5 Points Scored: 5 Score: Total Compliance
	<b>Auditor Comments:</b> Yes, trash cans are available on all portable restroom trailers.	
2.07.13	<b>Question:</b> Are any potential foreign material issues (e.g., metal, glass, plastic) controlled?	Possible Points: 5 Points Scored: 5 Score: Total Compliance
	<b>Auditor Comments:</b> Yes, there were no potential foreign material issues observed.	
<b>FARM</b>		
<b>Inorganic Fertilizers</b>		
2.08.06	<b>Question:</b> Are inorganic fertilizers used as an input (e.g., ammonium nitrate, ammonium sulfate, chemically synthesized urea, etc.)? Information gathering question.	Possible Points: 0 Points Scored: 0 Score: Yes
	<b>Auditor Comments:</b> Yes, inorganic fertilizers are utilized.	
2.08.06a	<b>Question:</b> 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
	<b>Auditor Comments:</b> Yes, all fertilizer is being used according to US regulations.	
2.08.06b	<b>Question:</b> Are there fertilizer use records available for each growing area, including application records?	Possible Points: 15 Points Scored: 15 Score: Total Compliance
	<b>Auditor Comments:</b> Yes, fertilizer records are available for each growing area. 07/08/2025 Custom blend of 17.4-17.4-17.4-3.5S was applied at rate of 635 lb/acre. 08/05/2025 liquid application via drip of CN9 was applied at a rate of 3.75 gal/acre. 08/16/2025 a liquid application of 8-24-0 was applied via drip at a rate of 1.25 gal/acre.	

2.08.06c	<b>Question:</b> 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?	<b>Possible Points:</b> 10 <b>Points Scored:</b> 10 <b>Score:</b> Total Compliance
	<b>Auditor Comments:</b> Yes, COA available and reviewed for 17.4-17.4-17.4-3.5S from Nutrien Ag Solutions. COA's were available and reviewed for CN9 and 408 from Howard Fertilizer and Chemical.	

<b>FARM</b>	Well
-------------	------

2.09.02a	<b>Question:</b> Are generic E. coli tests conducted on the water (taken from the closest practical point 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.	<b>Possible Points:</b> 15 <b>Points Scored:</b> 15 <b>Score:</b> Total Compliance
	<b>Auditor Comments:</b> Yes, generic e.coli tests are conducted on the water. Last water test was conducted on 9/16/2025. Results were negative for E.coli and Total Coliform.	

2.09.02b	<b>Question:</b> Do written procedures (SOPs) exist covering proper sampling protocols which include where samples should be taken and how samples should be identified?	<b>Possible Points:</b> 10 <b>Points Scored:</b> 10 <b>Score:</b> Total Compliance
	<b>Auditor Comments:</b> Yes, A Water Sampling SOP#07-03 covers proper sampling protocol. It states water should be collected at the closest point of use. Samples need to be taken to the lab within 24 hours after collection. Sampling is conducted once per season for wells and to be tested for Generic E.coli and Total Coliform. Last review of the SOP was conducted on 05/05/2025	

2.09.02c	<b>Question:</b> Do written procedures (SOPs) exist covering corrective measures for unsuitable or abnormal water testing results?	<b>Possible Points:</b> 10 <b>Points Scored:</b> 10 <b>Score:</b> Total Compliance
	<b>Auditor Comments:</b> Yes, Water Usage SOP#07-04 Well Disinfection details the procedures for abnormal water results. Details on the steps for well disinfection is outlined along with retesting procedures. SOP was last reviewed 05/05/2025.	

2.09.02d	<b>Question:</b> If unsuitable or abnormal results have been detected, have documented corrective measures been performed?	<b>Possible Points:</b> 0 <b>Points Scored:</b> 0 <b>Score:</b> N/A
	<b>Auditor Comments:</b> N/A, No unsuitable water results are on file to date.	

2.09.02e	<b>Question:</b> Where anti-microbial water treatments (e.g. chlorination, U.V., ozone, etc.) are used, are there records of the monitoring frequencies, results and where necessary the corrective actions?	<b>Possible Points:</b> 0 <b>Points Scored:</b> 0 <b>Score:</b> N/A
	<b>Auditor Comments:</b> N/A, No antimicrobial water treatments are utilized at this operation.	

