


CORRECTIVE ACTION REPORT

Operation Type: Packinghouse
Audit Report Summary

CB Registration No. PA-PGFS-8608-1
PrimusGFS ID #173107 - Cert:4
Audited by Primus Auditing Operations

PrimusGFS Version 3.0

[Ver en Español](#)

Organization:	JAB Produce Contact(s): Mke Smietana Address: 2404 S. Wolcott Ave. #23 60608 Location: Chicago, Illinois, United States Phone Number: 7732267805				
Operation:	J.A.B. Produce Contact(s): Mke Smietana Location: 2404 S Wolcott Ave Chicago, Illinois 60608, United States				
Shipper:	JAB Produce, Inc.				
Operation Type:	Packinghouse				
Audit Type:	Announced Audit				
Audit Scope:	The facility includes approximately 20000 square feet of cooler space located in the Chicago Produce Terminal Market. There are six cooler areas owned by the auditee, and nine packing tables located in another rented cooler of 5000 square feet. Iced product can be received and is stored in 2 coolers. No ice machines or topping of product conducted on site. Re-packing includes breaking down of cases into smaller units. There is no trimming, cutting or washing of re-packed product. During the audit, there were eight packers observed. Product sold mainly to retail, groceries, and food service. The facility operates 12 months with 52 employees, including two drivers. Most product is picked up by customers and the facility ships on 2 trucks. Observed yellow tomatoes and taro being re-packed on the day of the audit. Observed a variety of fruits and vegetables in the coolers. Pest control as follows: Terminal market(exterior)-Anderson, Company owned space-Ecolab, rented coolers and packing area- Anderson, and PrestoX. There are no critical control points associated with the HACCP Program.				
Date FSMS started:	19 Jul 2019 08:00				
Date FSMS finished:	19 Jul 2019 11:00				
Total Amount of Time in FSMS	3.00 Hours				
Date Operation Started:	19 Jul 2019 11:00				
Date Operation Finished:	19 Jul 2019 14:00				
Total Amount of Time in Operation	3.00 Hours				
Product(s) observed during audit:	Asparagus, Basil, Berries, Blueberries, Broccoli, Cabbage, Carrots, Cilantro, Cucumbers, Dasheen / Taro, Fruits, Green Onions/Salad Onions/Scallions, Lettuce, Melons, Peppers, Raspberries, Spinach, Strawberries, Tomatoes, Vegetables				
Similar product(s)/process(es) not observed:	None				
Product(s) applied for but not observed:	None				
Auditor:	Lori Randall (Primus Auditing Operations)				
Preliminary Audit Score:	96%				
Final Audit Score:	97%				
Certificate Valid From:	26 Aug 2019 To 25 Aug 2020				
GPS Coordinates:	<table border="1"> <thead> <tr> <th>Latitude</th> <th>Longitude</th> </tr> </thead> <tbody> <tr> <td>41° 50' 43"</td> <td>87° 40' 20"</td> </tr> </tbody> </table>  Click here to see map	Latitude	Longitude	41° 50' 43"	87° 40' 20"
Latitude	Longitude				
41° 50' 43"	87° 40' 20"				

Information related to the audited operation			
Total number of workers:	52	Maximum worker number during peak season:	52
Number of lines in normal production:	1	Number of lines running during the audit:	1
Square Footage/Meters:	25000 Square feet	Are/Is a CCP(s) identified:	No
Allergens:	Yes	Allergen type(s):	Peanut
Temperature Controlled Storage:	Yes	Wet or dry:	Dry-Water used for Cleaning
Water Source:	Municipal/District		

Product information for each product

		Operation Process(es)			
Product Group/Product Name	Seasonality	Cultural Methods	Cooling Equipment	Water Used	Antimicrobial Used
Asparagus	Year round	Conventional	N/A	N/A	N/A
Basil	Year round	Conventional	N/A	N/A	N/A
Berries	Year round	Conventional	N/A	N/A	N/A
Blueberries	Year round	Conventional	N/A	N/A	N/A
Broccoli	Year round	Conventional	N/A	N/A	N/A
Cabbage	Year round	Conventional	N/A	N/A	N/A
Carrots	Year round	Conventional	N/A	N/A	N/A
Cilantro	Year round	Conventional	N/A	N/A	N/A
Cucumbers	Year round	Conventional	N/A	N/A	N/A
Dasheen / Taro	Year round	Conventional	N/A	N/A	N/A
Fruits	Year round	Conventional	N/A	N/A	N/A
Green Onions/Salad Onions/Scallions	Year round	Conventional	N/A	N/A	N/A
Lettuce	Year round	Conventional	N/A	N/A	N/A
Melons	Year round	Conventional	N/A	N/A	N/A
Peppers	Year round	Conventional	N/A	N/A	N/A
Raspberries	Year round	Conventional	N/A	N/A	N/A
Spinach	Year round	Conventional	N/A	N/A	N/A
Strawberries	Year round	Conventional	N/A	N/A	N/A
Tomatoes	Year round	Conventional	N/A	N/A	N/A
Vegetables	Year round	Conventional	N/A	N/A	N/A

