

Arizona LGMA - 2022/2023 Audit Checklist

General Requirements			
Page #	Line #	Question #	Question
21	101	GR 01	Is a written Leafy Greens Compliance Plan which specifically addresses the Best Practices of the LGMA available for review?
21	102	GR 02	Does it specifically address best practices for water, soil amendments and crop inputs, environmental factors, work practices, and field sanitation?
21	104	GR 03	Is an up to date producers list with contact and location information available for review?
21	105	GR 04	Does the Shipper have a traceability process?
21	105	GR 04a	Does it enable identification of immediate non-transporter source?
21	105	GR 04b	Does it enable identification of immediate non-transporter subsequent recipient?
21	108	GR 05	Has the Shipper designated someone to implement and oversee the food safety program?
21	108	GR 05a	Is the name of the individual available?
21	108	GR 05b	Is 24/7 contact information for the individual available?
Records			
22	133	RE 01	Were all records required by the Leafy Greens Compliance Plan readily available and accessible for inspection during the audit? (e.g. Logs, Checklist, Spreadsheets, etc.)
			Do they include (as applicable):
21	118	RE 01a	Farm name and location
21	120	RE 01b	Actual values and observations obtained during monitoring
21	121	RE 01c	An adequate description of the leafy green product
21	123	RE 01d	Growing area location (i.e. production location including block and/or lot)
21	124	RE 01e	Date and time of the activity being documented
22	126	RE 02	Do records indicate they were created at the time the activity was performed?
22	128	RE 03	Were the records signed and dated by the person performing the documented activity?
21 & 22	115 & 130	RE 04	Did the Shipper assign/designate and document the supervisor/responsible party for records review and sign off?
			Have the following records been reviewed, signed and dated by a supervisor or responsible party:
29	347	RE 04a	Water records must be reviewed and signed within a week (Records include: ag water microbiological test results, ag water assessments, water treatment monitoring records and records of corrective actions for test that do not meet the water quality criteria)
		RE 04b	On-Farm Soil Amendments within a week (Records include: process control monitoring for on-farm produced soil amendments)
23	204	RE 04c	Training documentation for required training must be reviewed and signed within a reasonable timeframe per SOP.
78	910	RE 04d	Harvest equipment, tools, containers, packing material, buildings (if applicable packing facilities) cleaning and sanitation records in a reasonable timeframe per SOP (i.e. keep a record of the date and method of cleaning and sanitizing equipment)
22	149	RE 05	Do SOPs require documentation and records to be kept for 2 years?

Arizona LGMA - 2022/2023 Audit Checklist

Personnel Qualifications and Training			
22	163	PE 01	Did personnel receive training at hire and at least annually thereafter?
			Does the training provided to all personnel who work with leafy greens or supervise those who do include:
23	174	PE 01a	The principles of food hygiene and safety, including recognition of employee health conditions for illness?
82	1063	PE 01b	Training and education on infectious illnesses that can be asymptomatic (e.g. cyclosporiasis, hepatitis, salmonellosis, norovirus).
23	175	PE 01c	The importance of health and personal hygiene?
23	179	PE 01d	The standards established in these best practices that are applicable to the employee's job responsibilities?
			Do all harvest personnel receive additional training in:
23	183	PE 01e	Recognizing leafy greens that may be contaminated and therefore not be harvested? (This includes the potential of cut product to contact the ground/soil.)
23	185	PE 01f	Inspecting product containers, harvest equipment, and packaging materials to ensure they are working properly and do not pose a product contamination risk?
23	188	PE 01g	How to correct problems with product containers, harvest equipment, and packaging materials or report problems to supervisors?
23	191	PE 02	Are personnel conducting environmental hazard and risk assessments trained?
23	200	PE 03	Has a food safety professional / representative for each farm completed the Produce Safety Alliance, "Grower Training" or a standard curriculum recognized by the FDA?
23	200	PE 03a	Grower
23	200	PE 03b	Harvester
23	200	PE 03c	Cooler/Holder
23	203	PE 04	Are there records of training events that include the training date, topics covered, and trainee's name?
Environmental Assessments			
Pre-Season Assessment			
Animal Activity			
23	213	EA 01	Was a Pre-Season Assessment conducted prior to the first seasonal planting?
90-92	Figure 9 & Table 6	EA 02	Did the assessment indicate that the production area was free from evidence of animal intrusion or the potential risk of intrusion?
			If EA 02 is answered "NO" then EA 03 - EA 06 will drop down.
90-92	Figure 9 & Table 6	EA 03	Was the animal hazard or potential risk of intrusion assessed by Food Safety professional?
		EA 04	Was the animal hazard or potential risk of intrusion assessed as a "Low Hazard"?
		EA 05	Is there a written SOP for corrective actions for "Low Hazard" animal intrusion?
		EA 05a	If "YES" were corrective actions carried out according to company SOP?
		EA 06	Was the animal hazard or potential risk of intrusion assessed as a "Medium/High Hazard"?
		EA 06a	If "YES" were corrective actions formulated?

Arizona LGMA - 2022/2023 Audit Checklist

Animal Activity			
90-92	Figure 9 & Table 6	EA 06b	If "YES" is documentation available to show that actions were implemented?
90-93	Figure 9 & Table 6	EA 06c	If "YES" are you periodically monitoring the effectiveness of any corrective actions?
Adjacent and Nearby Land Use			
24	230	EA 07	Was a detailed risk assessment conducted for adjacent and nearby land use?
			If present, were the risk factors for the following evaluated for risk level:
26-27	Table 0	EA 08	Animal operations (i.e. AFO, CAFO, Grazing Lands, and Domestic Animals/Hobby Farms)
Pre-Season Assessment			
26-27	Table 0	EA 08a	If "Yes" were the current Metrics met?
26-27	Table 0	EA 08b	If "NO" are mitigation factors implemented and documented?
26-27	Table 0	EA 09	Compost / Soil Amendments Operations
26-27	Table 0	EA 09a	If "Yes" were the current Metrics met?
26-27	Table 0	EA 09b	If "NO" are mitigation factors implemented and documented?
26-27	Table 0	EA 10	Non-leafy greens crops - Was the distance evaluated based on risk and mitigation factors?
26-27	Table 0	EA 10a	If "Yes" were Table 0 risk factors evaluated?
26-27	Table 0	EA 10b	If "Yes" are mitigation measures for the risks in place and documented?
26-27	Table 0	EA 11	Water Source and Systems - Was the distance evaluated based on risk and mitigation factors?
26-27	Table 0	EA 11a	Wellhead proximate to Untreated Manure?
26-27	Table 0	EA 11b	If "Yes" are mitigation measures for the risks in place and documented?
26-27	Table 0	EA 11c	Surface Water proximate to Untreated Manure?
26-27	Table 0	EA 11d	If "Yes" are mitigation measures for the risks in place and documented?
26-27	Table 0	EA 11e	Water Storage and conveyance systems proximate to conditions that pose a food safety risk?
26-27	Table 0	EA 11f	If "Yes" are mitigation measures for the risks in place and documented?
26-27	Table 0	EA 12	Urban Settings
26-27	Table 0	EA 12a	If "Yes" were the current Metrics met?
26-27	Table 0	EA 12b	If "NO" are mitigation factors implemented and documented?
26-27	Table 0	EA 13	Other environmental considerations - Was the distance evaluated based on risk and mitigation factors?
26-27	Table 0	EA 13a	Were Table 0 risk factors evaluated?
26-27	Table 0	EA 13b	If "Yes" are mitigation measures for the risks in place and documented?
25	239-242	EA 14	Were additional risk assessments required after the initial pre-season assessment was conducted during the growing of the crop?
24	225-228	EA 14a	Were potential environmental sources of contaminants in or near production location evaluated after a change in weather conditions or weather events?
24	239-242	EA 14b	Were there adjacent and nearby land use that resulted in a possible higher risk situation required an additional risk assessment?
24	239-242	EA 14c	If "Yes" were mitigation factors implemented and documented?

Arizona LGMA - 2022/2023 Audit Checklist

Assessment of CAFO's			
24	244	EA 15	Is the adjacent and nearby land area free from concentrated animal feeding operations(CAFO)?
			If EA 15 is answered "NO" then EA 16 or EA 17 will drop down.
24-25	246-254	EA 16	Was the adjacent and nearby land area free from concentrated animal feeding operations (CAFO) containing 1,000-80,000 animals within 1200' of the crop edge?
24-26	246-254	EA 16a	If "NO" are there mitigation measures, topographical or climate features that indicate that the 1200' recommendation should be increased or modified?
24-27	246-254	EA 16b	If "NO" are mitigation measures in place and documented?
24-28	246-254	EA 16c	If "NO" was a rigorous pre-season assessment completed to address the impact of the CAFO?
24-29	246-254	EA 17	Was the adjacent and nearby land area free from concentrated animal feeding operations (CAFO) containing over 80,000 animals within 1 mile of the crop edge?
24-30	246-254	EA 17a	If "NO" are there mitigation measures, topographical or climate features that indicate that the 1 mile recommendation should be increased or modified?
24-31	246-254	EA 17b	If "NO" are mitigation measures in place and documented?
24-32	246-254	EA 17c	If "NO" was a rigorous pre-season assessment completed to address the impact of the CAFO?
			If EA 15 is answered "NO" then EA 17d-EA 17f will drop down.
			Did it address the following:
24-35	246-254	EA 17d	Information on the CAFO's Best Management Practices?
24-36	246-254	EA 17e	Number of animals within the CAFO?
24-37	246-254	EA 17f	Water source and distribution system for the production location proximate to the CAFO? (e.g. Appendix A)
Assessment of Historical Land use and Flooding			
25	264-266	EA 18	Are production blocks free from all of the following:
		EA 18a	History of flooding within the last 60 days
		EA 18b	History of grazing on the crop land within the last year
		EA 18c	History of hazardous activity including but not limited to CAFO, municipal waste, toxic waste, landfill, etc.?
			EA 18a - EA 18c if any of these are answered "NO" then EA 18c (1) will drop down
	EA 18c (1)	Were specific actions implemented and documented to mitigate the issue(s)?	
Pre-Harvest Assessment			
24	213	EA 19	Was a Pre-Harvest Assessment conducted within 7 days for each harvested lot?
			Did the assessment address the following:
26-27; 90-92	Table 0, Table 6, Figure 9	EA19a	Intrusion by animals
		EA19b	Flooding
		EA19c	Potential contamination materials
		EA19d	Condition of water source and distribution system
		EA19e	Worker hygiene and sanitary facilities
		EA19f	Environmental sources of contaminants after a change in weather conditions or weather events since the last assessment?
24	239-242	EA19g	Adjacent and nearby land use remains unchanged since the pre-season assessment was conducted?