2.09.02f	<p><b>Question:</b> Are records kept for periodic visual inspection of the water source and available for review?</p>	<p>Possible Points: 5</p> <p>Points Scored: 5</p> <p>Score: Total Compliance</p>			
	<p><b>Auditor Comments:</b> NC, there were no records are kept for the periodic visual inspection of the well</p>				
	<div><p><b>Auditee Comments:</b> Records will be kept for visual inspection of wells. Complete form included</p><p><a href="#">View Files</a></p></div> <table><tr><td></td><td>CA Accepted?</td></tr><tr><td><p><b>CB/Auditor Review Comments:</b> A visual inspection of the well was conducted on October 22.</p></td><td>Yes</td></tr></table>			CA Accepted?	<p><b>CB/Auditor Review Comments:</b> A visual inspection of the well was conducted on October 22.</p>
	CA Accepted?				
<p><b>CB/Auditor Review Comments:</b> A visual inspection of the well was conducted on October 22.</p>	Yes				

<b>FARM</b>	Questions for All Irrigation/Water Use
-------------	--

2.09.07	<b>Question:</b> Is dryland farming used in the growing operation	Possible Points: 0 Points Scored: 0 Score: No
	<b>Auditor Comments:</b> No, Dryland farming is not used in this operation	
2.09.08	<b>Question:</b> 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
	<b>Auditor Comments:</b> Yes, all wells were equipped with appropriate backflow devices.	
2.09.09	<b>Question:</b> If the operation stores water (tank, cistern, container), is the storage container well maintained?	Possible Points: 0 Points Scored: 0 Score: N/A
	<b>Auditor Comments:</b> N/A, this operation does not utilize storage tanks.	

FARM		Pesticide Usage			
2.10.01	<b>Question:</b> Are there up-to-date records of all pesticides applied during the growth cycle? A ZERO POINT (NON-COMPLIANCE) DOWN SCORE IN THIS QUESTION RESULTS IN AUTOMATIC FAILURE OF THIS AUDIT.	<b>Possible Points:</b> 15 <b>Points Scored:</b> 10 <b>Score:</b> Minor Deficiency			
	<b>Auditor Comments:</b> Major, Yes records are available and up to date however records are missing the applicator name, total amount applied, treated area size and active ingredient. Applications consist of the following for Silverleaf Whitefly: 09/13/2025 cucumber application of Elumin at 8 oz per acre (2 day PHI), Intrepid 2F at 10 oz per acre (3 day PHI) and Sivanto Prime (1 day PHI) at 14 oz per acre. Eggplant 09/03/2025 application consisted of Bravo 720 (3 day PHI) at 1.5 pints/acre, Inspire Super (0 day PHI) at 20 oz/ac, Actara (0 day PHI) at 10 oz/ac.				
	<div><div><b>Auditee Comments:</b> See attached Spray report with applicator name and active ingredients.</div><div>View Files</div></div> <table><tr><td></td><td>CA Accepted?</td></tr><tr><td><b>CB/Auditor Review Comments:</b> updated records provided now includes the applicator name and treated area size however still is missing the total amount applied.</td><td>Yes</td></tr></table>			CA Accepted?	<b>CB/Auditor Review Comments:</b> updated records provided now includes the applicator name and treated area size however still is missing the total amount applied.
	CA Accepted?				
<b>CB/Auditor Review Comments:</b> updated records provided now includes the applicator name and treated area size however still is missing the total amount applied.	Yes				
2.10.02	<b>Question:</b> Are all pesticides applied during the growth cycle authorized/registered by the authority/government of the country of production? ANY DOWN SCORE IN THIS QUESTION RESULTS IN AN AUTOMATIC FAILURE OF THE AUDIT.	<b>Possible Points:</b> 15 <b>Points Scored:</b> 15 <b>Score:</b> Total Compliance			
	<b>Auditor Comments:</b> Yes, all pesticides are registered with the EPA. Examples are Elumin EPA #59639-211, Inspire Super EPA #100-1317, Actara EPA# 100-938				
2.10.03	<b>Question:</b> Are all pesticides used during the growth cycle applied as recommended/directed in the label? ANY DOWN SCORE IN THIS QUESTION RESULTS IN AN AUTOMATIC FAILURE OF THE AUDIT.	<b>Possible Points:</b> 15 <b>Points Scored:</b> 15 <b>Score:</b> Total Compliance			
	<b>Auditor Comments:</b> Yes, all pesticides used were applied at the recommended by label. 09/13/2025 cucumber application of Elumin at 8 oz per acre (2 day PHI), Intrepid 2F at 10 oz per acre (3 day PHI) and Sivanto Prime (1 day PHI) at 14 oz per acre. Eggplant 09/03/2025 application consisted of Bravo 720 (7 day PHI) at 1.5 pints/acre, Inspire Super (7 day PHI) at 20 oz/ac, Actara (0 day PHI) at 10 oz/ac.				
2.10.04	<b>Question:</b> 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.	<b>Possible Points:</b> 15 <b>Points Scored:</b> 15 <b>Score:</b> Total Compliance			
	<b>Auditor Comments:</b> Yes, 09/13/2025 cucumber application of Elumin at 8 oz per acre (2 day PHI), Intrepid 2F at 10 oz per acre (3 day PHI) and Sivanto Prime (1 day PHI) at 14 oz per acre. Cucumbers were harvested 09/19/2025. Eggplant 09/03/2025 application consisted of Bravo 720 (3 day PHI) at 1.5 pints/acre, Inspire Super (0 day PHI) at 20 oz/ac, Actara (0 day PHI) at 10 oz/ac. Eggplant harvest after this date was 09/15/2025				
2.10.05	<b>Question:</b> Where products are destined for export, is there information for pesticide Maximum Residue Limits (MRLs) compliance considering country of destination, target crop(s), and active ingredients applied?	<b>Possible Points:</b> 0 <b>Points Scored:</b> 0 <b>Score:</b> N/A			
	<b>Auditor Comments:</b> NA, operation does not export out of the US				

