

AUDIT ID:

AUDIT DATE:	HANDLER:	CONTACT PERSON:	PHONE #:	E-MAIL:
1.				
2.				
AUDITOR:	ESCORT:	AUDIT SCOPE:		
		LGMA General Requirements/California Verification Audit		
GROWER:	HARVESTER:	CREW:	RANCH:	BLOCK:
COMMODITY & PACK STYLE:				
GROWER SANITATION SERVICE:		HARVESTER SANITATION SERVICE:		
COOLER:				
The review was based on the Commodity Specific Food Safety Guidelines for the Production and Harvest of Lettuce and Leafy Greens dated August 02, 2021. The following information and/or observations were noted during the audit.				
AUDITOR SIGNATURE:	DATE SUBMITTED:	TOTAL IN-PERSON TIME:		
Signature on File				
		TOTAL DURATION TIME:		
REVIEWER SIGNATURE:				

AUDIT ID: 0

Date:			
Handler:			
Grower:			
Page	Line #	General Requirements	Choose from dropdown
22	119	GR 01 - Is a written Leafy Greens Compliance Plan which specifically addresses the Best Practices of the LGMA available for review?	
		Comments:	
22	120-121	GR 02 - Does it specifically address the following subjects consistent with the LGMA:	
		GR 02a - Water	
		GR 02b - Soil Amendments	
		GR 02c - Environmental Factors	
		GR 02d - Work Practices	
		GR 02e - Field Sanitation	
		Comments:	
22	122	GR 03 - Is an up to date producers list with contact and location information available for review?	
		Comments:	
22	123	GR 04 - Is the shipper in compliance with the registration requirement of The Public Health Security and Bioterrorism Preparedness and Response Act of 2002?	
		Comments:	
22	125	GR 05 - Does the Shipper have a traceability process?	
		GR 05a - Does it enable identification of immediate non-transporter source?	
		GR 05b - Does it enable identification of immediate non-transporter subsequent recipient?	
		Comments:	
22	126	GR 06 - Has the Handler (or if applicable, the grower) designated someone to implement and oversee the food safety program?	
		GR 06a - Is the name of the individual available?	
		GR 06b - Is 24/7 contact information for the individual available?	
		Comments:	
22	128-132	GR 07 - Did Pre-Season and Pre-Harvest Risk Assessments determine that there is an	
		Comments:	
98-100	1290-1400	GR 08 - Was the risk-based pre-harvest testing conducted in accordance with the requirements in Issue 17 - Detailed Background Guidance Information?	
		Comments:	

AUDIT ID: 0

40,46, 57, 60, 61	Figure 1, 2B. 4. 5, Table 2F	GR 09 - Were the pre-harvest testing results positive? If yes, answer questions #GR 10		
		GR 10 - Was the product harvested for the fresh market?		
		Comments:		
23	136	GR 11 - Are any laboratory analysis conducted ? If Yes answer question # GR 12		
		Comments:		
23	136	GR 12 - What type of testing was conducted. Mark all that apply.		
23	136	GR 12a -	Water	<input type="checkbox"/>
23	136	GR 12b -	Soil	<input type="checkbox"/>
23	136	GR 12c -	Soil Amendments	<input type="checkbox"/>
23	136	GR 12d -	Crop Inputs	<input type="checkbox"/>
23	136	GR 12e -	Pre-Harvest Product Testing	<input type="checkbox"/>
23	136	GR 12f -	Other	<input type="checkbox"/>
		Comments:		
23	136	GR 13 - Is the laboratory certified/accredited for the testing that was conducted?		
		Comments:		
23	142	GR 14 - Were there any food safety issues that required a root cause analysis to be conducted? If yes, go to question #GR 15.		
		Comments:		
23	142	GR 15 - Was the root cause analysis documented?		
		Comments:		

AUDIT ID: 0

Page	Line #	Records	Choose from dropdown
23	151-157	RE 01 – Do records required by the Leafy Greens Compliance Plan include (as applicable):	
		RE 01a – farm name and location	
		RE 01b – actual values and observations obtained during monitoring	
		RE 01c – an adequate description of the leafy green product	
		RE 01d – growing area location (i.e. production location, including block and/or lot)	
		RE 01e – date and time of the activity being documented	
		Comments:	
23	159	RE 02 – Do records indicate they were created at the time the activity was performed?	
		Comments:	
23	161	RE 03 – Were the records signed and dated by the person performing the documented activity?	
		Comments:	
23	166	RE 04 - Were all records readily available and accessible for inspection during the audit? (e.g. logs, checklist, spreadsheets, etc.)	
		Comments:	
24	181	RE 05 – Do SOPs require documentation and records to be kept for 2 years?	
		Comments:	
23	148	RE 06 - Did the signatory assign or identify personnel to supervise (or otherwise be responsible for) operations to ensure compliance with the record requirements? If the answer is yes, go to question #RE07.	
		Comments:	
23	149	RE 07 - Is the assignment documented?	
		Comments:	

Page	Line #	Personnel Qualifications and Training	Choose from dropdown
24	194	PE 01 – Do training records indicate all personnel receive training at hire and at least annually thereafter? <i>Comments:</i>	
24-25	203-210	PE 02 - Does the training provided to all personnel who work with leafy greens or supervise those who do include: PE 02a - the principles of food hygiene and safety? PE 02b - the importance of health and personal hygiene? PE 02c - the standards established in these best practices that are applicable to the employee's job responsibilities? <i>Comments:</i>	
25	211-220	PE 03 - Do all harvest personnel receive additional training in: PE 03a - recognizing leafy greens that may be contaminated and therefore not be harvested? PE 03b - inspecting product containers, harvest equipment, and packaging materials to ensure they are working properly and do not pose a product contamination risk? PE 03c - how to correct problems with product containers, harvest equipment, and packaging materials or report problems to supervisors? <i>Comments:</i>	
25	221-233	PE 04 – Has a food safety professional / representative for each farm completed the Produce Safety Alliance, "Grower Training" or a standard curriculum recognized by the FDA? PE 04a - Grower PE 04b - Harvester PE 04c - Cooler/Holder <i>Comments:</i>	
25	224-225	PE 05 - Are there records of training events? Do they include: PE 05a - training date PE 05b - topics covered PE 05c - trainee name PE 05d - supervisor's signature indicating a review of training records was performed within a reasonable time of training <i>Comments:</i>	
25	226	PE 06 - Was there a supervisor's signature indicating a review was performed on all records within a reasonable time after records are made, per the company's SOP? <i>Comments:</i>	

AUDIT ID: 0

Page	Line #	Pre-Season Environmental Assessments		Yes, No, N/A
25	233	EA 01 - Was a detailed Pre-Season Risk Assessment completed prior to the first seasonal planting? If yes, answer questions #EA 2 and #EA 3.		
		Comments:		
25	233	EA 02 - Was the Pre-Season Risk Assessment conducted following applicable requirements and/or guidelines? (Example Issues 5, 12, 13, 14 and Appendix "I")		
		Comments:		
25 / 27	245 / 281	EA 03 - Did the Pre-Season Risk Assessment indicate that the adjacent land was free from uses or conditions that pose a food safety risk to crops, per Metrics Table 0 and Table 5? If no, answer questions # EA 04, EA 05,EA 06.		
		Comments:		
		EA 04 - What food safety risks were indicated on the Pre-Season Risk Assessment? Mark all that apply.		
25	239	EA 04a	Animal Intrusion	<input type="checkbox"/>
26	275	EA 04b	Flooding	<input type="checkbox"/>
26	271	EA 04c	History of Hazardous Activity	<input type="checkbox"/>
26	248	EA 04d	Compost	<input type="checkbox"/>
26	249 / 258	EA 04e	CAFO > 80,000	<input type="checkbox"/>
26	249 / 258	EA 04f	CAFO < 80,000	<input type="checkbox"/>
27	Table 0	EA 04g	AFO	<input type="checkbox"/>
27	Table 0	EA 04h	Grazing Lands	<input type="checkbox"/>
27	Table 0	EA 04i	Hobby Farms	<input type="checkbox"/>
27	Table 0	EA 04j	Non-synthetic soil amendments or crop inputs (animal based)	<input type="checkbox"/>
27	Table 0	EA 04k	Non-synthetic soil amendments or crop inputs (non-animal based)	<input type="checkbox"/>
27	Table 0	EA 04l	Bio-solids	<input type="checkbox"/>
26	273	EA 04m	Municipal Waste	<input type="checkbox"/>
26	273	EA 04n	Landfill	<input type="checkbox"/>
28	Table 0	EA 04o	Non-Leafy Green Crops	<input type="checkbox"/>
27	Table 0	EA 04p	Septic Leach Fields	<input type="checkbox"/>
27	Table 0	EA 04q	Habitat or Riparian Area	<input type="checkbox"/>
27	Table 0	EA 04r	Other?	<input type="checkbox"/>
		Comments:		
27	Table 0	EA 05	Were all risks checked above mitigated?	
		Comments:		

AUDIT ID: 0

27 /28	Table 0	EA 06	For indicated food safety risks, are mitigation measures, such as defined in Table 0 and Table 5, in place to justify a reduction of buffers and/or time?	
		Comments:		
26		EA 07	If CAFOs are adjacent to production location, did the assessment address the following:	
26	260	EA 07a	Information on the facility on their Best Management Practices?	
26	264	EA 07b	Number of animals within the CAFO?	
26	269	EA 07c	Water source and distribution system source for the production location proximate to the CAFO? (e.g. Appendix A)	
		Comments:		
25	245	EA 08	Did the Pre-Season Risk Assessment indicate that the adjacent land was free from uses or conditions that pose a food safety risk to water sources, per Metrics Table 0? If no, answer question #EA10.	
		Comments:		
26		EA 09 - What food safety risks to water were indicated on the Pre-Season Risk Assessment? Mark all that apply.		
28	Table 0	EA 09a	Well Head proximate to Untreated Manure?	<input type="checkbox"/>
28	Table 0	EA 09b	Surface Water proximate to Untreated Manure?	<input type="checkbox"/>
28	Table 0	EA 09c	Water Storage proximate to conditions that pose a food safety risk?	<input type="checkbox"/>
28	Table 0	EA 09d	Other?	<input type="checkbox"/>
		Comments:		
28	Table 0	EA 10	Are mitigation measures for the risks in place and documented?	
		Comments:		
28	Table 0	EA 11	Are mitigation measures, such as defined in Table 0, in place to justify a reduction of buffers?	
		Comments:		
Page #	Line #	Question #	Assessments Other Than Pre season and Pre Harvest	
26	254	EA 12	Between the Pre-Season and Pre-Harvest Assessments, were any additional assessments conducted due to on-farm or adjacent and nearby land activities which resulted in a possible high-risk situation and were additional mitigation performed as necessary? If yes, answer question #EA 14.	
		Comments:		
26	254	EA 13	Are mitigation measures implemented and documented?	
		Comments:		
Page #	Line #	Question #	Pre Harvest Assessment	
25	233	EA 14	Was a detailed Pre-Harvest Risk Assessment conducted within 7 days for each harvested lot? If Yes, answer questions #EA 15, #EA 16.	