AUDIT SCORING SUMMARY	Pre-Corrective Action Review		Post-Corrective Action Review	
Food Safety Management System Requirements	Score:	219	Score:	219
	Possible Points:	229	Possible Points:	229
	Percent Score:	95	Percent Score:	95
Module 5 - Good Manufacturing Practices Requirements	Score:	1098	Score:	1098
	Possible Points:	1128	Possible Points:	1128
	Percent Score:	97	Percent Score:	97
Module 6 - HACCP System Requirements	Score:	80	Score:	85
	Possible Points:	85	Possible Points:	85
	Percent Score:	94	Percent Score:	100
TOTAL	Score:	1397	Score:	1402
	Possible Points:	1442	Possible Points:	1442
	Percent Score:	96	Percent Score:	97

Non-Conformance Summary By Count	Pre-Corrective Action Non-Conformances	Post-Corrective Action Non-Conformances
Food Safety Management System Requirements	3	3
Module 5 - Good Manufacturing Practices Requirements	3	3
Module 6 - HACCP System Requirements	1	0
TOTAL	7	6

FSMS	Management System	Rejected						
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: Minor. Meetings have not been conducted quarterly as per guidelines. There was no meeting documented for second quarter. The Food Safety Committee includes Mike Smetana, Hector Espinoza, Blanca Coronel, Steve Serck, Steve Argires, Luis Lattica, Jose Martinez Sr and Jose Martinez Jr. Topics included audit preparation, documentation updates and employee training. Meeting minutes are documented on DOC 3.1-3, Food Safety Committee Form.</p> <p><i>Auditee Comments:</i> Did not have a 2nd quarter for the food safety committee. Will be done quarterly moving forward</p> <table border="1"> <thead> <tr> <th></th> <th>Accept CA?</th> <th></th> </tr> </thead> <tbody> <tr> <td><i>CB/Auditor Review Comments:</i> Reject. No objective evidence of compliance provided.</td> <td>No</td> <td> Possible Points: 5 Points Scored: 3 </td> </tr> </tbody> </table>		Accept CA?		<i>CB/Auditor Review Comments:</i> Reject. No objective evidence of compliance provided.	No	Possible Points: 5 Points Scored: 3	Possible Points: 5 Points Scored: 3 Score: Minor Deficiency
	Accept CA?							
<i>CB/Auditor Review Comments:</i> Reject. No objective evidence of compliance provided.	No	Possible Points: 5 Points Scored: 3						

FSMS	Management System	Rejected
------	-------------------	----------

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: 0 Score: Non-Compliance						
	Auditor Comments: No. There are no specific industry guidelines or best practices documents available.							
	<i>Auditee Comments:</i> Mke Smietana is FSPCA certified. Attached is FSPCA certification. View Files							
	<table border="1"> <tr> <td></td> <td style="text-align: center;">Accept CA?</td> <td></td> </tr> <tr> <td> CB/Auditor Review Comments: Reject. No objective evidence of compliance provided. </td> <td style="text-align: center; font-size: 1.2em;">No</td> <td> Possible Points: 3 Points Scored: 0 </td> </tr> </table>		Accept CA?		CB/Auditor Review Comments: Reject. No objective evidence of compliance provided.	No	Possible Points: 3 Points Scored: 0	
	Accept CA?							
CB/Auditor Review Comments: Reject. No objective evidence of compliance provided.	No	Possible Points: 3 Points Scored: 0						

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

1.06.02	Question: Are there current written food safety related specifications for all incoming products, ingredients, materials (including packaging), services provided on-site, and outsourced services?	Possible Points: 5 Points Scored: 0 Score: Non-Compliance						
	Auditor Comments: No. There are no food safety related specifications to review for incoming products, ingredients, materials, services provided on-site or outsourced services.							
	<i>Auditee Comments:</i> JAB produce uses USDA guidelines set forth for all incoming products and materials. Attached is copy of blue book guidelines. View Files							
	<table border="1"> <tr> <td></td> <td style="text-align: center;">Accept CA?</td> <td></td> </tr> <tr> <td> CB/Auditor Review Comments: Reject. No objective evidence of compliance provided. </td> <td style="text-align: center; font-size: 1.2em;">No</td> <td> Possible Points: 5 Points Scored: 0 </td> </tr> </table>		Accept CA?		CB/Auditor Review Comments: Reject. No objective evidence of compliance provided.	No	Possible Points: 5 Points Scored: 0	
	Accept CA?							
CB/Auditor Review Comments: Reject. No objective evidence of compliance provided.	No	Possible Points: 5 Points Scored: 0						