Arizona LGMA - 2022/2023 Audit Checklist

Pre-Harvest Assessment - Animal Intrusion			
90-92	Figure 9 & Table 6	EA 20	Did the assessment indicate that the production area was free from evidence of animal intrusion or the potential risk of intrusion?
		If EA 20 is answered "NO" then EA 20a - EA 20g will drop down.	
		EA 20a	Was the animal hazard or potential risk of intrusion assessed by food safety professional or food safety personnel?
		EA 20b	Was the animal hazard or potential risk of intrusion assessed as a "Low Hazard"?
		EA 20c	Is there a written SOP for corrective actions for "Low Hazard" animal intrusion?
		EA 20d	If "YES" were corrective actions carried out according to company SOP?
		EA 20e	Was the animal hazard or potential risk of intrusion assessed as a "Medium/High Hazard"?
		EA 20f	If "YES" were corrective actions carried out per the LGMA requirements?
		EA 20g	If "YES" is documentation available to show that actions were implemented?
Preharvest Assessment - Unusual or Other Events			
26-27; 85-86	Table 0 & Table 5	EA 21	Did the pre-harvest ranch assessment indicate that fields were flooded during the crop cycle?
		If EA 21 is answered "YES" then EA 21a - EA 21d will drop down	
		EA 21a	If production blocks were flooded is there documentation to indicate the extent of the flooding and the area of the crop impacted?
26-27; 85-86	Table 0 & Table 5	EA 21b	Was the product left un-harvested?
		EA 21c	If product was harvested, was a 30' (min) "no harvest" buffer from the high water mark established?
		EA 21d	Are these remedial activities documented?
91-92	Table 6	EA 22	Does the preharvest assessment indicate the production area was free from any other type of potential contamination? (i.e. potential contamination materials, condition of water source and distribution system, unexpected adjacent land activity that will pose a risk to food safety, worker hygiene and sanitary facilities)?
		If EA 22 is answered "NO" then EA 22a - EA 22h will drop down	
91-92	Table 6	EA 22a	Was a food safety assessment completed?
91-92	Table 6	EA 22b	Is the individual who conducted the assessment identified?
91-92	Table 6	EA 22c	Is the date of the assessment documented?
91-92	Table 6	EA 22d	Were remedial actions formulated?
91-92	Table 6	EA 22e	Was the field harvested?
91-92	Table 6	EA 22f	Is there documentation to show the remedial actions were followed?
91-92	Table 6	EA 22g	Did the remedial action include creation of "no harvest" buffer or separation zones around the potentially contaminated area(s)?
91-92	Table 6	EA 22h	Is documentation which fully delineates the potential contamination available for review?

Arizona LGMA - 2022/2023 Audit Checklist

Assessment of Produce Field			
24	225-228	EA 23	If the preharvest assessment indicates the production area had a changes in weather condition or weather events during the production period are the following addressed:
24	225-228	EA 23a	Potential impact on the crop or operations?
24	225-228	EA 23b	If the crop or operations were impacted were corrective actions carried out and documented according to Company SOP?
24	225-228	EA 23c	Was the production area evaluated for any discharge events or other potential impact on the crop or operations from a CAFO?
24	225-228	EA 23d	If the crop or operations were impacted by a discharge event were corrective actions carried out according to Company SOP?
Pre-Harvest Product Testing			
28	286	EA 24	Is there an SOP to address pre-harvest testing?
			Does your SOP include the following:
28	288	EA 24a	All lettuce and leafy green commodities. If testing programs differ by commodity, outline in the SOP.
28	289	EA 24b	Sampling timeline - An interval closer to estimated harvest date is considered a best practice.
28	290	EA 24c	Target organisms - Test for E. coli O157:H7, STEC/EHEC, and Salmonella.
28	291	EA 24d	Sampling lot size (Note: Sampling lot size may decrease when risk is elevated.)
28	292	EA 24e	Sample size
28	293	EA 24f	Number of grabs (Note: More individual grabs per lot improves the probability of contamination detection.)
28	294-296	EA 24g	Sampling method
		EA 24h	Additional risk considerations that impact sampling
		EA 24i	A test and hold policy
		EA 24j	Corrective measures to be taken when positive samples are detected
		EA 24k	How testing records are kept and the review policy for these records
28	285	EA 25	Was pre-harvest testing conducted?
28	302	EA 26	Was a trained sampler used?
28	304	EA 27	If the tests were positive for E. coli O157:H7, STEC/EHEC, and Salmonella, do records show that the lot sampled was not harvested?
28	304-306	EA 27a	Was a further investigation or a root cause analysis done? (NOTE: For Informational Purposes Only)
Water Use			
General Agricultural Water Management			
29	330	WU 01	Was an Agricultural Water Assessment completed prior to use for each agricultural water system?
29	331	WU 01a	Is an agricultural water system description (or other documentation) indicating the source(s) of water and distribution system(s) available for review?
29			For irrigation systems:
29	334	WU 01a (1)	Does the description (or other documentation) identify permanent above ground fixtures such that they can be located in the field?
29	333	WU 01a (2)	Does the map (or other documentation) identify the flow of the water system(s) and production blocks that may be served by the water source(s)?
29	345	WU 01a (3)	Are effluent systems that convey untreated human or animal wastes separated from irrigation water systems?
			For All Water Systems and Uses:
30	364	WU 01b	Was the system, including water source, water storage and water conveyance, evaluated to determined the system type(s) (Type A or Type B)?
31 & 38	Table 1 & 419-446	WU 01c	Has the operation established how and when water will be suitably applied for specific uses? (e.g. irrigation, chemical/nutrient application, dust abatement, equipment cleaning, etc.)

Arizona LGMA - 2022/2023 Audit Checklist

Managing Agricultural Water Storage and Conveyance Systems			
34	495	WU 02	Has an SOP been created for maintenance of ancillary equipment, water storage and conveyance?
			Does the SOP include the following:
34	497	WU 02a	Regularly scheduled visual inspections to ensure that it is in good working order and does not pose a contamination risk to the water system?
34	500	WU 02b	Does the SOP include maintaining water quality by removal of debris, weeds, algae, tulle, trash, and sediment within the producer's control?
34	502	WU 02c	Controls for pest access in place and corrective actions outlined if pest infestation occurs?
34	506	WU 02d	Controls identified for the prevention of run-off into water storage and conveyance systems?
34	508	WU 02e	Procedures to ensure standing water does not pose a contamination in place?
34	509	WU 02f	Management of agricultural water system components used to prepare and apply crop inputs to ensure these activities and equipment used are not a source of contamination?
34	511	WU 02g	Practices to ensure water used in aerial applications within the 21 days-to-scheduled harvest are Type A or B→A water systems?
34	513	WU 02g (1)	Holding tanks and equipment mounted application tanks, manifolds, boom lines and nozzles are properly maintained and cleaned?
34	515	WU 02g (2)	Water treatment chemistry or approach is compatible with the agricultural chemicals being applied?
34	516	WU 02h	Establish corrective action procedures for non-compliance scenarios (e.g. contaminated source water, animal intrusion, contaminated run-off, flooding)?
34	521	WU 03	Were corrective measures, cleaning activities, and maintenance documented?
Overhead Chemical Applications <u>prior</u> to 21 Days of Scheduled Harvest			
		WU 04	Were Overhead Chemical Applications utilized prior to 21 Days of Scheduled Harvest?
30	359	Wu 04a	If " <u>yes</u> ", did the water used for the applications meet the Baseline Microbial Assessment for Type A source water quality criteria?
30	363	Wu 04b	If " <u>yes</u> ", did the water used for the applications meet irrigation Type B water quality criteria as outlined in Table 2E (Routine Verification of Microbial Water Quality)?
Overhead Chemical Applications <u>within</u> 21 Days of Scheduled Harvest			
35	564	WU 05	Has an SOP been created for all of the parts of the agricultural water system used in overhead chemical application?
			The SOP for overhead applications must address the following:
35	566	WU 05a	Water used within 21 days requirement to meet Type A and/or B→A water quality criteria
35	568	WU 05b	Holding tanks, equipment mounted application tanks, manifolds, boom lines and nozzles are properly maintained and cleaned?
35	571	WU 05c	Water treatment chemistry or approach is compatible with the agricultural chemicals being applied?