AUDIT ID: 0

		Comments:		
22	128	EA 15	Was the Pre-Harvest Risk Assessment conducted following applicable requirements and/or guidelines? (Example Issues 5, 12, 13, 14 and Appendix "I")	
		Comments:		
25	234	EA 16	Did the Pre-Harvest Assessment indicate that the production area was free from uses or conditions that pose a food safety risk? If no, answer questions #EA 17 and #EA 18.	
		Comments:		
		EA 17	What food safety risks were indicated on the Pre-Harvest Risk Assessment? Mark all that apply.	
94	Figure 9	EA 17a	Medium-High Risk Intrusion by animals	<input type="checkbox"/>
95	Table 6	EA 17b	Low Risk Intrusion by animals	<input type="checkbox"/>
26	275-276	EA 17c	Flooding	<input type="checkbox"/>
25	236	EA 17d	Potential contamination materials	<input type="checkbox"/>
26	269	EA 17e	Condition of water source and distribution system	<input type="checkbox"/>
26	254	EA 17f	Unexpected adjacent land or nearby land activity that will pose a risk to food safety	<input type="checkbox"/>
26	250	EA 17g	Worker hygiene and sanitary facilities	<input type="checkbox"/>
25	242	EA 17j	Change of weather (i.e. severe wind, hail, freeze, excessive rain or consecutive weather events)	<input type="checkbox"/>
26	250	EA 17h	Other	<input type="checkbox"/>
		Comments:		
94 / 95	Figure 9 / Table 6	EA 18	For indicated food safety risk, are mitigation measures, such as defined in Table 6 and Figure 9, in place?	
		Comments:		

			AUDIT ID:	0
Page	Line #	Assessment of Agricultural Water System Water sources, irrigation methods, conveyance systems, and best practices		Yes, No, N/A
29	303-308	WU 01: Has a water system description that indicates the source, storage and conveyance of the system been completed and is it available for review? This description can use maps, photographs, drawings or other means to communicate the location of permanent fixtures and the flow of the water system. Comments:		
34-35	459-486	WU 02: Is there an SOP outlining best practices to avoid contamination of water sources, storage, and conveyance system within your control and does the SOP include corrective actions? Comments:		
34-35	459-486	WU 03: Is there a SOP for the maintenance of ancillary equipment, water storage, and conveyance components of each agricultural water system used in your operations, to ensure the condition of irrigation equipment does not pose a food safety risk and does the SOP include corrective actions? Comments:		
29-30	323-325 302-308 Appdx. A	WU 04: Prior to using water in any leafy green operation, was an agricultural water system assessment (including source, storage, and conveyance as described in Appendix A) performed? Comments:		
29-30	323-325 302-308 Appdx. A	WU 05: Were corrective actions identified during the agricultural water system assessment? Describe below in comments. Comments:		
29-30	323-325 302-308 Appdx. A	WU 06: If "YES", were corrective actions carried out according to the SOP? Comments:		
29-30	323-325 302-308 Appdx. A	WU 07: If "YES", is documentation available to show that actions were implemented? Comments:		
30	326-358	WU 08: What types of irrigation water sources are being used? Check all that apply and answer related questions in Checklist Section indicated. a. Type A Agricultural Water Systems Sourced from Public or Private Providers (Answer questions in Checklist Section B)		<input type="checkbox"/>

			AUDIT ID:	0
		b. Type A Agricultural Water Systems Sourced from Private Wells or Regulated Tertiary Treated Recycled Water Supplies (Answer questions in Checklist Section C)	<input type="checkbox"/>	
		c. Treated Type B -> A Agricultural Water Systems (Answer questions in Checklist Section D)	<input type="checkbox"/>	
		d. Type B Agricultural Water Systems - For example: Sources used as B, Untreated and exposed to the environment (open sources and/or delivery systems) (Answer question in Section E)	<input type="checkbox"/>	
		e. Natural (IE: Rain) (No additional questions)	<input type="checkbox"/>	
		f. Other (Please describe in comment section)	<input type="checkbox"/>	
		Comments:		
32	Table 1 415	WU 09: How is the agricultural water system being used? Check all that apply and answer related questions.		
		a. Treated Aerial Non-Irrigation within 21 days of scheduled harvest (sprayer, aircraft) (Answer questions in Checklist Section A)	<input type="checkbox"/>	
		b. Untreated Aerial Non-Irrigation greater than 21 days of scheduled harvest (sprayer, aircraft)	<input type="checkbox"/>	
		c. Untreated Aerial Irrigation within 21 days of scheduled harvest (overhead sprinklers)	<input type="checkbox"/>	
		d. Treated Aerial Irrigation within 21 days of scheduled harvest (overhead sprinklers)	<input type="checkbox"/>	
		e. Ground (furrow, drip) and/ or untreated aerial irrigation greater than 21 days of scheduled harvest.	<input type="checkbox"/>	
		f. Harvest (Answer questions in Checklist F)	<input type="checkbox"/>	
		g. Other (please describe in comment section)	<input type="checkbox"/>	
		Comments:		
31	366-378	WU 10: What is the system type? Check all that apply.		
		a. Closed delivery system	<input type="checkbox"/>	
		b. Open delivery system	<input type="checkbox"/>	
		Comments:		
31-33	394-416, Table 1	WU 11: When is your agricultural water system being used? Check all that apply.		
		a. Greater than 21 days until the scheduled harvest date?	<input type="checkbox"/>	
		b. Within 21 days of scheduled harvest date?	<input type="checkbox"/>	
		Comments:		
Page	Line #	Section A Overhead Chemical Applications within 21 Days of Scheduled Harvest (This section does NOT apply to chemical applications made through the distribution system, i.e. sprinkler)	Yes, No, N/A	
36	526-544	WU 12: Is there an SOP for all of the parts of the ag water system used in overhead chemical application and does the SOP include corrective actions?		

			AUDIT ID:	0
		Comments:		
36-37	545-558	WU 13: Is there an SOP for each unique application process to treat water that will be used in an overhead application within 21 days of a scheduled harvest and does the SOP include corrective actions?		
		Comments:		
37	559-562	WU 14: Is there a baseline for each unique application process to treat water that will be used in an overhead application within 21 days of a scheduled harvest and are there a minimum of 3 (100mL) samples, from different batches, per baseline?		
		Comments:		
37	563	WU 15: Are all 3 samples, for each baseline, non-detect for generic E.coli?		
		Comments:		
37	564-566	WU 16: Is there minimum of one (100 mL) microbiological sample taken each month from a representative agricultural water system or at the next application event?		
		Comments:		
37	567	WU 17: Are all routine microbiological sample non-detect for generic E.coli?		
		Comments:		
37	568-573	WU 18: If microbiological testing shows that the water did not meet generic E. coli acceptance criteria within 21 days of a scheduled harvest was a root cause analysis performed and the concern corrected? And was the grower/producer notified?		
		Comments:		
37	572-573	WU 19: If microbiological testing shows that the water did not meet generic E. coli acceptance criteria within 21 days of a scheduled harvest was the product tested for pathogens before harvest following the product testing requirements outlined in Table 2F?		
		Comments:		
37	575-576	WU 20: Are there monitoring records kept that verify that each application event is conducted following the parameters established during the initial setup?		
		Comments:		

			AUDIT ID:	0
37	578	WU 21: Did corrective actions get completed if monitoring shows that the water treatment parameters were not being met? <i>Comments:</i>		
37	579-580	WU 22: Was a microbiological sample taken to verify that the corrective action was effective and is the result part of the corrective action documentation? <i>Comments:</i>		
37	581-583	WU 23: If verification microbiological samples did not meet acceptance criteria was a root cause analysis performed and the treatment process corrected? <i>Comments:</i>		
37	581-583	WU 24: If verification microbiological samples did not meet acceptance criteria was product tested for pathogens before harvesting following the product testing requirements outlined in Table 2F? <i>Comments:</i>		
37	584-586	WU 25: Are records maintained that demonstrate the water used for chemical applications meets Type A source water requirements? <i>Comments:</i>		
Page	Line #	Section B: Irrigation Water from TYPE A Agriculture Water Systems Sourced from Public or Private Providers	Yes, No, N/A	
42	623 TABLE 2B-B1 Baseline Microbial Assessment	WU 26: Was Type A water sourced from public or private providers used in any overhead application within 21 days of schedule harvest? (If answer is yes then proceed to the following questions. If answer is no then proceed to Section C). <i>Comments:</i>		
42	623 TABLE 2B-B1 Baseline Microbial Assessment	WU 27: In lieu of a baseline microbial assessment, is the supplier's most current Certificate of Analysis (COA) available to review? (Note: Supplier annual water quality report is acceptable.) <i>Comments:</i>		
42	623 TABLE 2B-B1 Baseline Microbial Assessment	WU 28: Is water quality acceptable for Type A per COA & Per Table 2B in Metrics (If answer is NO, or COA is not available, water is considered Type B and go to Section C) <i>Comments:</i>		

			<i>AUDIT ID:</i>	0
42	623 TABLE 2B- B2 Initial Microbial Water Quality Assessment	WU 29: Were three samples collected for testing with at least one sample at the end of the delivery system before the 21-day to scheduled harvest period began?		
		Comments:		
43	623 TABLE 2B- B2 Initial Microbial Water Quality Assessment	WU 30: Did the water testing show that at least 2 of the 3 samples did not have detectable levels of generic E. coli, and the third sample had ≤ 10 MPN generic E. coli?		
		Comments:		
43	623 TABLE 2B- B2 Initial Microbial Water Quality Assessment	WU 31: If the initial microbial water quality assessment did not meet Type A water quality standards was a root cause analysis and an agricultural water system assessment (as described in Appendix A) completed and follow up testing conducted to use the system as Type A?		
		Comments:		
43	623 TABLE 2B- B2 Initial Microbial Water Quality Assessment	WU 32: If "YES" did follow up test results show that at least 4 out of 5 samples did not have detectable generic E. coli, and that the final sample had ≤ 10 MPN generic E. coli?		
		Comments:		
43	623 TABLE 2B- B2 Initial Microbial Water Quality Assessment	WU 33: If No was the system used as Type B?		
		Comments:		
44	624 TABLE 2B- B3 Routine Microbial water	WU 34: Was routine verification water testing performed at least once at each distinct irrigation system during the season with at least one sample at the end of the delivery system?		
		Comments:		
44	624 TABLE 2B- B3 Routine Microbial water	WU 35: Did the test show that at least 2 of 3 samples did not have detectable levels of generic E. coli, and the final sample had less than or equal to 10 MPN generic E. coli?		
		Comments:		

			AUDIT ID:	0
61	Line 659 TABLE 2F Routine Microbial water testing Remedial	WU 36: If No, were corrective actions taken and did the re-test show that 4 of 5 samples did not have detectable levels of generic E. coli and the final sample had ≤ 10 MPN generic E. coli?		
		Comments:		
66	659 Table 2F Routine Microbial water testing Remedial	WU 37: If No, were all affected lots (i.e., lots that have been irrigated with this water within the ≤ 21 days-to-scheduled-harvest window) tested for STEC (including E.coli O157:H7) and Salmonella prior to harvesting and after the last irrigation event?		
		Comments:		
66	659 TABLE 2F Routine Microbial water testing Remedial	WU 38: If pathogens were present, from positive test results, did the crop NOT get harvested for the fresh market and human consumption?		
		Comments:		
42-43	624 Table 2B- B2 Initial Microbial Water Quality	WU 39: Was the water system classified as type B?		
		Comments:		
42-43	624 Table 2B- B2 Initial Microbial Water Quality Assessmen	WU 40: Were there any material (significant) changes to the system after the initial microbial water quality assessment and/or routine microbial water testing?		
		Comments:		
42-43	624 Table 2B- B2 Initial Microbial Water Quality	WU 41: If YES, was another initial system microbial water assessment conducted? (If yes auditor to re-answer questions dealing with initial system microbial water assessments. WU15 to WU19)		
		Comments:		