GMP	Worker Practices	Rejected
------------	-------------------------	-----------------

5.05.13	Question: Are workers issued non-reproducible identification (e.g., badges, company ID cards, etc.)?	Possible Points: 5 Points Scored: 0 Score: Non-Compliance						
	Auditor Comments: No. Workers are not issued non-reproducible identification.							
	<i>Auditee Comments:</i> Will have ID badges in the near future but do not have any at this time							
	<table border="1"> <tr> <td></td> <td style="text-align: center;">Accept CA?</td> <td></td> </tr> <tr> <td> CB/Auditor Review Comments: Rejected. No objective evidence of compliance provided. </td> <td style="text-align: center; font-size: 1.2em;">No</td> <td> Possible Points: 5 Points Scored: 0 </td> </tr> </table>		Accept CA?		CB/Auditor Review Comments: Rejected. No objective evidence of compliance provided.	No	Possible Points: 5 Points Scored: 0	
	Accept CA?							
CB/Auditor Review Comments: Rejected. No objective evidence of compliance provided.	No	Possible Points: 5 Points Scored: 0						

GMP	Maintenance & Sanitation Files	Rejected
------------	---	-----------------

5.14.09	Question: Is there a routine program and written procedure to verify sanitation effectiveness using rapid post sanitation checks (e.g., ATP measurements, allergen specific proteins)?	Possible Points: 15 Points Scored: 0 Score: Non-Compliance						
	Auditor Comments: No. There is no testing program in place to verify sanitation effectiveness utilizing rapid post sanitation checks.							
	<i>Auditee Comments:</i> JAB is in the process of purchasing an ATP measurement device,.							
	<table border="1"> <tr> <td></td> <td style="text-align: center;">Accept CA?</td> <td></td> </tr> <tr> <td> CB/Auditor Review Comments: Rejected. No objective evidence of compliance provided. </td> <td style="text-align: center; font-size: 1.2em;">No</td> <td> Possible Points: 15 Points Scored: 0 </td> </tr> </table>		Accept CA?		CB/Auditor Review Comments: Rejected. No objective evidence of compliance provided.	No	Possible Points: 15 Points Scored: 0	
	Accept CA?							
CB/Auditor Review Comments: Rejected. No objective evidence of compliance provided.	No	Possible Points: 15 Points Scored: 0						

GMP	Testing	Rejected
------------	----------------	-----------------

5.16.01	<p>Question: Is there a written risk-based, scientifically valid microbiological testing program that may include pathogen testing, and details program design (zonal approach, food contact/non-food contact surfaces, spent sprout irrigation water, test & hold, water, ice, etc.), rationale for organisms tested for, procedures for sampling and testing (surfaces, water, product, ingredients, etc.), timing and frequency of testing, the testing methodology, the lab that performs the tests, and acceptable results/threshold levels for each organism?</p>	<p>Possible Points: 15 Points Scored: 5 Score: Major Deficiency</p>
	<p>Auditor Comments: Major. There is no written risk assessment included in the microbiological testing program. There is no rationale for the organisms tested, timing of the testing, or frequency of the testing. The program indicates 10-12 samples are to be collected. There are only results for 8 sites. The program does not include water testing. The program included sites to be tested, acceptable results, corrective actions.</p>	
<p><i>Auditee Comments:</i> SOP states that 8 samples are taken monthly. Water test analysis was submitted. Attached files. View Files</p>		
		Accept CA?
<p><i>CB/Auditor Review Comments:</i> Rejected. No objective evidence of compliance provided.</p>		No
		<p>Possible Points: 15 Points Scored: 5</p>

HACCP	Development of the HACCP Plan	Approved
--------------	--------------------------------------	-----------------

6.02.01	<p>Question: Has a documented hazard analysis for the processes been conducted, showing the various types of hazards, their likelihood of occurrence, their associated severity and their control measures? 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: Minor. The hazard analysis does not list a chemical hazard of allergens at receiving of the prepackaged peanuts. There is a detailed hazard analysis on file which includes rationale using a 9-point risk matrix. Each process step is included which identifies potential biological, chemical, and physical contaminants, as well as a detailed listing for each step as to the pre-requisite programs in place to prevent, reduce, or eliminate possible risks. Analysis is dated 06/25/2019 and includes likelihood of occurrence and severity of identified hazards.</p>	
<p><i>Auditee Comments:</i> Attached file with hazard for allergens. View Files</p>		
		Accept CA?
<p><i>CB/Auditor Review Comments:</i> Total compliance. Corrective actions accepted.</p>		Yes
		<p>Possible Points: 15 Points Scored: 15 New Score: Total Compliance</p>