Arizona LGMA - 2022/2023 Audit Checklist

Overhead Chemical Applications <u>within</u> 21 Days of Scheduled Harvest			
35	573	WU 05d	Control pest access to equipment during storage and staging
35-36	576-581	WU 05e	Corrective action procedures for non-compliance scenarios, includes treatment failure, contaminated source water, pest concerns, chemical incompatibility, equipment sanitation concerns)?
36	582	WU 06	Was there documentation of corrective measures, including cleaning activities and maintenance?
36	583	WU 07	Is there an SOP to address each unique application process to treat water?
			The SOP must address the following:
35	542	WU 07a	Use initial water treatment assessment to establish treatment parameters, monitoring to ensure consistent delivery and effectiveness (Note: You must reestablish treatment parameters if a material change to the system occurs)
36	589	WU 07b	Step-by- step instructions to ensure the water treatment is correctly implemented
36	590	WU 07c	Location of water sources
36	591	WU 07d	Name, and suggested supplies needed
36	592	WU 07e	Sanitizer used and quantity used
36	593	WU 07f	Critical limits and operational limits
36	594	WU 07g	Water sampling location
36	595	WU 07h	Corrective actions if critical limits are not met
36	596	WU 07i	Required records
36	598	WU 08	If Type A water is used, are records available that demonstrate the water used for chemical application meets the Baseline Microbial Assessment Criteria for Type A source water quality criteria?
25	566	WU 09	Was Type B→A water used for Overhead Chemical Applications within 21 Days of Scheduled Harvest?
36	597	WU 09a	Was a baseline for treated water done for each <u>overhead application process</u> (before the 21 day to-scheduled-harvest-period begins)?
36	598	WU 09a (1)	Were there a minimum of three 100 mL samples taken for each overhead application process from different treated water batches.
36	602	WU 09a (2)	Did all samples meet the acceptance criteria - three 100 mL samples with non-detectable generic E. coli?
36	604	WU 09b	Was a minimum of one 100 mL sample taken for routine testing done monthly from a representative <u>routinely treated water batch</u> or at the next application event?
36	606	WU 09b (1)	Did all samples meet the acceptance criteria of non-detectable generic E. coli?
			WU 09b (1) answered "NO" then WU 09b (2) - WU 09b (4) will drop down for Corrective Action
36	610	WU 09b (2)	Was your grower/producer notified?
36	609	WU 09b (3)	Was a root cause analysis done to correct the concern?

Arizona LGMA - 2022/2023 Audit Checklist

Overhead Chemical Applications <u>within</u> 21 Days of Scheduled Harvest			
36	611	WU 09b (4)	If water used within 21 days exceeds the acceptance criteria has been used for crop production was product sampled from all affected lots for STEC, including E coli O157:H7, and Salmonella, after the last irrigation and prior to harvest?
36	614	WU 09c	Was ongoing monitoring of the treated water performed at each application event to verify treatment parameters established during the initial set up were being followed ?
36	616	WU 09c (1)	Do records show the water treatment parameters were met?
WU 09c (1) answered "NO" then WU 09c (2) - WU 09c (5) will drop down for Corrective Action			
36	618	WU 09c (2)	Was a corrective action performed to ensure the water treatment was effective before using the water?
36	620	WU 09c (3)	Was a microbiological sample taken to verify the treatment was effective and was documented for the corrective action?
37	622	WU 09c (4)	If the microbiological sample did not meet the acceptance criteria of non-detectable generic E. coli was root cause analysis performed to correct the treatment process? (Note: It is suggested that the grower/producer is notified)
37	623	WU 09c (5)	If water exceeding the acceptance criteria has been used for crop production was product sampled from all affected lots for STEC, including E coli O157:H7, and Salmonella, after the last irrigation and prior to harvest?
Irrigation Water from TYPE B Agricultural Water (before and after 21 Days to scheduled harvest)			
38	Table 2A	WU 10	Was a source water test conducted, for each source of water, within 60 days of first use?
			<i>Note: Reclaimed water sample results and analysis provided by the water district or provider may be utilized as records of water source testing for verification and validation audits.</i>
38	Table 2A	WU 10a	Are records available to demonstrate that water samples have been collected on a monthly basis, or at the next irrigation event if greater than monthly?
38	Table 2A	WU 10b	Do records show that the water samples are taken no less than 18 hours apart?
38	Table 2A	WU 10c	Is the geometric mean less than or equal to 126 MPN/100 mL?
38,55	Table 2A & Table 2E	WU 10d	Are all individual samples less than or equal to 235MPN/100 mL for overhead application/irrigation 21 days prior to scheduled harvest or 576 MPN/100m ml for any type of water application, except overhead?
WU 10c or WU10d answered "NO" then WU 10d (1) - WU 10d (8) will drop down			
39	Figure 1	WU 10d (1)	Was the water distribution system use discontinued after the tests indicated the water source failed to meet the minimum water quality requirements?
38	Table 2A	WU 10d (2)	Was an agricultural water assessment completed on the water source and distribution system for possible contamination?
39	Figure 1	WU 10d (3)	Do records show that corrective actions were taken to eliminate the contamination sources?
38-39	Table 2A & Figure 1	WU 10d (4)	Was the system retested at the previous sampling point?
		WU 10d (5)	Did the samples meet the acceptance criteria - average less than 126 MPN/100 mL (based on rolling geometric mean=5) and all individual samples less than or equal to 235MPN/100 mL for overhead application/irrigation 21 days prior to scheduled harvest or 576 MPN/100 mL for any type of water application, except overhead?
		WU 10d (6)	Do records show the water system was not used while the water quality was inadequate?
		WU 10d (7)	If water exceeding the acceptance criteria has been used for crop production was product sampled from all affected lots for STEC, including E coli O157:H7, and Salmonella, after the last irrigation and prior to harvest?

Arizona LGMA - 2022/2023 Audit Checklist

Irrigation Water from TYPE B Agricultural Water (before and after 21 Days to scheduled harvest)				
38-39	Table 2A & Figure 1	WU 10d (8)	If "NO" or the tests were positive for STEC, including E coli O157:H7, or Salmonella, do records show that the crop was not harvested for human consumption?	
		WU 11	Records show the name of the test laboratory, water source, date, time, location of the sample and method of analysis, and if quantitative, the detection limit?	
		WU 12	The generic E.coli testing methodology is specified on the test report and meets any FDA method for quantitative monitoring of water for generic E. coli?	
Irrigation Water from TYPE A Agriculture Water Systems Sourced from Public or Private Providers				
40-42	Table 2B	WU 13	Is the TYPE A Irrigation water sourced from a public or private provider?	
40-42	Table 2B	WU 14	Was the public or private provider's most current COA available for review (e.g. may be provided by municipalities, irrigation districts, or other water providers)?	
40-43	Table 2B & Figure 2A	WU 15	Was an initial microbial water quality assessment performed at least one-time seasonally for each system (before the 21 day to-scheduled-harvest-period begins)?	
		WU 15a	Were three 100 mL samples taken during one irrigation event for the initial microbial water quality assessment, and at least one taken from the end of the delivery system?	
		WU 15b	Did sampling meet the acceptance criteria - three 100 mL samples with non-detectable generic E. coli in two of the three 100 mL samples, and the remaining sample no greater than 10 MPN per 100 mL?	
		If WU 15b answered "NO" then WU 15b (1) - WU 15b (4) will drop down		
		WU 15b (1)	Was an agricultural water assessment and root cause analysis performed prior to the next irrigation event?	
		WU 15b (2)	Was follow-up testing conducted (five 100 mL samples during the next irrigation event)?	
		WU 15b (3)	Did the five samples meet follow-up testing acceptance criterion - four must have no detectable generic E. coli and the one remaining sample must have levels not greater than 10 MPN/100 mL?	
		WU 15b (4)	If "NO" was the agricultural water system disqualified for Type A usage?	
		WU 16	If a material change was made to a system was another initial microbial water quality assessment conducted?	
		WU 16a	Were three 100 mL samples with at least one taken from the end of the delivery system taken during one irrigation event for the initial microbial water quality assessment?	
		WU 16b	Did sampling meet the acceptance criteria - three 100 mL samples with non-detectable generic E. coli in two of the three 100 mL samples, and the remaining sample no greater than 10 MPN per 100 mL?	
If WU 16b answered "NO" then WU 16b (1) - WU 16b (4) will drop down				
40-43	Table 2B & Figure 2A	WU 16b (1)	Was an agricultural water assessment and root cause analysis performed prior to the next irrigation event?	
		WU 16b (2)	Was follow-up testing conducted (five 100 mL samples during the next irrigation event)?	
		WU 16b (3)	Did the five samples meet follow-up testing acceptance criterion - four must have no detectable generic E. coli and the one remaining sample must have levels not greater than 10 MPN/100 mL ?	
		WU 16b (4)	If "NO" was the agricultural water system disqualified for Type A usage?	
40-43	Table 2B & Figure 2B	WU 17	Was a routine verification of microbial water quality performed on each distinct irrigation system at least once during the season?	

Arizona LGMA - 2022/2023 Audit Checklist

Irrigation Water from TYPE A Agriculture Water Systems Sourced from Public or Private Providers			
40-43	Table 2B & Figure 2B	WU 17a	Were three 100 mL samples taken during the routine verification with at least one taken from the end of the delivery system used to evaluate acceptance criteria?
		WU 17b	Did the three samples meet acceptance criterion - two must have no detectable generic E. coli and the one remaining sample must have levels not greater than 10 MPN/100 mL?
		If WU 17b answered "NO" then WU 17b (1) - WU 17b (2) will drop down	
		WU 17b (1)	Was a Level 1 Assessment performed prior to the next irrigation event?
		WU 17b (2)	Was follow-up testing conducted (five 100 mL samples during the next irrigation event with at least one taken from the end of the delivery system)?
Irrigation Water from TYPE A Agriculture Water Systems Sourced from Public or Private Providers			
40-43	Table 2B & Figure 2B	If WU 17b (2) answered "NO" then WU 17b (3) - WU 17b (5) will drop down	
		WU 17b (3)	Was the agricultural water discontinued for Type A use?
		WU 17b (4)	If water exceeding the acceptance criteria has been used for crop production was product sampled from all affected lots for STEC, including E coli O157:H7, and Salmonella, after the last irrigation and prior to harvest?
		WU 17b (5)	If "NO" or the tests were positive for STEC, including E coli O157:H7, or Salmonella do records show that the crop was not harvested for human consumption?
40-43	Table 2B & Figure 2B	WU 18	Records show the name of the test laboratory, water source, date, time, location of the sample and method of analysis, and if quantitative, the detection limit?
		WU 19	The generic E.coli testing methodology is specified on the test report and meets any FDA method for quantitative monitoring of water for generic E. coli?
Irrigation Water from TYPE A Agricultural Water Systems Sourced from Private Wells or Regulated Tertiary Treated Recycled Water Supplies			
45-48	Table 2C & Figure 3A	WU 20	For the purpose of baseline microbial assessment are records of analysis of source water available - historical water test data?
		WU 20a	Is a self-certification with historical water test data available that states the acceptance criteria has been met with at least one test taken within the last 6 months?
		WU 20b	If "NO" was the system tested two times, three 100 mL samples at the source, no less than seven days apart prior to using the water in the 21 days-to-scheduled harvest window?
		WU 20c	Did the sampling meet the acceptance criteria - five of the six total samples have no detectable generic E. coli and the remaining sample has no greater than 10 MPN in 100 mL?
		If WU 20c answered "NO" then WU 20c (1) - WU 20c (2) will drop down	
		WU 20c (1)	Was an agricultural water assessment and root cause analysis performed?
		WU 20c (2)	Was the agricultural water system disqualified for Type A usage?
45-47 & 49	Table 2C & Figure 3B	WU 21	Was an initial microbial water quality assessment performed at least one-time seasonally for each system (before the 21 day to-scheduled-harvest-period begins)?
		WU 21a	Were three 100 mL samples from the end of the delivery system taken during one irrigation event for the initial microbial water quality assessment?
		WU 21b	Did sampling meet the acceptance criteria - three 100 mL samples from end of delivery system with non-detectable generic E. coli in two of three 100 mL samples and the remaining sample no greater than 10 MPN per 100 mL?
		If WU 21b answered "NO" then WU 21b (1) - WU 21b (4) will drop down	
		WU 21b (1)	Was an agricultural water assessment and root cause analysis performed prior to the next irrigation event?