			AUDIT ID:	0
Page	Line #	Section C Irrigation Water from Type A Agricultural Water Systems Sourced from Private Wells or Regulated Tertiary Treated Recycled Water Supplies	Choose from dropdown	
47	636 Table 2C- C1 Baseline Microbial Assessment	WU 42: Was water used in any overhead application within 21 days of schedule harvest? (If answer is yes then proceed to the following questions. Otherwise skip this section.) Comments:		
47	636 Table 2C- C1 Baseline Microbial Assessment	WU 43: Was baseline microbial assessment established using one of the following options? Choose all that apply. a. Most recent historical water test data with one test taken within the last 6 months <input type="checkbox"/> b. New water test data via sampling <input type="checkbox"/> Comments:		
48	636 Table 2C- C1 Baseline Microbial Assessment	WU 44: For each source did the data establish that the water quality meets Type A acceptance criteria? *For chronological historical test results (with one being within the last 6 months), 4 out of 5 samples did not have detectable generic E. coli, and that the final sample had ≤ 10 MPN generic E. coli? *For new water test data 5 out of 6 samples did not have detectable generic E. coli, and that the final sample had ≤ 10 MPN generic E. coli? The 6 samples were taken during 2 sampling events (3 samples per event) at least 7 days apart. (If answer is NO, water is considered Type B and go to Section C) Comments:		
48	636 Table 2C- C2 Initial Microbial Water Quality	WU 45: Were three samples collected for testing during 1 irrigation event with at least one sample taken at the end of the delivery system before the 21-day to scheduled harvest period began? Comments:		
48	636 Table 2C- C2 Initial Microbial Water Quality	WU 46: Did the water testing show that at least 2 of the 3 samples did not have detectable levels of generic E. coli, and the third sample had less than or equal to 10 MPN generic E. coli? Comments:		

			AUDIT ID:	0
48	636 Table 2C- C2 Initial Microbial Water Quality Assessment Remedial	WU 47: If the initial microbial water quality assessment did not meet Type A water quality standards, was a root cause analysis and an agricultural water system assessment (as described in Appendix A) completed and follow up testing conducted to use the system as Type A?		
		Comments:		
49	636 Table 2C- C2 Initial Microbial Water Quality	WU 48: If "YES" did follow up test results show that at least 4 out of 5 samples did not have detectable generic E. coli, and that the final sample had less than or equal to 10 MPN generic E. coli?		
		Comments:		
49	636 Table 2C- C2 Initial	WU 49: If "NO" was system used as Type B?		
		Comments:		
49	636 Table 2C- C3 Routine Verification of Microbial Water	WU 50: Was a routine verification water testing performed at least once at each distinct irrigation system during the season with at least one sample at the end of the delivery system?		
		Comments:		
49	636 Table 2C- C3 Routine Verification of Microbial	WU 51: Did the test show that at least 2 of 3 samples did not have detectable levels of generic E. coli, and the final sample had less than or equal to 10 MPN generic E. coli?		
		Comments:		
61	Line 659 TABLE 2F Routine Microbial water testing Remedial	WU 52: If No, were corrective actions taken and did the re-test show that 4 of 5 samples did not have detectable levels of generic E. coli and the final sample had ≤ 10 MPN generic E. coli?		
		Comments:		
61	659 Table 2F Routine Microbial water testing Remedial	WU 53: If No were all affected lots (i.e., lots that have been irrigated with this water within the <21 days-to-scheduled-harvest window) tested for STEC (including E. coli O157:H7) and Salmonella prior to harvesting and after the last irrigation event?		
		Comments:		

			<i>AUDIT ID:</i>	0
61	659 Table 2F Routine Microbial water testing Remedial	WU 54: If pathogens were present, from positive test results, did the crop NOT get harvested for the fresh market and human consumption?		
		Comment:		
61	659 Table 2F Routine Microbial water testing Remedial	WU 55: Was the system classified as Type B?		
		Comments:		
48	Line 659 TABLE 2C- C2 Initial Microbial	WU 56: Were there any material (significant) changes to the system after the initial microbial water quality assessment?		
		Comments:		
48	659 Table 2C- C2 Initial Microbial Water Quality	WU 57: If YES, was another initial system microbial water assessment conducted? (If yes auditor to re-answer questions dealing with initial system microbial water assessments. WU45 to WU49)		
		Comments:		
Page	Line #	Section D Irrigation Water from Treated Type B to A Agricultural Water Systems: Water from canals, rivers or reservoirs (Type B) or water from Sections A&B that did not meet Type A standard.	Yes, No, N/A	
54	Table 2D 647	WU 58: Has any water been treated from Type B to A. If yes answer the following questions.		
		Comment:		
	Appendix A Pg 22 Table 9 Initial Irrigation Water Treatment	WU 59: Was an Initial Irrigation Water Treatment Assessment conducted and an SOP established outlining the water baseline quality, treatment method, mitigations used, dose, and methods for verification of treatment to change water from Type B to A per Appendix A guidance?		
		Comments:		
	Appendix A Pg 22 Table 9 Initial Irrigation W t	WU 60: Are antimicrobial treatments used and managed in a manner that meets all federal, state and local regulations and label requirements?		

			<i>AUDIT ID:</i>	0
	Water Treatment	Comments:		
	Appendix A Pg 23 Table 10 Initial Microbial Water Quality	WU 61: Did the Initial Microbial Water Quality Assessment collect at least three (3) 100 mL samples during one irrigation event with at least one sample collected at the end of the delivery system and each collected at a different sprinkler head?		
		Comments:		
	Appendix A Pg 23 Table 10 Initial Microbial Water Quality Assessment	WU 62: Did the Initial Microbial Water Quality Assessment water testing show that at least 2 of the 3 samples did not have detectable levels of generic E. coli, and the third sample had ≤ 10 MPN generic E. coli and for total coliform a monitoring maximum level of 99 MPN in 100mL in all water samples or an adequate log reduction per Appendix A guidance?		
		Comments:		
	Appendix A Pg 23 Table 10 Initial Microbial Water	WU 63: If the initial microbial water quality assessment did not meet Type A water quality standards, was a root cause analysis and an agricultural water system assessment (as described in Appendix A) completed and follow up testing conducted to use the system as Type A?		
		Comments:		
61	Line 659 TABLE 2F Routine Microbial water testing Remedial	WU 64: If "YES" did follow up test results show that at least 4 out of 5 samples did not have detectable generic E. coli, that the 5th sample had ≤ 10 MPN generic E. coli, and all samples met the Total Coliform monitoring requirement of a max value of 99 MPN or an adequate log reduction?		
		Comments:		
	Appendix A Pg 23 Table 10 Initial Microbial Water Quality	WU 65: If "NO" was system used as Type B?		
	A	Comments:		

			<i>AUDIT ID:</i>	0
54	647 Table 2D- D1 Routine Verification of Microbial Water Quality	<p>WU 66: Was routine water testing performed on a monthly frequency (or at the next irrigation event if longer than monthly) with at least three (3) 100 mL samples collected during one irrigation event with at least one sample at the end of the delivery system and if the irrigation treatment system is being used within the 21 days to scheduled harvest window was each distinct system sampled on at least 2 occasions separated by at least 3 days?</p> <p>Comments:</p>		
54	647 Table 2D- D1 Routine Verification of Microbial Water	<p>WU 67: Did water testing show that at least 2 of the 3 samples did not have detectable levels of generic E. coli, and the third sample had ≤ 10 MPN generic E. coli and for Total Coliform a monitoring maximum level of 99 MPN in 100 mL in all water samples or an adequate log reduction per Appendix A guidance?</p> <p>Comments:</p>		
55	616 Table 2F Routine Microbial water testing	<p>WU 68: If the answer is No, were corrective actions taken and 4 of 5 samples did not have detectable levels of generic E. coli and < 10 MPN as the single sample maximum for one (1) sample and were all samples at a level ≤ 99 MPN for Total coliform or an adequate log reduction?</p> <p>Comments:</p>		
61	659 Table 2F Routine Microbial water testing Remedial	<p>WU 69: For generic E. coli re-test failure if the water from the initial sampling to the last round of sampling has been applied to leafy greens, was the crop tested from all affected lots (i.e., lots that have been irrigated with this water within the <21 days-to-scheduled-harvest window) for STEC (including E. coli O157:H7) and Salmonella per Table 2F?</p> <p>Comments:</p>		
61	659 Table 2F Routine Microbial water testing Remedial	<p>WU 70: For Total Coliforms re-test failure was a root cause analysis performed to evaluate the irrigation treatment system and corrections made per Table 2F?</p> <p>Comments:</p>		
55	647 Table 2D- D2 Routine Water Treatment Monitoring	<p>WU 71: For each irrigation event are treatment monitoring records available?</p> <p>Comments:</p>		

			<i>AUDIT ID:</i>	0
55	647 Table 2D- D2 Routine Water Treatment	WU 72: Do the records show that the monitoring requirements are being met? If yes skip to question WU79.		
		Comments:		
55	Line 647 Table 2D- D2 Routine Water Treatment	WU 73: If monitoring records show that treatment parameters weren't met, in accordance to the monitoring SOP, were remedial actions conducted including taking microbial verification water samples in accordance to Table 2D section D2?		
		Comments:		
55	Line 647 Table 2D- D1 Routine Verification of Microbial Water Quality	WU 74: Did verification sample results show that at least 2 of the 3 samples did not have detectable levels of generic E. coli, and the third sample had ≤ 10 MPN generic E. coli and for Total Coliform a monitoring maximum level of 99 MPN in 100 mL in all water samples or an adequate log reduction per Appendix A guidance?		
		Comments:		
55	659 Table 2F Routine Microbial water testing	WU 75: If the answer is No, were corrective actions taken and were 4 of 5 samples non-detect for generic E. coli and < 10 MPN as the single sample maximum for one (1) sample and were all samples at a level ≤ 99 MPN for Total coliform or an adequate log reduction?		
	R di i	Comments:		
55	659 Table 2F Routine Microbial water testing	WU 76: For generic E. coli re-test failure if the water from the initial sampling to the last round of sampling has been applied to leafy greens, was the crop tested from all affected lots (i.e., lots that have been irrigated with this water within the <21 days-to-scheduled-harvest window) for STEC (including E. coli O157:H7) and Salmonella per Table 2F?		
	Remedial	Comments:		
55	659 Table 2F Routine Microbial water testing	WU 77: For Total Coliforms re-test failure was a root cause analysis performed to evaluate the irrigation treatment system and corrections made per Table 2F?		
	R di i	Comments:		
55	Appendix A Pg 23 Table 10 Initial Microbial Water Quality	WU 78: Was the water classified as Type B?		