2.10.06	<b>Question:</b> Where products are destined for export, is there evidence that Maximum Residue Limits (MRLs) of the intended markets are?	Possible Points: 0 Points Scored: 0 Score: N/A
	<b>Auditor Comments:</b> NA, Operation does not export out of the US	
2.10.07	<b>Question:</b> Is there a documented procedure for the pesticide applications, considering mixing and loading, applying, and equipment cleaning?	Possible Points: 15 Points Scored: 15 Score: Total Compliance
	<b>Auditor Comments:</b> Yes, there is Pesticide usage SOP detailing pesticide applications, Crop Protection Equipment Cleaning SOP, Mixing of Crop Protection Chemicals SOP, and Applying Crop Protection Chemicals SOP. All SOP's were last reviewed on 05/05/2025	
2.10.08	<b>Question:</b> Is there documentation that shows the individual(s) making decisions for pesticide applications is competent?	Possible Points: 15 Points Scored: 15 Score: Total Compliance
	<b>Auditor Comments:</b> Yes, SW has a current and valid Pesticide Applicator License issued by the GA Department of AG. License #05570, Expiration date of 12/28/2025	
2.10.09	<b>Question:</b> 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
	<b>Auditor Comments:</b> Yes, the individual, CFS, that handles the pesticides has conducted Pesticide Handling Training on 05/20/2025 by SW.	
IPM Practices		
9.01.01	<b>Question:</b> Does the operation have a documented integrated pest management (IPM) plan?	Score: Non-Compliance
	<b>Auditor Comments:</b> Yes the operation does have a IPM SOP from Clark Crop Consulting, Inc. This SOP states the process taken to monitor crops for insects and diseases, determine the severity of each and plan a course of action, implement said course of action and monitor results. However the SOP lacks the threshold values .	
	<div><div><b>Auditee Comments:</b> See attached Letter of Guarantee from Clark with Thresholds included</div><div><div></div><div>View Files</div></div></div> <div><div><b>CB/Auditor Review Comments:</b> Updated SOP now includes thresholds for pests and disease.</div><div><div>CA Accepted?</div><div>Yes</div></div></div>	
9.01.02	<b>Question:</b> Does the operation have evidence of implementation of IPM practices?	Score: Total Compliance
	<b>Auditor Comments:</b> Yes, records in the form of scouting reports dated 08/13/2025, 09/13/2025, and 09/15/2025 which match usage reports where present confirming implementation.	
9.01.02a	<b>Question:</b> Does the operation monitor the effectiveness of non-chemical control methods used?	Score: Total Compliance
	<b>Auditor Comments:</b> Yes, the operation monitors the effectiveness of non-chemical controls through assessment of growing area during scouting.	
9.01.03	<b>Question:</b> Does the operation assess pesticide risk?	Score: Total Compliance
	<b>Auditor Comments:</b> Yes, the operation assesses pesticide risk through the review of pesticide labels.	
9.01.03a	<b>Question:</b> Are pesticide applications tied to a documented justification?	Score: Total Compliance
	<b>Auditor Comments:</b> Yes, all pesticide applications were observed to be tied to justification in the form of scouting records.	