Arizona LGMA - 2022/2023 Audit Checklist

Irrigation Water from TYPE A Agricultural Water Systems Sourced from Private Wells or Regulated Tertiary Treated Recycled Water Supplies			
45-47 & 49	Table 2C & Figure 3B	WU 21b (2)	Was follow-up testing conducted (five 100 mL samples during the next irrigation event)?
		WU 21b (3)	Did the five samples meet follow-up testing acceptance criterion - four must have no detectable generic E. coli and the one remaining sample must have levels not greater than 10 MPN/100 mL?
		WU 21b (4)	If "NO" was the agricultural water system disqualified for Type A usage?
45-47 & 49	Table 2C & Figure 3B	WU 22	If a material change was made to a system was another initial microbial water quality assessment conducted?
		WU 22a	Were three 100 mL samples with at least one taken from the end of the delivery system taken during one irrigation event for the initial microbial water quality assessment?
		WU 22b	Did sampling meet the acceptance criteria - three 100 mL samples from end of delivery system with non-detectable generic E. coli in two of the three 100 mL samples, and the remaining sample no greater than 10 MPN per 100 mL?
			If WU 22b answered "NO" then WU 22b (1) - WU 22b (4) will drop down
		WU 22b (1)	Was an agricultural water assessment and root cause analysis performed prior to the next irrigation event?
		WU 22b (2)	Was follow-up testing conducted (five 100 mL samples during the next irrigation event)?
		WU 22b (3)	Did sampling meet follow-up testing acceptance criterion - four of the five total samples must have no detectable generic E. coli and the one remaining sample must have levels not greater than 10 MPN/100 mL?
		WU 22b (4)	If "NO" was the agricultural water system disqualified for Type A usage?
45-47 & 50	Table 2C & Figure 3C	WU 23	Was routine verification performed on each distinct irrigation system sampled and tested for generic E. coli at least once during the season with three 100 mL samples at the end of the delivery system?
		WU 23a	Were three 100 mL samples taken during the routine verification from the end of the delivery system to evaluate acceptance criteria?
		WU 23b	Did the three samples meet acceptance criteria - two must have no detectable generic E. coli and the one remaining sample must have levels not greater than 10 MPN/100 mL?
			If WU 23b answered "NO" then WU 23b (1) - WU 23b (3) will drop down
		WU 23b (1)	Was a Level 1 Assessment performed prior to the next irrigation event?
		WU 23b (2)	Was follow-up testing conducted (five 100 mL samples during the next irrigation event)?
		WU 23b (3)	Did the five samples for the level one assessment meet acceptance criterion - four must have no detectable generic E. coli and the one remaining sample must have levels not greater than 10 MPN/100 mL?
			If WU 23b (3) answered "NO" then WU 23b (4) - WU 23b (6) will drop down
		WU 23b (4)	Was the agricultural water discontinued for Type A use?
		WU 23b (5)	If water exceeding the acceptance criteria has been used for crop production was product sampled from all affected lots for STEC, including E coli O157:H7, and Salmonella, after the last irrigation and prior to harvest?
WU 23b (6)	If "NO" or the tests were positive for STEC, including E coli O157:H7, or Salmonella do records show that the crop was not harvested for human consumption?		
45-47	Table 2C	WU 24	Records show the name of the test laboratory, water source, date, time, location of the sample and method of analysis, and if quantitative, the detection limit?
		WU 24a	The generic E.coli testing methodology is specified on the test report and meets any FDA method for quantitative monitoring of water for generic E. coli and total coliforms?

Arizona LGMA - 2022/2023 Audit Checklist

Irrigation Water from Treated TYPE B->A Agricultural Water Systems			
35	484	WU 25	Was an SOP established outlining irrigation treatment and process parameters for irrigation treatment systems based on the Initial Irrigation water Treatment Assessment?
35		WU 26	Was an Initial Irrigation Water Treatment Assessment performed to establish treatment process parameters prior to 21 days-to-scheduled harvest?
35		WU 26a	Was an initial microbial water quality assessment conducted prior to 21 days-to-scheduled harvest?
35		WU 26b	Was the assessment repeated if material changes occurred?
51	Table 2D (D1)	WU 27	Was routine verification of microbial water quality for each distinct system performed?
51	Table 2D	WU 27a	If the system is used within the 21 days to harvest window is sampling (three 100 mL samples) conducted monthly?
51	Table 2D	WU 27b	If the system is used within the 21 days to harvest window, was the irrigation treatment system tested on at least two occasions separated by at least three days?
51	Table 2D	WU 27c	Was at least one sample taken from the end of the delivery system?
51	Table 2D	WU 27d	Did sampling meet the acceptance criteria - three 100 mL samples with non-detectable generic E. coli in two of the three 100 mL samples, and the remaining sample no greater than 10 MPN per 100 mL?
			If WU 27c or WU 27d answered "NO" then WU 27d (1) - WU 27d (3) will drop down
58	Table 2F	WU 27d (1)	Was a Level 1 Assessment performed prior to the next irrigation event?
58	Table 2F	WU 27d (2)	Was follow-up testing conducted (five 100 mL samples during the next irrigation event)?
58	Table 2F	WU 27d (3)	Did the five samples for the level one assessment meet acceptance criterion - four must have no detectable generic E. coli and the one remaining sample must have levels not greater than 10 MPN/100 mL?
58			If WU 27d (3) answered "NO" then WU 27d (4) - WU 27d (6) will drop down
58	Table 2F	WU 27d (4)	Was the agricultural water discontinued for Type A use?
58	Table 2F	WU 27d (5)	If water exceeding the acceptance criteria has been used for crop production was product sampled from all affected lots for STEC, including E coli O157:H7, and Salmonella, after the last irrigation and prior to harvest?
58	Table 2F	WU 27d (6)	If "NO" or the tests were positive for STEC, including E coli O157:H7, or Salmonella do records show that the crop was not harvested for human consumption?
51	Table 2D (D1)	WU 28	Did all samples meet the data monitoring criteria for Total Coliform - maximum level of no greater than 99 MPN per 100 mL?
51	Table 2D (D1)	WU 29	Was there an adequate log reduction (as outlined in Appendix A) in Total Coliforms, based on the untreated water's baseline levels?
			<i>Note: If "NO" to WU28 or WU29 then continue to monitor for total coliforms and continue to evaluate your irrigation treatment system to identify and correct any failures.</i>
52	Table 2D (D2)	WU 30	Is the water treatment system being monitored when in use for flow rates and treatment related parameters per the SOP (routine water treatment monitoring)?

Arizona LGMA - 2022/2023 Audit Checklist

Irrigation Water from Treated TYPE B → A Agricultural Water Systems			
52	Table 2D (D2)	WU 31	During every irrigation event, treatment-related parameter values such as residual antimicrobial levels, pH, dose settings, UVT, etc. must be documented to demonstrate the system is working as intended?
52	Table 2D (D2)	WU 32	Is the system tested for microbial water quality if the monitoring parameters fall outside the acceptable criteria?
52	Table 2D (D2)	WU 33	Are USEPA antimicrobial water treatments being used, per the label instructions?
52	Table 2D (D2)	WU 34	Was the crop nutrients and/or crop protection materials window not invoked within 21 days to scheduled harvest for overhead irrigation?
If WU 34 answered "NO" then WU 34a - WU 34c (3) will drop down			
53	Table 2D (D3)	WU 34a	Was it followed by antimicrobial water treatment?
53	Table 2D (D3)	WU 34b	<u>Was Option 1 selected?</u>
53	Table 2D (D3)	WU 34b (1)	Was the crop pre-harvest tested for pathogens from all affected lots for STEC, including E. coli O157:H7 and Salmonella after the last irrigation event?
53	Table 2D (D3)	WU 34b (2)	If no, or the tests were positive for STEC, including E. coli O157:H7, or Salmonella do records show that the crop was not harvested for human consumption?
53	Table 2D (D3)	WU 34c	<u>Was Option 2 selected?</u>
53	Table 2D (D3)	WU 34c (1)	Was one sample collected pre-treatment as close to the point of use during the irrigation event when crop nutrition/protection chemicals were applied?
53	Table 2D (D3)	WU 34c (2)	Was microbial water quality acceptance criteria and action as described in Table X taken?
53	Table 2D (D3)	WU 34c (3)	If no, or the tests were positive for STEC, including E. coli O157:H7, or Salmonella do records show that the crop was not harvested for human consumption?
53	Table 2D (D3)	WU 35	If water exceeding the acceptance criteria has been used for crop production within 21 days to scheduled harvest was product sampled from all affected lots for STEC, including E coli O157:H7, and Salmonella, after the last irrigation and prior to harvest?
Irrigation Water from Treated TYPE B → Agricultural Water Systems			
53	Table 2D (D3)	WU 35a	If "NO" or the tests were positive for STEC, including E coli O157:H7, or Salmonella do records show that the crop was not harvested for human consumption?
51	Table 2D (D1)	WU 36	Records show the name of the test laboratory, water source, date, time, location of the sample and method of analysis, and if quantitative, the detection limit?
51	Table 2D (D1)	WU 37	The generic E.coli testing methodology is specified on the test report and meets any FDA method for quantitative monitoring of water for generic E. coli and total coliforms?
Harvest Direct Produce Contact, Harvest Food Contact Surfaces and Hand Wash Water (On-Farm Practices Only)			
59-60	Table 2G	WU 38	Is the water that directly contacts edible portions of harvested crop, hand wash water or used on food-contact surfaces (i.e. equipment or utensils) from a source that meets the U.S. EPA Maximum Contaminant Level Goal (MCLG) for E. coli.?
59-60	Table 2G	WU 38a	If "NO" has the water received sufficient disinfection to meet the USEPA MCLG for microbial quality?
59-60	Table 2G	WU 39	Was a source water test conducted for each source of water within 60 days of first use?