			AUDIT ID:	0
	Quality Assessment	Comments:		
55	Appendix A Pg 23 Table 10 Initial Microbial Water Quality Assessment	WU 79: Were there any material (significant) changes to the system after the initial microbial water quality assessment?		
		Comments:		
55	Appendix A Pg 23 Table 10 Initial Microbial Water Quality Assessment	WU 80: If YES, was another initial system microbial water assessment conducted? (If yes auditor to re-answer questions dealing with initial system microbial water assessments.)		
		Comments:		
Page	Line #	Section E Irrigation Water from Type B Agricultural Water Systems		Yes, No, N/A
38 & 58	606 Table 2A 652 Table 2E	WU 81: Was a source water quality microbiological test conducted for each source of water within 60 days of first use on post germinated fields?		
		Comments:		
38 & 58	606 Table 2A 652 Table 2E	WU 82: Are records available to demonstrate that One (1) 100 mL water sample has been collected from each water distribution system on a monthly basis (or at the next irrigation event if longer than monthly)?		
		Comments:		
38 & 58	606 Table 2A 652 Table 2E	WU 83: Do Records show that the water samples are taken no less than 18 hours apart?		
		Comments:		
38 & 58	606 Table 2A 652 Table 2E	WU 84: Is the geometric mean less than or equal to 126 MPN/100 mL?		
		Comments:		
38 & 58	606 Table 2A 652 Table 2E	WU 85: Are all individual samples less than or equal to 235MPN/100 ml (foliar) or 576 MPN/100mL (non-Foliar)?		
		If no answer the applicable questions below: Non-foliar: WU 86 to WU 91 Foliar: WU 92 to WU 98		
		Comments:		

			AUDIT ID:	0
38-40	606 Table 2A 608 Figure 1 Non-Foliar Remedial	WU 86: Was an agricultural water system assessment conducted and were samples for the required water re-testing taken at the previous sampling point?		
		Comments:		
40	608 Figure 1 Non-Foliar Remedial Actions	WU 87: Was one (1) 100 mL water test taken daily (not less than 18 hours apart) for 5 days?		
		Comments:		
40	608 Figure 1 Non-Foliar Remedial Actions	WU 88: Were these 5 test results meeting the acceptance criteria: average less than 126 MPN/100mL (based on rolling geometric mean=5) and no sample exceeded 576 MPN/100 mL (non-foliar)?		
		Comments:		
40	608 Figure 1 Non-Foliar Remedial Actions	WU 89: Do records show the water system was not used while the water quality was inadequate?		
		Comments:		
40	608 Figure 1 Non-Foliar Remedial Actions	WU 90: If no, was product sampled for STEC (including E. coli O157:H7) and Salmonella?		
		Comments:		
40	608 Figure 1 Non-Foliar Remedial Actions	WU 91: Do records show that the crop was not harvested for human consumption when the tests were positive for STEC (including E. coli O157:H7) and Salmonella?		
		Comments:		
60	655 Figure 5 Foliar Remedial Actions	WU 92: If the water source is a well was an agricultural system assessment and/or treatment performed?		
		Comments:		
60	655 Figure 5 Foliar Remedial Actions	WU 93: Were samples for the required water re-testing taken at the previous sampling point?		
		Comments:		

			AUDIT ID:	0
60	655 Figure 5 Foliar Remedial Actions	WU 94: Were (3) 100 mL water test taken (not less than 18 hours apart)?		
		Comments:		
60	655 Figure 5 Foliar Remedial Actions	WU 95: If yes, were these (3) test results meeting the acceptance criteria? (all less than 126 MPN/100mL?)		
		Comments:		
60	655 Figure 5 Foliar Remedial Actions	WU 96: If no, was the water source discontinued for use until brought back within acceptance criteria?		
		Comments:		
60	655 Figure 5 Foliar Remedial A ti	WU 97: If crop was contacted by the water exceeding the acceptance criteria was product sampled for STEC (including E. coli O157:H7) and Salmonella?		
		Comments:		
60	655 Figure 5 Foliar Remedial Actions	WU 98: Do records show that the crop was not harvested for human consumption when the tests were positive for STEC (including E. coli O157:H7) and Salmonella?		
		Comments:		
Page	Line #	Section F Harvest Water used on Product, Food Contact Surfaces and for Hand Washing	Yes, No, N/A	
63	Line 661 TABLE 2G	WU 99: Was water used during harvest application to the edible portion of the crop or food contact surfaces or hand washing? (If answer is yes, then proceed to following questions otherwise stop here).		
		Comments:		
63	Line 661 TABLE 2G	WU 100: Is there an SOP prepared to make sure that water used for harvest direct product contact, food contact surfaces, and hand washing is sourced from municipal, well, or Reverse Osmosis water sources. Does this water meet the Maximum Contaminant Level Goal for generic E.coli as specified by U.S. EPA or contains an approved disinfection method at sufficient concentration or of sufficient wavelength to prevent cross-contamination?		
		Comments:		

			AUDIT ID:	0
63	Line 661 TABLE 2G	WU 101: Did water quality meet microbial standards? <ul style="list-style-type: none"> Single pass use – Water must have non-detectable levels of generic E. coli or breakpoint disinfectant present at point of entry Multi-pass use – Water must have non-detectable levels of generic E. coli and/or sufficient disinfectant to ensure returned water has no detectable E. coli Chlorine ≥ 1 ppm free chlorine after application and pH 5.5 – 7.5 If no, answer the questions below.		
61	Line 661 TABLE 2G	WU 102: Is there an SOP that determines what corrective actions are required when harvest water does not meet acceptance criteria?		
		Comments:		
61	Line 661 TABLE 2G	WU 103: Are there records demonstrating that the water was no longer used until corrective actions were complete?		
		Comments:		
61	Line 661 TABLE 2G	WU 104: If the water source is a well was an agricultural system assessment and/or treatment performed?		
		Comments:		
61	Line 661 TABLE 2G	WU 105: Was the distribution line and source inlet examined as described in Appendix A and retested from the same point of use?		
		Comments:		
61	Line 661 TABLE 2G	WU 106: Were all samples non-detect less than or equal to 2 MPN/100mL for generic E.coli?		
		Comments:		
65	Line 665 Figure 6	WU 107: If crop, or food contact surfaces, were contacted by the water exceeding the acceptance criteria was product sampled for STEC (including E. coli O157:H7) and Salmonella?		
		Comments:		
65	Line 665 Figure 6	WU 108: Do records show that the crop was not distributed for human consumption when the tests were positive for STEC (including E. coli O157:H7) and Salmonella?		
		Comments:		

AUDIT ID: 0

Page	Line #	Soil Amendments And Crop Inputs		Yes, No, N/A
66	670-697	SA 01	What soil amendments or crop inputs are being used? Mark all that apply.	
Soil Amendments:				
66	703	SA 01a	Raw manure and/or other soil amendments containing untreated animal by-products, uncomposted or incompletely composted animal manure, or not thermally treated animal products	
66	692	SA 01b	7a – Composted Biological Soil Amendments of animal origin	
66	693	SA 01c	7b1 – Composted Biological Soil Amendments Not Containing products of animal origin	
66	694	SA 01d	7b2 - Non-Composted Biological Soil Amendments Not Containing products of animal origin	
66	695	SA 01e	7c – Biological Soil Amendments that have gone through a validated treatment process	
66	696	SA 01f	7d – Synthetic and/or Inorganic Soil Amendments	
66	697	SA 01g	7e – Soil Amendments with Combined Components	
		Comments:		
Crop Inputs				
66	692	SA 01h	7a - Composted Biological Crop Inputs of animal origin	
66	693	SA 01i	7b1 - Composted Biological Crop Inputs Not Containing Products of animal origin	
66	694	SA 01j	7b2 - Non-Composted Biological Crop Inputs Not Containing products of animal origin	
66	695	SA 01k	7c- Biological Crop Inputs that have gone through a validated treatment process	
66	696	SA 01l	7d - Synthetic and/or Inorganic Crop Inputs	
66	697	SA 01m	7e – Crop Inputs with Combined Components	
		Comments:		
Soil Amendments:				
66	699	SA 02	Have risk assessments for soil amendments (except category 7d) that considered the supplier, delivery, storage, application, weather/climatic conditions, animal intrusion, visitor/employee movements, vehicle traffic or other applicable hazards been performed?	
		Comments:		
67	714	SA 03	Is there a written SOP that implements management controls regarding storage and application controls (e.g. supplier approval, source of the amendment, delivery and transport, surplus or unconsumed inventory, length of storage and storage location prior to crop application, timing of applications within the crop cycle and processes used for application, weather events, other potential hazards)?	
		Comments:		

AUDIT ID: 0

68	751	SA 04	Is there a written SOP from the soil amendment suppliers to prevent cross-contamination of in-process and finished soil amendments with raw materials? The SOPs should consider the equipment, runoff, wind, and instructions for the handling, conveyance and storage of in-process and finished soil amendments that have become contaminated?	
		Comments:		
Crop Inputs				
68	780	SA 05	Is there a risk assessment for crop inputs that considers the supplier, delivery, storage, and application of the product?	
		Comments:		
69	799	SA 06	Is there an SOP that establishes management controls that significantly reduce the likelihood that crop inputs being used may contain human pathogens? The SOP must address supplier approval, source of the amendment, delivery, and transport, surplus or unconsumed inventory, length of storage and storage location prior to crop application, timing of application in the crop cycle and processes used for application, weather events, potential for animal intrusion on-farm, visitor and employee movements, and vehicle traffic.	
		Comments:		
Raw manure, untreated animal products/by-products, or not fully composted green waste, biosolids, and/or animal manure containing soil amendments				
66	703	SA 07	Were raw manure and/or other soil amendments containing untreated animal by-products, uncomposted or incompletely composted animal manure, or non-thermally treated animal manure applied to lettuce/leafy greens production? If yes, answer question # SA 08.	
		Comments:		
71	Table 3	SA 08	Were leafy greens planted before one year? If yes, answer question #SA 09.	
		Comments:		
71	Table 3	SA 09	Was the 270-day time period used? If yes, answer question #SA 10.	
		Comments:		
71	Table 3	SA 10	Was soil testing conducted? If yes, answer question #SA 11.	
		Comments:		
71	Table 3	SA 11	Did testing results meet the required acceptance criteria?	
		Comments:		
71	Table 3	SA 12	Have Type A biosolids been used as a soil amendment or used as an ingredient for soil amendments for lettuce/leafy greens production? If yes, answer question #SA 13.	
		Comments:		
71	Table 3	SA 13	Were leafy greens planted within one year from application?	
		Comments:		
71	Table 3	SA 14	Have Type B biosolids been used as a soil amendment or used as an ingredient for soil amendments for lettuce/leafy greens production? If yes, answer question #SA 15.	
		Comments:		

AUDIT ID: 0

71	Table 3	SA 15	Were leafy greens planted within 38 months from application?	
		Comments:		
7a Soil Amendments - Biological of Animal Origin				
72-73	Table 3-7a	SA 16	Were any soil amendments of animal origin composted with the windrow method applied to the field within the last year? If yes, answer question #SA 17.	
		Comments:		
72-73	Table 3-7a	SA 17	Are Process Validation records available for review? If yes, answer questions #SA 18, #SA 19, #SA 20.	
		Comments:		
72-73	Table 3-7a	SA 18	Did the active compost maintain aerobic conditions for a minimum of 131°F or higher for 15 days or longer?	
		Comments:		
72-73	Table 3-7a	SA 19	Was there a minimum of five (5) turnings during this period?	
		Comments:		
72-73	Table 3-7a	SA 20	Is there a Letter of Guarantee, or other comparable documentation, available that shows the soil amendment has been adequately cured?	
		Comments:		
72-73	Table 3-7a	SA 21	Were any soil amendments of animal origin composted with the Enclosed or Within-Vessel composting method? If yes, answer question #SA 22.	
		Comments:		
72-73	Table 3-7a	SA 22	Are Process Validation records available for review? If yes, answer questions #SA 23, #SA 24.	
		Comments:		
72-73	Table 3-7a	SA 23	Was the active compost maintained for a minimum of 131 °F for 3 days?	
		Comments:		
72-73	Table 3-7a	SA 24	Is there a letter of Guarantee, or other comparable documentation, available that verifies that the soil amendment has been adequately cured?	
		Comments:		
72-73	Table 3-7a	SA 25	Were any soil amendments of animal origin composted with the Aerated Static Pile Composting method? If yes, answer questions #SA 26.	
		Comments:		
72-73	Table 3-7a	SA 26	Are Process Validation records available for review? If yes, answer questions # SA 27, #SA 28, #SA 29.	
		Comments:		
72-73	Table 3-7a	SA 27	Was the active compost covered with insulating materials, per federal, state and local regulations?	
		Comments:		
72-73	Table 3-7a	SA 28	Was the pile maintained for a minimum of 131°F for 3 days?	
		Comments:		
72-73	Table 3-7a	SA 29	Is there a Letter of Guarantee, or other comparable documentation, available that shows the soil amendment has been adequately cured?	

AUDIT ID: 0

		Comments:		
72-73	Table 3-7a	SA 30	If any soil amendments became contaminated, was the product segregated and not used until determined safe for food production?	
		Comments:		
72-73	Table 3-7a	SA 31	Has each lot of composted material or soil amendment been applied to the production location more than 45 days before harvest?	
		Comments:		
72-73	Table 3-7a	SA 32	For on-farm compost, are process control monitoring records reviewed, dated and signed by supervisor or responsible party, within a week after the records were made?	
		Comments:		
72-73	Table 3-7a	SA 33	Has each lot of composted material that is less than or equal to 5000 cubic yards been tested as required?	
		Comments:		
72-73	Table 3-7a	SA 34	Has acceptance criteria been met for the following:	
72-73	Table 3-7a	SA 34a	Fecal coliforms : < 100 MPN / gram	
72-73	Table 3-7a	SA 34b	Salmonella: Negative or less than detection limit (<1 MPN/30 grams)	
72-73	Table 3-7a	SA 34c	STEC: Negative or less than Detection Limit per methodology used	
		Comments:		
72-73	Table 3-7a	SA 35	Have the recommended test methods been used:	
72-73	Table 3-7a	SA 35a	Fecal coliforms: U.S. EPA Method 1680; multiple-tube MPN	
72-73	Table 3-7a	SA 35b	Salmonella spp: U.S. EPA Method 1682	
72-73	Table 3-7a	SA 35c	STEC: Any laboratory validated method for compost	
72-73	Table 3-7a	SA 35d	Other U.S. EPA, FDA, AOAC, or TMECC-accredited methods used as an appropriate replacement	
		Comments:		
72-73	Table 3-7a	SA 36	Has the Sampling Plan followed the acceptable criteria:	
72-73	Table 3-7a	SA 36a	Was a representative and random composite sample was obtained following California State regulations?	
72-73	Table 3-7a	SA 36b	Was the sample obtained by a trained sampler?	
		Comments:		
7b[1] Composted Soil Amendments Not Containing Products of Animal Origin (Green/plant waste, vegetative material, pre/post consumer waste not containing products of animal origin, etc.)				
73-75	Table 3-7b[1]	SA 37	Were any soil amendments of non-animal origin composted with the windrow method applied to the field within the last year? If yes, answer question #SA 38.	

AUDIT ID: 0

73-75	Table 3-7b[1]	SA 38	Are Process Validation records available for review? If yes, answer questions #SA 39,#SA 40,#SA 41.	
		Comments:		
73-75	Table 3-7b[1]	SA 39	Did the active compost maintain aerobic conditions for a minimum of 131°F or higher for 15 days or longer?	
		Comments:		
73-75	Table 3-7b[1]	SA 40	Was there a minimum of five (5) turnings during this period?	
		Comments:		
73-75	Table 3-7b[1]	SA 41	Is there a Letter of Guarantee, or other comparable documentation, available that shows the soil amendment has been adequately cured?	
		Comments:		
73-75	Table 3-7b[1]	SA 42	Is there a Letter of Guarantee, or other comparable documentation (ingredient statement, agricultural label etc.) available that shows the soil amendment is free of product of animal origin?	
		Comments:		
73-75	Table 3-7b[1]	SA 43	Were any soil amendments of non-animal origin composted with the Enclosed or Within-Vessel composting method? If yes, answer question #SA 44.	
		Comments:		
73-75	Table 3-7b[1]	SA 44	Are Process Validation records available for review? If yes, answer questions #SA 45, #SA 46, #SA 47.	
		Comments:		
73-75	Table 3-7b[1]	SA 45	Was the active compost was maintained for a minimum of 131 °F for 3 days?	
		Comments:		
73-75	Table 3-7b[1]	SA 46	Is there a letter of Guarantee, or other comparable documentation, available that verifies that the soil amendment has been adequately cured?	
		Comments:		
73-75	Table 3-7b[1]	SA 47	Is there a Letter of Guarantee, or other comparable documentation (ingredient statement, agricultural label etc.) available that shows the soil amendment is free of product of animal origin?	
		Comments:		
73-75	Table 3-7b[1]	SA 48	Were any soil amendments of non-animal origin composted with the Aerated Static Pile Composting method? If yes, answer questions #SA 49.	
		Comments:		
73-75	Table 3-7b[1]	SA 49	Are Process Validation records available for review? If yes, answer questions #SA 50, #SA 51, #SA 52.	
		Comments:		
73-75	Table 3-7b[1]	SA 50	Was the active compost covered with insulating materials, per federal, state and local regulations?	
		Comments:		
73-75	Table 3-7b[1]	SA 51	Was the pile maintained for a minimum of 131°F for 3 days?	
		Comments:		

AUDIT ID: 0

73-75	Table 3-7b[1]	SA 52	Is there a Letter of Guarantee, or other comparable documentation, available that shows the soil amendment has been adequately cured?	
		Comments:		
73-75	Table 3-7b[1]	SA 53	Is there a Letter of Guarantee, or other comparable documentation (ingredient statement, agricultural label etc.) available that shows the soil amendment is free of product of animal origin?	
		Comments:		
73-75	Table 3-7b[1]	SA 54	If any soil amendments became contaminated, was the product segregated and not used until determined safe for food production?	
		Comments:		
73-75	Table 3-7b[1]	SA 55	Has each lot of composted material or soil amendment been applied to the production location more than 45 days before harvest?	
		Comments:		
73-75	Table 3-7b[1]	SA 56	For on-farm compost, are process control monitoring records reviewed, dated and signed by supervisor or responsible party, within a week after the records were made?	
		Comments:		
73-75	Table 3-7b[1]	SA 57	Has each lot of composted material that is less than or equal to 5000 cubic yards been tested as required?	
		Comments:		
73-75	Table 3-7b[1]	SA 58	Has acceptance criteria been met for the following:	
73-75	Table 3-7b[1]	SA 58a	Fecal coliforms: < 100 MPN / gram	
73-75	Table 3-7b[1]	SA 58b	Salmonella: Negative or less than Detection Limit (<1 MPN/30 grams)	
73-75	Table 3-7b[1]	SA 58c	STEC: Negative or less than Detection Limit per methodology used	
		Comments:		
73-75	Table 3-7b[1]	SA 59	Have the recommended test methods been used:	
73-75	Table 3-7b[1]	SA 59a	Fecal coliforms: U.S. EPA Method 1680; multiple-tube MPN	
73-75	Table 3-7b[1]	SA 59b	Salmonella spp: U.S. EPA Method 1682	
73-75	Table 3-7b[1]	SA 59c	STEC: Any laboratory validated method for compost	
73-75	Table 3-7b[1]	SA 59d	Other U.S. EPA, FDA, AOAC, or TMECC-accredited methods used as an appropriate replacement	
		Comments:		
73-75	Table 3-7b[1]	SA 60	Has the Sampling Plan followed the acceptable criteria:	
73-75	Table 3-7b[1]	SA 60a	Was a representative and random composite sample was obtained following California State regulations.	
73-75	Table 3-7b[1]	SA 60b	Was the sample obtained by a trained sampler?	
		Comments:		

AUDIT ID: 0

7b[2] Non-Composted Soil Amendments Not Containing Products of Animal Origin (green/plant waste, vegetative material, pre/post consumer waste not containing products of animal origin, etc.)

75-77	Table 3-7b[2]	SA 61	Were any non-composted soil amendments of non-animal origin applied to the field within the last year? If yes, answer #SA 62.	
		Comments:		
75-77	Table 3-7b[2]	SA 62	Is there a Letter of Guarantee, or other comparable documentation (ingredient statement, agricultural label etc.) available that shows the soil amendment is free of product of animal origin?	
		Comments:		
75-77	Table 3-7b[2]	SA 63	Are on-farm produced soil amendments process control monitoring records reviewed, dated and signed by supervisor or responsible party, within a week after the records were made?	
		Comments:		
75-77	Table 3-7b[2]	SA 64	Has acceptance criteria been met for the following:	
75-77	Table 3-7b[2]	SA 64a	Fecal coliforms: < 100 MPN / gram of total solids (Dry weight basis)	
75-77	Table 3-7b[2]	SA 64b	Salmonella: Negative or less than Detection Limit (<1 MPN/30 grams)	
75-77	Table 3-7b[2]	SA 64c	STEC: Negative or less than Detection Limit (per methodology used)	
75-77	Table 3-7b[2]	SA 64d	Listeria monocytogenes: Negative	
		Comments:		
75-77	Table 3-7b[2]	SA 65	Have recommended test methods (U.S. EPA, FDA, AOAC, or TMECC or validated/accredited methods) been used as appropriate	
		Comments:		
75-77	Table 3-7b[2]	SA 66	Is Lot Information described on the COA or accompanying the COA?	
		Comments:		
75-77	Table 3-7b[2]	SA 67	Has the Sampling Plan followed the acceptable criteria?	
75-77	Table 3-7b[2]	SA 67a	For solids, was the sample a minimum of n=60?	
75-77	Table 3-7b[2]	SA 67b	For liquids was the sample size per production process lot sizes?	
75-77	Table 3-7b[2]	SA 67c	Was the sample obtained by a trained sampler and/or verified automated process?	
		Comments:		
7c Biological Soil Amendments that have gone through a Validated Treatment Process (not including composting)				
77-78	Table 3-7c	SA 68	Has a soil amendment been applied that has gone through a validated treatment process? If yes, answer the following questions.	
		Comments:		
77-78	Table 3-7c	SA 69	Are a Certificate of Process Validity as defined by the "Guidelines" and a COA that meets acceptance criteria available for review?	