Arizona LGMA - 2022/2023 Audit Checklist

Harvest Direct Produce Contact, Harvest Food Contact Surfaces and Hand Wash Water (On-Farm Practices Only)			
59-60 & 61	Table 2G & Figure 6	WU 40	Are records available to demonstrate that water samples or monitoring results have been collected from each water distribution system within the last month?
		WU 40a	Were the microbial acceptance criteria met?
		WU 40b	Is there a corrective action SOP for harvest direct produce contact, harvest food contact surfaces and hand wash water that does not meet acceptance criteria?
			If WU 40a is answered "NO" then WU 40b (1) - WU 40b (8) will drop down
		WU 40b (1)	Was use of the water discontinued after the tests indicated the water source failed to meet the minimum water quality requirements?
59-60 & 61	Table 2G & Figure 6	WU 40b (2)	Was an agricultural water assessment completed on the water source and distribution system for possible contamination?
		WU 40b (3)	Do records show that corrective actions were taken per SOP to eliminate the contamination sources?
		WU 40b (4)	Was the water retested at the same sampling point?
		WU 40b (5)	Did the retest results meet the acceptance criteria - non-detectable per U.S. EPA Maximum Contaminant Level Goal (MCLG) for E. coli. (e.g. less than 2.2 MPN/100 mL)?
		WU 40b (6)	Do records show the water was not used while the water quality was inadequate? (e.g. records for a change in the water source)
		WU 40b (7)	If water exceeding acceptance criteria has been used for crop production was product sampled from all affected lots for STEC, including E. coli O157:H7, and Salmonella?
		WU 40b (8)	Records show that the crop was not harvested for human consumption when the tests were positive for STEC, including E. coli O157:H7, or Salmonella?
59-60	Table 2G	WU 41	If the water is reused (multi-pass), is sufficient disinfectant added and monitored at routine intervals to prevent possible cross-contamination? (e.g. Chlorine-more than 1ppm free chlorine and pH 5.5-7.5 or other approved treatment per product EPA label for human pathogen reduction in water)
59-60	Table 2G	WU 42	If disinfectant is used during re-hydration or product coring in the field (single-pass) does the water have breakpoint disinfectant present at point of entry and does the operation monitor and test for disinfectant levels?
Municipal & Well Exemptions			
59-60	Table 2G	WU 43	Is the source water from a municipal supply or well?
59-60	Table 2G	WU 43a	Does this source qualify for the 5 consecutive monthly samples below the generic E. coli detection limit on record exemption?
59-60	Table 2G	WU 43b	Is the last sample recorded within 180 days of the audit date?
59-60	Table 2G	WU 44	Show the name of the test laboratory, water source, date, time, location of the sample and method of analysis, and if quantitative, the detection limit?
59-60	Table 2G	WU 45	The generic E. coli testing methodology is specified on the test report and meets any FDA method for quantitative monitoring of water for generic E. coli?

Arizona LGMA - 2022/2023 Audit Checklist

Soil Amendments and Crop Inputs			
62	755	SA 01	Are there SOP's that address the implementation of storage and application controls that establish management controls that significantly reduce the likelihood that soil amendments being used may contain human pathogens.
			Does the SOP address the following:
63	758	SA 01a	Supplier Approval (e.g. Supplier and/or on-farm SOP to prevent cross contamination and written sampling procedures)
63	759	SA 01b	Source and Quality of the amendment
63	760	SA 01c	Delivery and transport
63	761	SA 01d	Surplus/unconsumed inventory
63	762	SA 01e	Length of Storage and storage location prior to crop application
63	763	SA 01f	Timing of application in the crop cycle and processes used for application.
63	764	SA 01g	Weather events (wind, rain and water runoff)
63	765	SA 01h	Potential for animal intrusion while on farm
63	766	SA 01i	Visitor and employee movements
63	767	SA 01j	Vehicle traffic
65	838	SA 02	Are there SOP's that address the implementation of storage and application controls that establish management controls that significantly reduce the likelihood that crop inputs being used may contain human pathogens.
			Does the SOP address the following:
65	841	SA 02a	Supplier Approval (e.g. Supplier and/or on-farm SOP to prevent cross contamination and written sampling procedures)
65	842	SA 02b	Source and Quality of the amendment
65	843	SA 02c	Delivery and transport
65	844	SA 02d	Surplus/unconsumed inventory
65	845	SA 02e	Length of Storage and storage location prior to crop application
65	846	SA 02f	Timing of application in the crop cycle and processes used for application.
65	847	SA 02g	Weather events (wind, rain and water runoff)
65	848	SA 02h	Potential for animal intrusion while on farm
65	849	SA 02i	Visitor and employee movements
65	850	SA 02j	Vehicle traffic
63 & 65	752 & 865	SA 03	Do you use any materials that are not verified to be safe for food production as soil amendment or crop input?
65	835	SA 03a	If water is used to make agricultural tea does it meet Table 2G acceptance?
62 & 65	748 & 833	SA 04	Do you use soil amendments or crop inputs made from mortality composting processes? If yes, answer the following question.
62 & 65	748 & 833	SA 04a	Did the process follow all local, state, and federal regulations?
63 & 64	754 & 825	SA 05	Do you use soil amendments or crop inputs made from post-consumer waste materials? If yes, answer the following question.
64 & 64	755 & 825	SA 05a	Were the materials used according to all local, state, and federal regulations?

Arizona LGMA - 2022/2023 Audit Checklist

Soil Amendments and Crop Inputs			
63	768	SA 06	If any soil amendments and/or crop inputs became contaminated, was the product segregated and not used until determined safe for food production?
63	768	SA 07	Are <u>on-farm</u> produced soil amendments and/or crop inputs used? If yes, answer the following question.
63	768	SA 07a	Are soil amendments and/or crop inputs suspected of being contaminated? If yes, answer the following question.
63	770	SA 07a(1)	Are soil amendments and/or crop inputs segregated and kept from use until it is determined to be safe for food production? (Proof of reconditioning, verification it is free of pathogens - COA)
Raw manure, untreated animal products/by-products, or not fully composted green waste, biosolids, and/or animal manure-containing <u>soil amendments</u> (see composted)			
62	743	SA 08	Was 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 the following question.
66	Table 3	SA 08a	Were leafy greens planted before one year? If yes, answer the following question.
66	Table 3	SA 08b	Was the 270-day time period used? If yes, answer the following questions.
66	Table 3	SA 08b (1)	Was soil testing conducted?
66	Table 3	SA 08b (2)	Did testing results meet the required acceptance criteria?
66	Table 3	SA 09	Have <u>Type A biosolids</u> been used as a soil amendment or used as an ingredient for soil amendments for lettuce/leafy greens production? If yes, answer the following question.
66	Table 3	SA 09a	Were leafy greens planted within one year from application?
66	Table 3	SA 10	Have <u>Type B biosolids</u> been used as a soil amendment or used as an ingredient for soil amendments for lettuce/leafy greens production? If yes, answer the following question.
66	Table 3	SA10a	Were leafy greens planted within 38 months from application?
7A- Composted Soil Amendments (contain animal manure or animal products)			
67-68	Table 3-7A	SA 11	Were any soil amendments of animal origin composted with the <u>windrow method</u> applied to the field within the last year? If yes, answer the following question.
67-68	Table 3-7A	SA 11a	Are Process Validation records available for review? If yes, answer the following questions.
67-68	Table 3-7A	SA 11a (1)	Did the active compost maintain aerobic conditions for a minimum of 131°F or higher for 15 days or longer?
67-68	Table 3-7A	SA 11a (2)	Was there a minimum of five (5) turnings during this period?
67-68	Table 3-7A	SA 11a (3)	Is there a Letter of Guarantee, or other comparable documentation, available that shows the soil amendment has been adequately cured?
67-68	Table 3-7A	SA 12	Were any soil amendments of animal origin composted with the <u>Enclosed or Within-Vessel</u> composting method? If yes, answer the following question.
67-68	Table 3-7A	SA 12a	Are Process Validation records available for review?
67-68	Table 3-7A	SA 12b	Was the active compost maintained for a minimum of 131 °F for 3 days or longer?
67-68	Table 3-7A	SA 13	Were any soil amendments of animal origin composted with the <u>Aerated Static Pile</u> Composting method? If yes, answer the following question.
67-68	Table 3-7A	SA 13a	Are Process Validation records available for review?
67-68	Table 3-7A	SA 13b	Was the active compost covered with insulating materials, per federal, state and local regulations?
67-68	Table 3-7A	SA 13c	Was the pile maintained for a minimum of 131°F for 3 days or longer?
67-68	Table 3-7A	SA 13d	Is there a Letter of Guarantee, or other comparable documentation, available that shows the soil amendment has been adequately cured?

Arizona LGMA - 2022/2023 Audit Checklist

7A- Composted Soil Amendments (contain animal manure or animal products)			
67-68	Table 3-7A	SA 14	Has each lot of composted material or soil amendment been applied to the production location more than 45 days before harvest?
67-68	Table 3-7A	SA 15	Has each lot of composted material that is less than or equal to 5000 cubic yards been tested as required? If yes, answer the following question.
67-68	Table 3-7A	SA 16	Has each unique lot been tested before application? If yes, answer the following questions.
			Has acceptance criteria been met for the following:
67-68	Table 3-7A	SA 16a	Fecal coliforms : < 1000 MPN / gram
67-68	Table 3-7A	SA 16b	Salmonella: Negative or less than Detection Limit (<1 MPN/30 grams)
67-68	Table 3-7A	SA 16c	STEC: Negative or less than Detection Limit per methodology used
			Have the recommended test methods been used:
67-68	Table 3-7A	SA 16d	Fecal coliforms: U.S. EPA Method 1680; multiple-tube MPN
67-68	Table 3-7A	SA 16e	Salmonella spp: U.S. EPA Method 1682
67-68	Table 3-7A	SA 16f	STEC: Any laboratory validated method for compost
67-68	Table 3-7A	SA 16g	Other U.S. EPA, FDA, AOAC, or TMECC-accredited methods used as an appropriate replacement
			Has the sampling plan followed the acceptable criteria:
67-68	Table 3-7A	SA 16h	Was a representative and random composite sample obtained as described in the California State regulations?
67-68	Table 3-7A	SA 16i	Was the sample obtained by a trained representative?
			Has the testing frequency been used:
67-68	Table 3-7A	SA 16j	Were there products suspected of contamination or has bulk finished product, not enclosed or packaged, been stored for greater than one calendar year?
67-68	Table 3-7A	SA 16j(1)	If yes, does the product meet the metric requirements in Table 3 - 7A?
67-68	Table 3-7A	SA 17	Are test results, COA's, and documentation current, and reviewed before use (i.e. application or before first use)?
67-68	Table 3-7A	SA 18	Are policies, procedures, letters of guarantee, and similar types of documents, updated annually?
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.)			
69-70	Table 3-7B[1]	SA 19	Were any soil amendments of non-animal origin composted with the <u>windrow method</u> applied to the field within the last year? If yes, answer the following question.
69-70	Table 3-7B[1]	SA 19a	Are Process Validation records available for review? If yes, answer the following questions.
69-70	Table 3-7B[1]	SA 19a (1)	Did the active compost maintain aerobic conditions for a minimum of 131°F or higher for 15 days or longer?
69-70	Table 3-7B[1]	SA 19a (2)	Was there a minimum of five (5) turnings during this period?
69-70	Table 3-7B[1]	SA 19a (3)	Is there a Letter of Guarantee, or other comparable documentation, available that shows the soil amendment has been adequately cured?
69-70	Table 3-7B[1]	SA 20	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?
69-70	Table 3-7B[1]	SA 21	Were any soil amendments of non-animal origin composted with the <u>Enclosed or Within-Vessel</u> composting method? If yes, answer the following question.
69-70	Table 3-7B[1]	SA 21a	Are Process Validation records available for review? If yes, answer the following questions.
67-68	Table 3-7B[1]	SA 21a (1)	Was the pile maintained for a minimum of 131°F for 3 days or longer?

Arizona LGMA - 2022/2023 Audit Checklist

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.)			
69-70	Table 3-7B[1]	SA 21a (2)	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?
69-70	Table 3-7B[1]	SA 22	Were any soil amendments of non-animal origin composted with the <u>Aerated Static Pile</u> Composting method? If yes, answer the following question.
69-70	Table 3-7B[1]	SA 22a	Are Process Validation records available for review? If yes, answer the following questions.
69-70	Table 3-7B[1]	SA 22a (1)	Was the active compost covered with insulating materials, per federal, state and local regulations?
69-70	Table 3-7B[1]	SA 22a (2)	Was the pile maintained for a minimum of 131°F for 3 days or longer?
69-70	Table 3-7B[1]	SA 22a (3)	Is there a Letter of Guarantee, or other comparable documentation, available that shows the soil amendment has been adequately cured?
69-70	Table 3-7B[1]	SA 23	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?
69-70	Table 3-7B[1]	SA 24	Has each lot of composted material or soil amendment been applied to the production location more than 45 days before harvest?
69-70	Table 3-7B[1]	SA 25	Has each lot of composted material that is less than or equal to 5000 cubic yards been tested as required? If yes, answer the following questions.
69-70	Table 3-7B[1]	SA 26	Has each unique lot been tested before application? If yes, answer the following questions.
			Has acceptance criteria been met for the following:
69-70	Table 3-7B[1]	SA 26a	Fecal coliforms: < 1000 MPN / gram
69-70	Table 3-7B[1]	SA 26b	Salmonella: Negative or less than Detection Limit (<1 MPN/30 grams)
69-70	Table 3-7B[1]	SA 26c	STEC: Negative or less than Detection Limit per methodology used
			Have the recommended test methods been used:
69-70	Table 3-7B[1]	SA 26d	Fecal coliforms: U.S. EPA Method 1680; multiple-tube MPN
69-70	Table 3-7B[1]	SA 26e	Salmonella spp: U.S. EPA Method 1682
69-70	Table 3-7B[1]	SA 26f	STEC: Any laboratory validated method for compost
69-70	Table 3-7B[1]	SA 26g	Other U.S. EPA, FDA, AOAC, or TMECC-accredited methods used as an appropriate replacement
			Has the sampling plan followed the acceptable criteria:
69-70	Table 3-7B[1]	SA 26h	Was a representative and random composite sample obtained as described in the California State regulations?
69-70	Table 3-7B[1]	SA 26i	Was the sample obtained by a trained representative?
			Has the testing frequency been used:
69-70	Table 3-7B[1]	SA 26j	Were there products suspected of contamination or has bulk finished product, not enclosed or packaged, been stored for greater than one calendar year?
69-70	Table 3-7B[1]	SA 26j (1)	If yes, does the product meet the metric requirements in Table 3 - 7B[1]?
69-70	Table 3-7B[1]	SA 27	Are test results, COA's, and documentation current, and reviewed before use (i.e. application or before first use)?
69-70	Table 3-7B[1]	SA 28	Are policies, procedures, letters of guarantee, and similar types of documents, updated annually?

Arizona LGMA - 2022/2023 Audit Checklist

7B[2] - Non-Composted, Solid and Liquid Soil Amendments Not Containing products of Animal origin (fungal/bacterial extracts, green/plant waste, plant extracts, vegetative material, algae, yeast extract, pre/post-consumer waste not containing products of animal origin, etc.)			
71-72	Table 3-7B[2]	SA 29	Were any non-composted soil amendments of non-animal origin applied to the field within the last year? If yes, answer the following question.
71-72	Table 3-7B[2]	SA 29a	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?
71-72	Table 3-7B[2]	SA 30	Has each lot been tested before application? If yes, answer the following questions.
			Has acceptance criteria been met for the following:
71-72	Table 3-7B[2]	SA 30a	Fecal coliforms: < 1000 MPN / gram of total solids (Dry weight basis)
71-72	Table 3-7B[2]	SA30b	Salmonella: Negative or less than Detection Limit (<1 MPN/30 grams)
71-72	Table 3-7B[2]	SA30c	STEC: Negative or less than Detection Limit (per methodology used)
71-72	Table 3-7B[2]	SA 30d	Listeria monocytogenes: Negative
71-72	Table 3-7B[2]	SA 30e	Have recommended test methods (U.S. EPA, FDA, AOAC, or TMECC or validated/accredited methods) been used?
71-72	Table 3-7B[2]	SA 30f	Is Lot Information described on the COA or accompanying the COA?
			Has the sampling plan followed the acceptable criteria for the following:
71-72	Table 3-7B[2]	SA 30g	For solids, was the sample a minimum of n=60?
71-72	Table 3-7B[2]	SA 30h	For liquids was the sample size per production process lot sizes?
71-72	Table 3-7B[2]	SA 30i	If no, is an application time interval used?
71-72	Table 3-7B[2]	SA 30j	Was the sample obtained by a trained representative and/or verified automated process?
			Has the testing frequency been used:
71-72	Table 3-7B[2]	SA 30k	Were there products suspected of contamination or was bulk finished product, not enclosed or packaged, been stored for greater than one calendar year?
71-73	Table 3-7B[2]	SA 30k (1)	If yes, does the product meet the metric requirements in Table 3 - 7B[2]?
71-72	Table 3-7B[2]	SA 31	Are test results, COA's, and documentation current, and reviewed before use (i.e. application or before first use)?
71-72	Table 3-7B[2]	SA 32	Are policies, procedures, letters of guarantee, and similar types of documents, updated annually?
7C Biological Soil Amendments that have gone through a Validated Treatment Process (not including composting)			
72-74	Table 3-7C	SA 33	Has a soil amendment been applied that has gone through a heat validated treatment process? If yes, answer the following questions.
72-74	Table 3-7C	SA 33a	Are a Certificate of Process Validity as defined by the "Guidelines" and a COA that meets acceptance criteria available for review?
72-74	Table 3-7C	SA 33b	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?
			Have acceptance criteria been met for each of the following:
70-72	Table 3-7C	SA 33c	Fecal coliforms: Negative or less than Detection Limit per gram
70-72	Table 3-7C	SA 33d	Salmonella: Negative or less than Detection Limit (<1 MPN/30 grams)
70-72	Table 3-7C	SA 33e	STEC: Negative or less than Detection Limit (per methodology used)
70-72	Table 3-7C	SA 33f	Listeria monocytogenes: Not detected of Detection Limit (<1 CFU/5 grams)