AUDIT ID: 0

		Comments:		
77-78	Table 3-7c	SA 70	If a Certificate of Process Validity is not available and COA that meets acceptance criteria is available, was the amendment applied no less than 45 days from harvest?	
		Comments:		
77-78	Table 3-7c	SA 71	Are on-farm produced soil amendments process control monitoring records reviewed, dated and signed by supervisor or responsible party, within a week after the records were made?	
		Comments:		
77-78	Table 3-7c	SA 72	Have acceptance criteria been met for the following?	
77-78	Table 3-7c	SA 72a	Fecal coliforms: Negative or less than Detection Limit per gram	
77-78	Table 3-7c	SA 72b	Salmonella: Negative or less than Detection Limit (<1 MPN/30 grams)	
77-78	Table 3-7c	SA 72c	STEC: Negative or less than Detection Limit (per methodology used)	
77-78	Table 3-7c	SA 72d	Listeria monocytogenes: Not detected of Detection Limit (<1 CFU/5 grams)	
		Comments:		
77-78	Table 3-7c	SA 73	Have the recommended test methods been used?	
77-78	Table 3-7c	SA 73a	Fecal coliforms: U.S. EPA Method 1680; multiple-tube MPN	
77-78	Table 3-7c	SA 73b	Salmonella spp: U.S. EPA Method 1682	
77-78	Table 3-7c	SA 73c	STEC and <i>Listeria monocytogenes</i> : Any laboratory validated method for compost	
77-78	Table 3-7c	SA 73d	U.S. EPA, FDA, AOAC, or other validated/accredited methods may be used as appropriate	
		Comments:		
77-78	Table 3-7c	SA 74	Is Lot Information described on the COA or accompanying the COA?	
		Comments:		
77-78	Table 3-7c	SA 75	Has the Sampling Plan followed the acceptable criteria?	
77-78	Table 3-7c	SA 75a	For solids, was the sample a minimum of n=60?	
77-78	Table 3-7c	SA 75b	For liquids was the sample size per production process lot sizes?	
77-78	Table 3-7c	SA 75c	Was the sample obtained by a trained sampler and/or verified automated process	
		Comments:		
7d Synthetic and/or Inorganic Soil Amendments				
78-79	Table 3-7d	SA 76	Have synthetic and/or Inorganic Soil Amendments been applied?	
		Comments:		

AUDIT ID: 0

78-79	Table 3 - 7d	SA 77	Is documentation available that shows the soil amendment is free of non-synthetic products and not containing ingredients of animal origin or manure?	
		Comments:		
7e Soil Amendments with Combined Components.				
79	Table 3 - 7e	SA 78	Has a soil amendment that has combined different categories of materials been applied within the past year?	
		Comments:		
79	Table 3 - 7e	SA 79	Does the combined soil amendment include (check those that apply):	
79	Table 3 - 7e	SA 79a	Composted material containing animal manure or animal products	<input type="checkbox"/>
79	Table 3 - 7e	SA 79b	Composted material not containing products of animal origin	<input type="checkbox"/>
79	Table 3 - 7e	SA 79c	Non-Composted, Solid and Liquid, Not Containing products of animal origin	<input type="checkbox"/>
79	Table 3 - 7e	SA 79d	Biological material that has gone through a Validated Treatment Process	<input type="checkbox"/>
79	Table 3 - 7e	SA 79e	Synthetic and/or Inorganic material	<input type="checkbox"/>
		Comments:		
79	Table 3 - 7e	SA 80	Have the acceptance criteria been met for the most stringent component? (See above for appropriate criteria.)	
		Comments:		
79	Table 3 - 7e	SA 81	Has the Sampling Plan followed the criteria for the most stringent component?	
		Comments:		
79	Table 3 - 7e	SA 82	If product has been applied to the edible portion of the crop, have application intervals for the most stringent component been followed?	
		Comments:		
79	Table 3 - 7e	SA 83	Are test results, COAs, and documentation current, reviewed before use and available for verification from the grower for a period of two years?	
		Comments:		
Raw manure,untreated animal products/by-products, or not fully composted green waste, biosolids, and/or animal manure containing crop inputs.				
71	Table 3	SA 84	Were raw manure and/or other crop inputs containing untreated animal by-products, uncomposted or incompletely composted animal manure, or non-thermally treated animal manure applied to lettuce/leafy greens production? If yes, answer question #SA 85.	
		Comments:		
71	Table 3	SA 85	Were leafy greens planted before one year? If yes, answer question #SA 86.	
		Comments:		
71	Table 3	SA 86	Was the 270-day time period used? If yes, answer question #87.	
		Comments:		
71	Table 3	SA 87	Was soil testing conducted? If yes, answer question #SA 88.	

AUDIT ID: 0

		Comments:		
71	Table 3	SA 88	Did testing results meet the required acceptance criteria?	
		Comments:		
71	Table 3	SA 89	Have Type A biosolids been used as a crop input or an ingredient for crop inputs for lettuce/leafy greens production?	
		Comments:		
71	Table 3	SA 90	Have Type B biosolids been used as a crop input or an ingredient for crop inputs for lettuce/leafy greens production?	
		Comments:		
7a Crop Inputs - Biologicals of Animal Origin				
72-73	Table 3 - 7a	SA 91	Were any crop inputs of animal origin composted with the windrow method applied to the crop within the last year? If yes, answer question #SA 92.	
		Comments:		
72-73	Table 3 - 7a	SA 92	Are Process Validation records available for review? If yes, answer questions #SA 93, #SA 94, #SA 95.	
		Comments:		
72-73	Table 3 - 7a	SA 93	Did the active compost maintain aerobic conditions for a minimum of 131°F or higher for 15 days or longer?	
		Comments:		
72-73	Table 3 - 7a	SA 94	Was there a minimum of five (5) turnings during this period?	
		Comments:		
72-73	Table 3 - 7a	SA 95	Is there a Letter of Guarantee, or other comparable documentation, available that shows the crop input has been adequately cured?	
		Comments:		
72-73	Table 3 - 7a	SA 96	Were any crop inputs of animal origin composted with the Enclosed or Within-Vessel composting method? If yes, answer question #SA 97.	
		Comments:		
72-73	Table 3 - 7a	SA 97	Are Process Validation records available for review? If yes, answer questions #SA 98, #SA 99, #SA 100.	
		Comments:		
72-73	Table 3 - 7a	SA 98	Was the active compost was maintained for a minimum of 131 °F for 3 days?	
		Comments:		
72-73	Table 3 - 7a	SA 99	Is there a letter of Guarantee, or other comparable documentation, available that verifies that the crop inputs has been adequately cured?	
		Comments:		
72-73	Table 3 - 7a	SA 100	Were any crop inputs of animal origin composted with the Aerated Static Pile Composting method? If yes, answer question #SA 101.	
		Comments:		
72-73	Table 3 - 7a	SA 101	Are Process Validation records available for review? If yes, answer questions #SA 102, #SA 103, #SA 104	
		Comments:		
72-73	Table 3 - 7a	SA 102	Was the active compost covered with insulating materials, per federal, state and local regulations?	

AUDIT ID: 0

		Comments:		
72-73	Table 3 - 7a	SA 103	Was the pile maintained for a minimum of 131°F for 3 days?	
		Comments:		
72-73	Table 3 - 7a	SA 104	Is there a Letter of Guarantee, or other comparable documentation, available that shows the crop input has been adequately cured?	
		Comments:		
72-73	Table 3 - 7a	SA 105	If any crop inputs became contaminated, was the product segregated and not used until determined safe for food production?	
		Comments:		
72-73	Table 3 - 7a	SA 106	Has each lot of composted material or crop input been applied to the production location more than 45 days before harvest?	
		Comments:		
72-73	Table 3 - 7a	SA 107	For on-farm compost, are process control monitoring records reviewed, dated and signed by supervisor or responsible party, within a week after the records were made?	
		Comments:		
72-73	Table 3 - 7a	SA 108	Has each lot of composted material that is less than or equal to 5000 cubic yards been tested as required?	
		Comments:		
72-73	Table 3 - 7a	SA 109	Has acceptance criteria been met for the following:	
72-73	Table 3 - 7a	SA 109a	Fecal coliforms: < 100 MPN / gram	
72-73	Table 3 - 7a	SA 109b	Salmonella: Negative or less than Detection Limit (<1 MPN/30 grams)	
72-73	Table 3 - 7a	SA 109c	STEC: Negative or less than Detection Limit per methodology used	
		Comments:		
72-73	Table 3 - 7a	SA 110	Have the recommended test methods been used?	
72-73	Table 3 - 7a	SA 110a	Fecal coliforms: U.S. EPA Method 1680; multiple-tube MPN	
72-73	Table 3 - 7a	SA 110b	Salmonella spp: U.S. EPA Method 1682	
72-73	Table 3 - 7a	SA 110c	STEC: Any laboratory validated method for compost	
72-73	Table 3 - 7a	SA 110d	Other U.S. EPA, FDA, AOAC, or TMECC-accredited methods used as an appropriate replacement	
		Comments:		
72-73	Table 3 - 7a	SA 111	Has the Sampling Plan followed the acceptable criteria:	
72-73	Table 3 - 7a	SA 111a	Was a representative and random composite sample was obtained following California State regulations?	
72-73	Table 3 - 7a	SA 111b	Was the sample obtained by a trained sampler?	
		Comments:		

AUDIT ID: 0

**7b[1] Composted Crop Inputs Not Containing Products of Animal Origin
(green/plant waste, vegetative material, pre/post-consumer waste not
containing products of animal origin, etc.)**

73-75	Table 3-7b[1]	SA 112	Were any crop inputs of non-animal origin composted with the windrow method applied to the field within the last year? If yes, answer question #SA 113.	
		Comments:		
73-75	Table 3-7b[1]	SA 113	Are Process Validation records available for review? If yes, answer questions #SA 114, #SA 115, #SA 116.	
		Comments:		
73-75	Table 3-7b[1]	SA 114	Did the active compost maintain aerobic conditions for a minimum of 131°F or higher for 15 days or longer?	
		Comments:		
73-75	Table 3-7b[1]	SA 115	Was there a minimum of five (5) turnings during this period?	
		Comments:		
73-75	Table 3-7b[1]	SA 116	Is there a Letter of Guarantee, or other comparable documentation, available that shows the crop input has been adequately cured?	
		Comments:		
73-75	Table 3-7b[1]	SA 117	Is there a Letter of Guarantee, or other comparable documentation (ingredient statement, agricultural label etc.) available that shows the crop input is free of product of animal origin?	
		Comments:		
73-75	Table 3-7b[1]	SA 118	Were any crop inputs of non-animal origin composted with the Enclosed or Within-Vessel composting method? If yes, answer question #SA 119.	
		Comments:		
73-75	Table 3-7b[1]	SA 119	Are Process Validation records available for review? If yes, answer questions #SA 120 #SA 121, #SA 122.	
		Comments:		
73-75	Table 3-7b[1]	SA 120	Was the active compost maintained for a minimum of 131 °F for 3 days?	
		Comments:		
73-75	Table 3-7b[1]	SA 121	Is there a Letter of Guarantee, or other comparable documentation (ingredient statement, agricultural label etc.) available that shows the crop input is free of product of animal origin?	
		Comments:		
73-75	Table 3-7b[1]	SA 122	Were any crop inputs of non-animal origin composted with the Aerated Static Pile Composting method? If yes, answer questions #SA 124.	
		Comments:		
73-75	Table 3-7b[1]	SA 123	Are Process Validation records available for review? If yes, answer questions #SA 125,#SA 126, #SA 127.	
		Comments:		
73-75	Table 3-7b[1]	SA 124	Was the active compost covered with insulating materials, per federal, state and local regulations?	
		Comments:		
73-75	Table 3-7b[1]	SA 125	Was the pile maintained for a minimum of 131°F for 3 days?	

AUDIT ID: 0

		Comments:		
73-75	Table 3-7b[1]	SA 126	Is there a Letter of Guarantee, or other comparable documentation, available that shows the crop input has been adequately cured?	
		Comments:		
73-75	Table 3-7b[1]	SA 127	Is there a Letter of Guarantee, or other comparable documentation (ingredient statement, agricultural label etc.) available that shows the crop input is free of product of animal origin?	
		Comments:		
73-75	Table 3-7b[1]	SA 128	Has each lot of composted material or crop input been applied to the production location more than 45 days before harvest?	
		Comments:		
73-75	Table 3-7b[1]	SA 129	For on-farm compost, are process control monitoring records reviewed, dated and signed by supervisor or responsible party, within a week after the records were made?	
		Comments:		
73-75	Table 3-7b[1]	SA 130	Has each lot of composted material that is less than or equal to 5000 cubic yards been tested as required?	
		Comments:		
73-75	Table 3-7b[1]	SA 131	Has acceptance criteria been met for the following:	
73-75	Table 3-7b[1]	SA 131a	Fecal coliforms : < 100 MPN / gram	
73-75	Table 3-7b[1]	SA 131b	Salmonella: Negative or less than Detection Limit (<1 MPN/30	
73-75	Table 3-7b[1]	SA 131c	STEC: Negative or less than Detection Limit per methodology used	
		Comments:		
73-75	Table 3-7b[1]	SA 132	Have the recommended test methods been used:	
73-75	Table 3-7b[1]	SA 132a	Fecal coliforms: U.S. EPA Method 1680; multiple-tube MPN	
73-75	Table 3-7b[1]	SA 132b	Salmonella spp: U.S. EPA Method 1682	
73-75	Table 3-7b[1]	SA 132c	STEC: Any laboratory validated method for compost	
73-75	Table 3-7b[1]	SA 132d	Other U.S. EPA, FDA, AOAC, or TMECC-accredited methods used as an appropriate replacement	
		Comments:		
73-75	Table 3-7b[1]	SA 133	Has the Sampling Plan followed the acceptable criteria:	
73-75	Table 3-7b[1]	SA 133a	Was a representative and random composite sample was obtained following California State regulations.	
73-75	Table 3-7b[1]	SA 133b	Was the sample obtained by a trained sampler?	
		Comments:		

7b[2] Non-Composted Crop Inputs Not Containing Products of Animal Origin (green/plant waste, vegetative material, pre/post-consumer waste not containing products of animal origin, etc.)

AUDIT ID: 0

75-77	Table 3-7b[2]	SA 134	Were any non-composted crop inputs of non-animal origin applied to the field within the last year? If yes, answer # SA 135.	
		Comments:		
75-77	Table 3-7b[2]	SA 135	Is there a Letter of Guarantee, or other comparable documentation (ingredient statement, agricultural label etc.) available that shows the crop input is free of product of animal origin?	
		Comments:		
75-77	Table 3-7b[2]	SA 136	Are on-farm produced crop inputs process control monitoring records reviewed, dated and signed by supervisor or responsible party, within a week after the records were made?	
		Comments:		
75-77	Table 3-7b[2]	SA 137	Has acceptance criteria been met for the following:	
75-77	Table 3-7b[2]	SA 137a	Fecal coliforms: < 100 MPN / gram of total solids (Dry weight basis)	
75-77	Table 3-7b[2]	SA 137b	Salmonella: Negative or less than Detection Limit (<1 MPN/30 grams)	
75-77	Table 3-7b[2]	SA 137c	STEC: Negative or less than Detection Limit (per methodology used)	
75-77	Table 3-7b[2]	SA 137d	Listeria monocytogenes: Negative	
		Comments:		
75-77	Table 3-7b[2]	SA 138	Have recommended test methods (U.S. EPA, FDA, AOAC, or TMECC or validated/accredited methods) been used as appropriate?	
		Comments:		
75-77	Table 3-7b[2]	SA 139	Is Lot Information described on the COA or accompanying the COA?	
		Comments:		
75-77	Table 3-7b[2]	SA 140	Has the Sampling Plan followed the acceptable criteria?	
75-77	Table 3-7b[2]	SA 140a	For solids, was the sample a minimum of n=60?	
75-77	Table 3-7b[2]	SA 140b	For liquids was the sample size per production process lot sizes?	
75-77	Table 3-7b[2]	SA 140c	Was the sample obtained by a trained sampler and/or verified automated process?	
		Comments:		
7c– Biological Crop Inputs that have gone through a validated treatment process (not including composting)				
77-78	Table 3-7c	SA 141	Has a crop input been applied that has gone through a validated treatment process?	
		Comments:		
77-78	Table 3-7c	SA 142	Are a Certificate of Process Validity as defined by the “Guidelines” and a COA that meets acceptance criteria available for review?	
		Comments:		
77-78	Table 3-7c	SA 143	If a Certificate of Process Validity is not available and COA that meets acceptance criteria is available, was the amendment applied no less than 45 days from harvest?	

AUDIT ID: 0

		Comments:		
77-78	Table 3-7c	SA 144	Are on-farm produced crop inputs process control monitoring records reviewed, dated and signed by supervisor or responsible party, within a week after the records were made?	
		Comments:		
77-78	Table 3-7c	SA 145	Has acceptance criteria been met for the following:	
77-78	Table 3-7c	SA 145a	Fecal coliforms: Negative of less than Detection Limit per gram	
77-78	Table 3-7c	SA 145b	Salmonella: Negative or less than Detection Limit (<1 MPN/30 grams)	
77-78	Table 3-7c	SA 145c	STEC: Negative or less than Detection Limit (per methodology used)	
77-78	Table 3-7c	SA 145d	Listeria monocytogenes: Not detected of Detection Limit (<1 CFU/5 grams)	
		Comments:		
77-78	Table 3-7c	SA 146	Have the recommended test methods been used for the following:	
77-78	Table 3-7c	SA 146a	Fecal coliforms: U.S. EPA Method 1680; multiple-tube MPN	
77-78	Table 3-7c	SA 146b	Salmonella spp: U.S. EPA Method 1682	
77-78	Table 3-7c	SA 146c	STEC and <i>Listeria monocytogenes</i> : Any laboratory validated method for compost	
77-78	Table 3-7c	SA 146d	U.S. EPA, FDA, AOAC, or other validated/accredited methods may be used as appropriate	
		Comments:		
77-78	Table 3-7c	SA 147	Is Lot Information described on the COA or accompanying the COA?	
		Comments:		
77-78	Table 3-7c	SA 148	Has the Sampling Plan followed the acceptable criteria?	
77-78	Table 3-7c	SA 148a	For solids, was the sample a minimum of n=60?	
77-78	Table 3-7c	SA 148b	For liquids was the sample size per production process lot sizes?	
77-78	Table 3-7c	SA 148c	Was the sample obtained by a trained sampler and/or verified automated process	
		Comments:		
7d - Synthetic and/or Inorganic Crop Inputs				
78-79	Table 3-7d	SA 149	Have synthetic and/or inorganic crop inputs been applied to the crop?	
		Comments:		
78-79	Table 3-7d	SA 150	Is documentation available that shows the crop input is free of non-synthetic products and not containing ingredients of animal origin or manure?	
		Comments:		
7e – Combined Crop Input Components				

AUDIT ID: 0

79	Table 3-7e	SA 151	Has a crop input that has combined different categories of materials been applied within the past year?	
		Comments:		
79	Table 3-7e	SA 152	Does the combined crop input include (check those that apply):	
79	Table 3-7e	SA 152a	Composted material containing animal manure or animal products	<input type="checkbox"/>
79	Table 3-7e	SA 152b	Composted material not containing products of animal origin	<input type="checkbox"/>
79	Table 3-7e	SA 152c	Non-Composted, Solid and Liquid, Not Containing products of animal origin	<input type="checkbox"/>
79	Table 3-7e	SA 152d	Biological material that have gone through a Validated Treatment Process	<input type="checkbox"/>
79	Table 3-7e	SA 152e	Synthetic and/or Inorganic material	<input type="checkbox"/>
		Comments:		
79	Table 3-7e	SA 153	Have the acceptance criteria been met for the most stringent component? (See previous sections for appropriate criteria.)	
		Comments:		
79	Table 3-7e	SA 154	Has the Sampling Plan followed the criteria for the most stringent component?	
		Comments:		
79	Table 3-7e	SA 155	If product has been applied to the edible portion of the crop, have application intervals for the most stringent component been followed?	
		Comments:		
79	Table 3-7e	SA 156	Are test results, COAs, and documentation current, reviewed before use and available for verification from the grower for a period of two years?	
		Comments:		

AUDIT ID: 0

Page	Line#	WORKER PRACTICES: General Requirements	Yes, No, N/A
86-87	980-1033	WP 01 - Is there a written policy that addresses the following points for all employees and all visitors to the field location which describes the required hygiene rules?	
		WP 01a - Sanitary Facilities	
		WP 01b - Field Worker Practices (GMP's, GHP's, etc.)	
		WP 01c - Worker Health Practices	
		Comments:	

		WORKER PRACTICES: Sanitary Facilities	
87-88	1020-1054	WP 02 - Is there a documented field sanitary facility program that addresses the following?	
		WP 02a - The number, condition, type, placement, and location of cleaning of field sanitation units (field permanent vs harvest placement) complies with applicable state and/or federal regulations.	
		WP 02b - Sanitary facilities are readily accessible (proximate) to the work area.	
		WP 02c - Sanitary facilities are regularly maintained according to schedule.	
		WP 02d - Sanitary facilities have sufficient consumable supplies (i.e.: hand soap, water that meets the acceptance criteria for hand washing, paper towels, toilet paper, etc.).	
		WP 02e - Readily understandable signs are posted to instruct employees to wash their hands before beginning or returning to work.	
		WP 02f - Field sanitation facilities are cleaned and serviced with waste disposed of on a scheduled basis and at a location that minimizes the potential risk for product contamination. Gray water is not released in production areas.	
		WP 02g - Field sanitation cleaning tools are segregated and properly labeled, (i.e., color code, tool description) to prevent misuse or cross-contamination (i.e., tools used for bathroom cleaning).	
		WP 02h - If applicable, cleaning tools used for sanitary units shall only be used for sanitary unit cleaning and shall be stored in a manner to prevent contamination when not in use.	
		WP 02i - Address the placement of the sanitary facility in order to minimize any impact on the crop in the field and roads including:	
		WP 02j- Minimize the impact on the crop from leaks and/or, spills, and the cleaning and servicing of the sanitary facility.	
		WP 02k - Ability to access the unit for service	
		WP 02l - storage of harvest units when not in use and cleaning procedures prior to placing back into service before transporting to harvest or field location.	
		WP 02m - Documented response plan in the event of a major leak and/or spill.	
		WP 02n-The availability of servicing records (either contracted or in-house) to verify the program is occurring according to SOP.	

AUDIT ID: 0

		Comments:	
--	--	------------------	--

87-89	980-1002	WP 03 - Is there a written worker practices program that establishes employee work rules that address the following:	
		WP 03a - Training on proper sanitation and hygiene practices	
		WP 03b - Requirement for workers to wash their hands with soap and water before beginning or returning to work, and any other time when hands may have become contaminated, and that prohibits using hand sanitizer as a substitute for hand washing?	
		WP 03c - Confine smoking, eating and drinking (except water) to designated areas.	
		WP 03d - Storage requirements for personal items in/or adjacent to the field?	
		WP 03e- The appropriate use and sanitation of gloves and that prevents the use of personal gloves and prevents gloves from being taken home?	
		WP 03f- Avoid contact with animals	
		WP 03g - When applicable training on portable unit cleaning procedures.	
		Comments:	

87	1003-1009	WP 04 - For materials targeted for further processing, is there a written physical hazard prevention program which includes the following?	
		WP 04a - The proper wearing of head and facial hair restraints.	
		WP 04b- The proper wearing of apron and other food safety apparel.	
		WP 04c - Removal of visible jewelry (rings, bracelets, necklaces, body piercings, etc.) or covering of hand jewelry prior to the start of work.	
		WP 04d - Removal of all objects from upper pockets.	
		WP 04e - Prohibitions on spitting, urinating or defecating in the field.	
		Comments:	

WORKER PRACTICES: Worker Health Practices			
87	1010-1019	WP 05- Is there a written worker health practices program that establishes employee work rules which address the following?	
		WP 05a - Workers with diarrheal disease or symptoms of other infectious disease are prohibited from being in the field or handling fresh produce or food-contact surfaces?	
		WP 05b- Workers with open cuts or lesions are prohibited from handling fresh produce.	
		WP 05c - Actions for employee to take in the event of injury or illness (e.g. notifying supervisor).	
		WP 05d - A policy describing procedures for handling/disposition of produce or food contact surfaces that have come into contact with blood or other body fluids.	
		WP 05e - A policy describing return to work procedures when an employee had an illness or injury preventing them from working with food.	
		Comments:	