Arizona LGMA - 2022/2023 Audit Checklist

7C Biological Soil Amendments that have gone through a Validated Treatment Process (not including composting)			
			Have the recommended test methods been used:
72-74	Table 3-7C	SA 33g	Fecal coliforms: U.S. EPA Method 1680; multiple-tube MPN
72-74	Table 3-7C	SA 33h	Salmonella spp: U.S. EPA Method 1682
72-74	Table 3-7C	SA 33i	STEC and <i>Listeria monocytogenes</i> : Any laboratory validated method for compost
72-74	Table 3-7C	SA 33j	U.S. EPA, FDA, AOAC, or other validated/accredited methods may be used as appropriate
72-74	Table 3-7C	SA 33k	Is Lot Information described on the COA or accompanying the COA?
			Has the Sampling Plan followed the acceptable criteria for the following:
72-74	Table 3-7C	SA 33l	For solids, was the sample a minimum of n=60?
72-74	Table 3-7C	SA 33m	For liquids was the sample size per production process lot sizes?
72-74	Table 3-7C	SA 33n	Was the sample obtained by a trained representative and/or verified automated process?
			Has the testing frequency been used:
72-74	Table 3-7C	SA 33o	Was each lot tested before application to production fields?
72-74	Table 3-7C	SA 33p	Was the lot suspected of contamination and reconditioned/re-processed?
72-75	Table 3-7C	SA 33p (1)	If yes, does the product meet the metric requirements in Table 3 - 7C?
72-74	Table 3-7C	SA 34	Are test results, COA's, and documentation current, and reviewed before use (i.e. application or before first use)?
72-74	Table 3-7C	SA 35	Are policies, procedures, letters of guarantee, and similar types of documents, updated annually?
7D Synthetic and/or Inorganic Soil Amendments			
74	Table 3 - 7D	SA 36	Have synthetic and/or Inorganic Soil Amendments been applied?
74	Table 3 - 7D	SA 37	Is documentation available that shows the soil amendment is free of non-synthetic products and not containing ingredients of animal origin or manure?
74	Table 3 - 7D	SA 38	Were products used in accordance with all local, state, and federal regulations?
74	Table 3 - 7D	SA 39	Was the documentation available and reviewed before use (i.e. application or before first use)?
7E - Soil Amendments with Combined Components			
74	Table 3 - 7E	SA 40	Has a soil amendment that has combined different categories of materials been applied within the past year? If yes, answer the following question.
			Does the combined soil amendment include:
74	Table 3 - 7E	SA 40a	Composted material containing animal manure or animal products
74	Table 3 - 7E	SA 40b	Composted material not containing products of animal origin
74	Table 3 - 7E	SA 40c	Non-Composted, Solid and Liquid, not containing products of animal origin
74	Table 3 - 7E	SA 40d	Biological material that has gone through a Validated Treatment Process
74	Table 3 - 7E	SA 40e	Synthetic and/or Inorganic material
74	Table 3 - 7E	SA 40f	Have the acceptance criteria been met the requirement of its respective class of materials? (See above for appropriate criteria.)
74	Table 3 - 7E	SA 40g	Has the sampling plan followed the criteria for the requirement of its respective class of materials?
74	Table 3 - 7E	SA 41	If product has been applied to the edible portion of the crop, have application intervals for the requirement of its respective class of materials per the most stringent limits been followed?
74	Table 3 - 7E	SA 42	Are test results, COAs, and documentation current, reviewed before use and available for verification from the grower for a period of two years?

Arizona LGMA - 2022/2023 Audit Checklist

Raw manure, untreated animal products/by-products, or not fully composted green waste, biosolids, and/or animal manure-containing <u>crop inputs</u> (see composted)			
64	821	SA 43	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 the following question.
66	Table 3	SA 43a	Were leafy greens planted before one year? If yes, answer the following question.
66	Table 3	SA 43b	Was the 270-day time period used? If yes, answer the following questions.
66	Table 3	SA 43b (1)	Was soil testing conducted?
66	Table 3	SA 43b (2)	Did testing results meet the required acceptance criteria?
66	Table 3	SA 44	Have <u>Type A biosolids</u> been used as a crop input or an ingredient for crop inputs for lettuce/leafy greens production?
66	Table 3	SA 44a	Were leafy greens planted within one year from application?
66	Table 3	SA 45	Have <u>Type B biosolids</u> been used as a crop input or an ingredient for crop inputs for lettuce/leafy greens production?
66	Table 3	SA 45a	Were leafy greens planted within 38 months from application?
7A- Composted Crop Inputs (contain animal manure or animal products)			
67-68	Table 3-7A	SA 46	Were any crop inputs of animal origin composted with the windrow method applied to the crop within the last year? If yes, answer the following questions.
67-68	Table 3-7A	SA 46a	Are <u>Process Validation</u> records available for review?
67-68	Table 3-7A	SA 46a (1)	Did the active compost maintain aerobic conditions for a minimum of 131°F or higher for 15 days or longer?
67-68	Table 3-7A	SA 46a (2)	Was there a minimum of five (5) turnings during this period?
67-68	Table 3-7A	SA 46a (3)	Is there a Letter of Guarantee, or other comparable documentation, available that shows the crop input has been adequately cured?
67-68	Table 3-7A	SA 47	Were any crop inputs of animal origin composted with the <u>Enclosed or Within-Vessel</u> composting method? If yes, answer the following questions.
67-68	Table 3-7A	SA 47a	Are Process Validation records available for review?
67-68	Table 3-7A	SA 47b	Was the active compost was maintained for a minimum of 131 °F for 3 days or longer?
67-68	Table 3-7A	SA 48	Were any crop inputs of animal origin composted with the <u>Aerated Static Pile</u> Composting method? If yes, answer the following questions.
67-68	Table 3-7A	SA 48a	Are Process Validation records available for review?
67-68	Table 3-7A	SA 48b	Was the active compost covered with insulating materials, per federal, state and local regulations?
67-68	Table 3-7A	SA 48c	Was the pile maintained for a minimum of 131°F for 3 days?
67-68	Table 3-7A	SA 48d	Is there a Letter of Guarantee, or other comparable documentation, available that shows the crop input has been adequately cured?
67-68	Table 3-7A	SA 49	Has each lot of composted material or crop input been applied to the production location more than 45 days before harvest?
67-68	Table 3-7A	SA 50	Has each lot of composted material that is less than or equal to 5000 cubic yards been tested as required? If yes, answer the following questions.
67-68	Table 3-7A	SA 51	Has each unique lot been tested before application? If yes, answer the following questions.

Arizona LGMA - 2022/2023 Audit Checklist

7A- Composted Crop Inputs (contain animal manure or animal products)			
			Has acceptance criteria been met for the following:
67-68	Table 3-7A	SA 51a	Fecal coliforms: < 1000 MPN / gram
67-68	Table 3-7A	SA 51b	Salmonella: Negative or less than Detection Limit (<1 MPN/30 grams)
67-68	Table 3-7A	SA 51c	STEC: Negative or less than Detection Limit per methodology used
			Have the recommended test methods been used:
67-68	Table 3-7A	SA 51d	Fecal coliforms: U.S. EPA Method 1680; multiple-tube MPN
67-68	Table 3-7A	SA 51e	Salmonella spp: U.S. EPA Method 1682
67-68	Table 3-7A	SA 51f	STEC: Any laboratory validated method for compost
67-68	Table 3-7A	SA 51g	Other U.S. EPA, FDA, AOAC, or TMECC-accredited methods used as an appropriate replacement
			Has the sampling plan followed the acceptable criteria:
67-68	Table 3-7A	SA 51h	Was a representative and random composite sample was obtained following California State regulations?
67-68	Table 3-7A	SA 51i	Was the sample obtained by a trained representative?
			Has the testing frequency been used:
67-68	Table 3-7A	SA 51j	Were there products suspected of contamination or has bulk finished product, not enclosed or packaged, been stored for greater than one calendar year?
		SA 51j (1)	If yes, does the product meet the metric requirements in Table 3 - 7A?
67-68	Table 3-7A	SA 52	Are test results, COA's, and documentation current, and reviewed before use (i.e. application or before first use)?
67-68	Table 3-7A	SA 53	Are policies, procedures, letters of guarantee, and similar types of documents, updated annually?
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.)			
69-70	Table 3-7B[1]	SA 54	Were any Crop Inputs of non-animal origin composted with the <u>windrow method</u> applied to the field within the last year? If yes, answer the following questions.
69-70	Table 3-7B[1]	SA 54a	Are Process Validation records available for review?
69-70	Table 3-7B[1]	SA 54a (1)	Did the active compost maintain aerobic conditions for a minimum of 131°F or higher for 15 days or longer?
69-70	Table 3-7B[1]	SA 54a (2)	Was there a minimum of five (5) turnings during this period?
69-70	Table 3-7B[1]	SA 54a (3)	Is there a Letter of Guarantee, or other comparable documentation, available that shows the crop input has been adequately cured?
69-70	Table 3-7B[1]	SA 54a (4)	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?
69-70	Table 3-7B[1]	SA 55	Were any Crop Inputs of non-animal origin composted with the <u>Enclosed or Within-Vessel</u> composting method? If yes, answer the following questions.
69-70	Table 3-7B[1]	SA 55a	Are Process Validation records available for review?
69-70	Table 3-7B[1]	SA 55b	Was the active compost was maintained for a minimum of 131 °F for 3 days or longer?
69-70	Table 3-7B[1]	SA 55c	Is there a Letter of Guarantee, or other comparable documentation (ingredient statement, agricultural label etc.) available that shows the crop inputs is free of product of animal origin?
69-70	Table 3-7B[1]	SA 56	Were any Crop Inputs of non-animal origin composted with the <u>Aerated Static Pile Composting</u> method? If yes, answer the following questions.
69-70	Table 3-7B[1]	SA 56a	Are Process Validation records available for review?
69-70	Table 3-7B[1]	SA 56b	Was the active compost covered with insulating materials, per federal, state and local regulations?