AUDIT ID: 0

Page	Line#	FIELD SANITATION: General Requirements	Yes, No, N/A
86	980-982	FS 01 - Is there a written policy for all employees and all visitors in the field location which describes the required field sanitation SOPs?	
		Comments:	

		FIELD SANITATION: Field Activities	
86	983-984	FS 02 - Does the written field activity SOP address the following:	
		FS 02a - Is a specific individual assigned the food safety responsibility for growing operations?	
88-89	1055-1079	FS 02b - Cross contamination by farming equipment and tools that comes into contact with, uncovered produce, raw manure, untreated compost, waters of unknown quality, animal hazards or other potential sources.	
		FS 02c - If "Yes" does it appropriately restrict the use or require a documented cleaning and sanitation program of the equipment?	
		FS 02d - If cleaning and sanitation is required, are records of the cleaning/sanitation available for review.	
		Comments:	

		FIELD SANITATION: Harvest Activities	
86	983-984	FS 03 - Does the written harvest activity SOP address the following:	
		FS 03a - Is a specific individual assigned the food safety responsibility for harvesting?	
95	1245 Table 6	FS 03b - Is a documented daily food safety harvest assessment available for review?	
		FS 03c - Is the assessment dated?	
		FS 03d - Is the individual who conducted the assessment identified?	
		FS 03e - Are the specific growing blocks associated with the assessment clearly identified?	
		FS 03f - Is the Harvester name and contact information documented?	
		Comments:	
		FS 04 - Did the assessment indicate that there was evidence of animal intrusion in the production area ?	
		Comments:	

		If FS 04 is answered "YES" then answer FS 04a - FS04f.	
95	1245 Table 6	FS 04a- Was the animal hazard or potential risk of intrusion assessed by food safety professional or food safety personnel?	
		FS 04b - Was the animal hazard or potential risk of intrusion assessed as a "Low Hazard"?	
		FS 04c- If "YES" were corrective actions carried out according to company SOP?	

AUDIT ID: 0

		FS 04d- Was the animal hazard or potential risk of intrusion assessed as a "Medium/High Hazard"?	
		FS 04e- If "YES" were corrective actions carried out per the LGMA requirements?	
		FS 04f - If "YES" is documentation available to show that actions were implemented?	
		Comments:	
92	1164-1166	FS 05 - If an environmental source of contamination is proximate, was the production area assessed for changes associated to weather (e.g. severe wind, hail, freeze, excessive rain or consecutive weather events) and/or discharge/drainage events?	
		Comments:	
83-85	848-926	FS 06 - Is there a Sanitation SOP (SSOP) for food-contact surfaces of harvest equipment and tools addressing the following:	
		FS 06a - Method and frequency of cleaning and sanitation	
		FS 06b- Are the food contact surfaces on harvest equipment cleaned and sanitized at the end of each daily harvest?	
		FS 06c- Prior to beginning harvest, is a daily inspection of equipment conducted that addresses cleaning and sanitation or noticeable change in condition (i.e., accumulation of dirt, debris, dust, droppings, etc.) since prior sanitation?	
		FS 06d - Does the daily inspection indicate a change in condition (i.e., accumulation of dirt, debris, dust, droppings, etc.) of the food contact surfaces on harvest equipment necessitating that it need to be rinsed and sanitized?	
		FS 06e - Are food contact surfaces on harvest equipment cleaned and sanitized before moving to the next commodity and/or field and when there is excessive soil build up?	
		FS 06f - Prior to harvest and when crews are exiting for breaks, harvest tools are placed in a receptacle containing water of adequate sanitary quality.	
		FS 06g- The design, and maintenance, of harvest equipment and tools will ensure effective cleaning for the life of the equipment.	
		FS 06h - Are harvester sanitation personnel utilizing PPE equipment such as gloves, aprons, boots, face shields, respirators (if required) in such a way as to prevent cross-contamination of harvest equipment, tools, etc?	
		FS 06i - Chemical usage and record keeping (e.g. soap, detergent, sanitizer, etc.)	
		FS 06j - Equipment specific cleaning instructions	
83	863	FS 06k - Secure chemical storage	
86	985	FS 06l - All chemical storage containers are labeled appropriately	
83	880	FS 06m - Sanitation Procedures Verification	
84	886	FS 06n - Daily inspection	
		Comments:	

AUDIT ID: 0

83	866-867	FS 07- Documentation (logs or records) must be maintained daily for each harvest equipment (e.g., container, equipment, tools, etc.) cleaning and sanitation event. This documentation must be reviewed, dated, and signed by a supervisor within a reasonable, designated, maximum amount of time.	
		Comments:	

84	917-926	FS 08 - Is there an SOP for non-food-contact surfaces of harvest equipment and tools addressing the following:	
		FS 08a – Method and frequency of cleaning	
		FS 08b- Chemical usage and record keeping? (e.g. soap, detergent, sanitizer, etc.)	
		FS 08c - Equipment-specific cleaning instructions?	
		FS 08d - Cleaning verification?	
95	Table 6	FS 08e - Daily inspection?	
		Comments:	

85	927-933	FS 09 - Is there an SOP for handling and storage of product containers which addresses the following:	
		FS 09a- Overnight storage	
		FS 09b - Contact with the ground or soil	
		FS 09c - Container assembly (RPC, fiber bin, plastic bin, etc.)	
		FS 09d - Damaged containers	
		FS 09e - Use of containers only as intended	
		Comments:	

84	894-900	FS 10 - Is there an SOP for sanitary operation of equipment?	
		FS 10a - Are spills and leaks addressed?	
		FS 10b - Harvest equipment protection?	
		FS 10c - Overnight equipment and tool storage	
		FS 10d- Procedures for when the equipment is not being used which including the removal of equipment from the work area.	
		FS 10e - Does the SOP for Sanitary Operation of Equipment, address remedial actions taken as necessary?	
		Comments:	
84	898-899	FS 11 - Is there an SOP for water tanks, containers, and equipment used for hydration, that includes the maintenance, cleaning, and sanitation for equipment used for hydration.	
		Comments:	

AUDIT ID: 0

85	927-933	FS 12- Are packing materials or containers cleanable or designed for single use and adequate for their intended use?	
		Comments:	
85	932	FS 13- Are reusable packing materials or containers cleaned and sanitized or fitted with a clean liner?	YES
		Comments:	
85	828	FS 14- Are reusable packing materials and containers kept off the floor or ground and protected from possible contamination?	
		Comments:	
84	904-908	FS 15 - Are instruments or controls used to measure, regulate, or record temperature, hydrogen ion concentration, pH, sanitizer concentration or other conditions:	
		FS 15a - Accurate and precise as necessary and appropriate for their intended use?	
		FS 15b - Adequately maintained?	
		FS 15c- Adequate in number for their intended use?	
		Comments:	
84	909-912	FS 16- Is waste, trash, and other debris conveyed, stored, and disposed of in a manner that protects product and production area from contamination?	
		Comments:	
85	939-949	FS 17 – Are there any buildings used to store packing material?	
		FS17a – Does the building design and use prevent food contact surface contamination?	
		FS 17b – Are packaging materials and other food-contact surfaces kept separate from contamination sources by partition, time, location, enclosed system, or other effective means and have proper drainage and protection from condensate or drips to keep food-contact surfaces from getting wet?	
		Comments:	
	1244 Figure 9 1247	FS 18- Is there a written SOP which addresses corrective actions for "Low Hazard" animal intrusion?	
94-95	Table 6	Comments:	

AUDIT ID: 0

Page	Line#	FIELD OBSERVATIONS: Water Use	Yes, No, N/A
6	Appendix A, Table 1	FO 01 - Are all active and/or inactive water sources recorded in the Water Use Audit?	
29	302-315	Comments:	
29	309-211	FO 01a - From visual inspection, is there evidence that the water sources and distribution systems may pose a contamination risk (damage, inadequately maintained, evidence of animal activity, connection with effluent systems)?	
		FO 01b - Are there other observations of improper use of water?	
		Comments:	
FIELD OBSERVATIONS: Soil Amendments			
66-70	698-835	FO 02 - Is there evidence of undocumented use of soil amendments?	
		FO 02a - Is there evidence of improperly applied soil amendments?	
		FO 02b - Is there evidence of improperly stored soil amendments?	
		FO 02c - Are there other observations of improper use of soil amendments?	
		Comments:	
FIELD OBSERVATIONS: Environmental Factors			
27-28	Table 0	FO 03 - Is there evidence of fecal contamination in the field?	
		FO 03a - Is there evidence of animal hazard in the field?	
	281	FO 03b - Is there evidence of non-compliance with distances as outlined in the Environmental Assessment?	
		FO 03c - Is there evidence that remedial actions such as animal barriers (fences, gates, grates, etc.) are not in good repair and/or not operational?	
		FO 03d - Is there evidence that worker hygiene rules have been violated during the crop cycle?	
		FO 03e - Are there other observations of environmental risk factors?	
		Comments:	
FIELD OBSERVATIONS: Worker Practices			
86-87	977-1002	FO 04 - Were any employees observed eating, drinking (except water), chewing tobacco or smoking in crop production actively harvested areas?	
		Comments:	
86	987-990	FO 04a - Were all employees observed to have washed their hands after restroom usage, work breaks or any returning to work occasion?	
		Comments:	
87	1021-1022	FO 04b - Is there evidence that sanitary facilities are not routinely clean and operational?	
		Comments:	

AUDIT ID: 0

87	1010-1019	FO 04c - Is there evidence that worker hygiene rules have been violated during the crop cycle?	
		Comments:	
87	1029-1030	FO 04d - Is there evidence that sanitary facilities are not adequately stocked with disposable supplies?	
		Comments:	

87	1003-1009	FO 04e - Were improperly stored personal items observed in the field?	
		Comments:	

86	978-979	FO 04f - Is there evidence or observations that employees are not using the restrooms?	
		Comments:	

87	1013-1014	FO 04g - Were any employees observed with uncovered wounds, boils or cuts?	
87	1011-1012	FO 04h - Were any employees observed with symptoms of infection or contagious disease?	
		Comments:	

		FO 04i - Were there any other observations of improper work practices?	
		Comments:	

FIELD OBSERVATIONS: Field Sanitation			
86	969-970	FO 05 - Is there evidence of excessive non-vegetative debris in the field?	
83	863	FO 05a - Is there evidence of open and/or unsupervised chemicals in the field?	
84	894-895	FO 05b -Is there evidence of leaks and spills on and/or from equipment in the field?	
88	1071-1072	FO 05c - Is there evidence of the use of non-sanitized farm equipment that may have come in contact with raw manure, untreated compost, waters of unknown quality, wildlife or domestic animals?	
85	957-959	FO 05d - Is there evidence of cross-contamination of the product cut end or potential cross contamination of product and/or product contact surfaces, and packaging?	
		FO 05e - Are there any other observations of improper field sanitation?	
		Comments:	

AUDIT ID: 0

Page	Line#	SOIL FERTILITY	Yes, No, N/A
97	1255-1266	SF 01: Have all production blocks intended for spinach been evaluated for the presence of cadmium?	
		Comments:	
		SF02: Has a soil fertility program been developed?	
		Comments:	

AUDIT ID: 0

Page	Line #	TRANSPORTATION	Yes, No, N/A
97	1270-1279	TR 01 - Is there an inspection program for equipment and shipping containers used to transport leafy greens from the farm and on the farm?	
		TR 01a - Are shipping units and equipment used to transport leafy greens on the farm or from the farm to a cooling, packing, or processing facility part of an inspection program?	
		TR 01b - Is the condition of shipping units and equipment checked for cleanliness before being used to ship leafy greens?	
		Comments:	