Arizona LGMA - 2022/2023 Audit Checklist

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.)			
69-70	Table 3-7B[1]	SA 56c	Was the pile maintained for a minimum of 131°F for 3 days?
69-70	Table 3-7B[1]	SA 56d	Is there a Letter of Guarantee, or other comparable documentation, available that shows the crop input has been adequately cured?
69-70	Table 3-7B[1]	SA 56e	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?
69-70	Table 3-7B[1]	SA 57	Has each lot of composted material or crop input been applied to the production location more than 45 days before harvest?
69-70	Table 3-7B[1]	SA 58	Has each lot of composted material that is less than or equal to 5000 cubic yards been tested as required?
69-70	Table 3-7B[1]	SA 59	Has each unique lot been tested before application? If yes, answer the following questions.
			Has acceptance criteria been met for the following:
69-70	Table 3-7B[1]	SA 59a	Fecal coliforms : < 1000 MPN / gram
69-70	Table 3-7B[1]	SA 59b	Salmonella: Negative or less than Detection Limit (<1 MPN/30 grams)
69-70	Table 3-7B[1]	SA 59c	STEC: Negative or less than Detection Limit per methodology used
			Have the recommended test methods been used:
69-70	Table 3-7B[1]	SA 59d	Fecal coliforms: U.S. EPA Method 1680; multiple-tube MPN
69-70	Table 3-7B[1]	SA 59e	Salmonella spp: U.S. EPA Method 1682
69-70	Table 3-7B[1]	SA 59f	STEC: Any laboratory validated method for compost
69-70	Table 3-7B[1]	SA 59g	Other U.S. EPA, FDA, AOAC, or TMECC-accredited methods used as an appropriate replacement
69-70			Has the sampling plan followed the acceptable criteria:
69-70	Table 3-7B[1]	SA 59h	Was a representative and random composite sample was obtained following California State regulations.
69-70	Table 3-7B[1]	SA 59i	Was the sample obtained by a trained representative?
69-70			Has the testing frequency been used:
69-70	Table 3-7B[1]	SA 59j	Were there products suspected of contamination or has bulk finished product, not enclosed or packaged, been stored for greater than one calendar year?
69-70	Table 3-7B[1]	SA 59j (1)	If yes, does the product meet the metric requirements in Table 3 - 7B[1]?
69-70	Table 3-7B[1]	SA 60	Are test results, COA's, and documentation current, and reviewed before use (i.e. application or before first use)?
69-70	Table 3-7B[1]	SA 61	Are policies, procedures, letters of guarantee, and similar types of documents, updated annually?

Arizona LGMA - 2022/2023 Audit Checklist

7B[2] - Non-Composted, Solid and Liquid Crop Inputs Not Containing products of Animal origin (fungal/bacterial extracts, green/plant waste, plant extracts, vegetative material, algae, yeast extract, pre/post-consumer waste not containing products of animal origin, etc.)			
71-72	Table 3-7B[2]	SA 62	Were any non-composted Crop Inputs of non-animal origin applied to the field within the last year? If yes, answer the following question.
71-72	Table 3-7B[2]	SA 62a	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?
71-72	Table 3-7B[2]	SA 63	Has each lot been tested before application? If yes, answer the following questions.
			Has acceptance criteria been met for the following:
71-72	Table 3-7B[2]	SA 63a	Fecal coliforms: < 1000 MPN / gram of total solids (Dry weight basis)
71-72	Table 3-7B[2]	SA 63b	Salmonella: Negative or less than Detection Limit (<1 MPN/30 grams)
71-72	Table 3-7B[2]	SA 63c	<i>STEC</i> : Negative or less than Detection Limit (per methodology used)
71-72	Table 3-7B[2]	SA 63d	Listeria monocytogenes: Negative
71-72	Table 3-7B[2]	SA 63e	Have recommended test methods (U.S. EPA, FDA, AOAC, or TMECC or validated/accredited methods) been used as appropriate?
71-72	Table 3-7B[2]	SA 63f	Is Lot Information described on the COA or accompanying the COA?
			Has the sampling plan followed the acceptable criteria for the following:
71-72	Table 3-7B[2]	SA 63g	For solids, was the sample a minimum of n=60?
71-72	Table 3-7B[2]	SA 63h	For liquids was the sample size per production process lot sizes?
71-72	Table 3-7B[2]	SA 63i	If no, is an application time interval used?
71-72	Table 3-7B[2]	SA 63j	Was the sample obtained by a trained representative and/or verified automated process?
			Has the testing frequency been used:
71-72	Table 3-7B[2]	SA 63k	Were there products suspected of contamination or has bulk finished product, not enclosed or packaged, been stored for greater than one calendar year?
		SA 63k (1)	If yes, does the product meet the metric requirements in Table 3 - 7B[2]?
71-72	Table 3-7B[2]	SA 64	Are test results, COA's, and documentation current, and reviewed before use (i.e. application or before first use)?
71-72	Table 3-7B[2]	SA 65	Are policies, procedures, letters of guarantee, and similar types of documents, updated annually?

Arizona LGMA - 2022/2023 Audit Checklist

7C– Biological Crop Inputs that have gone through a Validated Treatment Process (not including composting)			
72-74	Table 3-7C	SA 66	Has a crop input been applied that has gone through a validated treatment process? If yes, answer the following questions.
72-74	Table 3-7C	SA 66a	Are a Certificate of Process Validity as defined by the “Guidelines” and a COA that meets acceptance criteria available for review?
70-72	Table 3-7C	SA 66b	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?
			Has acceptance criteria been met for the following:
70-72	Table 3-7C	SA 66c	Fecal coliforms: Negative or less than Detection Limit per gram
70-72	Table 3-7C	SA 66d	Salmonella: Negative or less than Detection Limit (<1 MPN/30 grams)
70-72	Table 3-7C	SA 66e	STEC: Negative or less than Detection Limit (per methodology used)
70-72	Table 3-7C	SA 66f	Listeria monocytogenes: Not detected or less than Detection Limit (<1 CFU/5 grams)
			Have the recommended test methods been used for the following:
70-72	Table 3-7C	SA 66g	Fecal coliforms: U.S. EPA Method 1680; multiple-tube MPN
70-72	Table 3-7C	SA 66h	Salmonella spp: U.S. EPA Method 1682
70-72	Table 3-7C	SA 66i	STEC and <i>Listeria monocytogenes</i> : Any laboratory validated method for compost
70-72	Table 3-7C	SA 66j	U.S. EPA, FDA, AOAC, or other validated/accredited methods may be used as appropriate
70-72	Table 3-7C	SA 66k	Is Lot Information described on the COA or accompanying the COA?
			Has the sampling plan followed the acceptable criteria?
70-72	Table 3-7C	SA 66l	For solids, was the sample a minimum of n=60?
70-72	Table 3-7C	SA 66m	For liquids was the sample size per production process lot sizes?
70-72	Table 3-7C	SA 66n	Was the sample obtained by a trained representative and/or verified automated process
			Has the testing frequency been used:
70-72	Table 3-7C	SA 66o	Was each lot tested before application to production fields?
70-72	Table 3-7C	SA 66p	Was the lot suspected of contamination and reconditioned/re-processed?
		SA 66p(1)	If yes, does the product meet the metric requirements in Table 3 - 7C?
70-72	Table 3-7C	SA 67	Were products used in accordance with all local, state, and federal regulations?
70-72	Table 3-7C	SA 68	Was the documentation available and reviewed before use (i.e. application or before first use)?

Arizona LGMA - 2022/2023 Audit Checklist

7D - Synthetic and/or Inorganic Crop Inputs			
74	Table 3 - 7D	SA 69	Have synthetic and/or Inorganic Crop Inputs been applied to the crop?
74	Table 3 - 7D	SA 70	Is documentation available that shows the crop input is free of non-synthetic products and not containing ingredients of animal origin or manure?
74	Table 3 - 7D	SA 71	Were products used in accordance with all local, state, and federal regulations?
74	Table 3 - 7D	SA 72	Was the documentation available and reviewed before use (i.e. application or before first use)?
7E – Combined Crop Input Components			
74	Table 3 - 7E	SA 73	Has a crop input that has combined different categories of materials been applied within the past year? If yes, answer the following questions.
			Does the combined crop input include:
74	Table 3 - 7E	SA 73a	Composted material containing animal manure or animal products
74	Table 3 - 7E	SA 73b	Composted material not containing products of animal origin
74	Table 3 - 7E	SA 73c	Non-Composted, Solid and Liquid, Not Containing products of animal origin
74	Table 3 - 7E	SA 73d	Biological material that have gone through a Validated Treatment Process
74	Table 3 - 7E	SA 73e	Synthetic and/or Inorganic material
74	Table 3 - 7E	SA 73f	Have the acceptance criteria been met for the highest risk ingredient? (See previous sections for appropriate criteria.)
74	Table 3 - 7E	SA 73g	Has the sampling plan followed the criteria for the highest risk ingredient?
74	Table 3 - 7E	SA 74	If product has been applied to the edible portion of the crop, have application intervals for the requirement of its respective class of materials per the most stringent limits been followed?
74	Table 3 - 7E	SA 75	Are test results, COAs, and documentation current, reviewed before use and available for verification from the grower for a period of two years?

Arizona LGMA - 2022/2023 Audit Checklist

Field Sanitation Daily Harvest Assessment			
General Requirements			
81	1025	FS 01	Is there a written policy for all employees in the field location which describes the required field sanitation SOPs?
81	1028	FS 01a	Is a specific individual designated as responsible for food safety compliance with the best practices of the LGMA for growing operations?
81	1028	FS01b	Is a specific individual designated as responsible for food safety compliance with the best practices of the LGMA for harvesting?
Daily Harvest Assessment			
		FS 02	Is a documented daily food safety harvest assessment available for review?
22	128	FS 02a	Is the assessment dated?
22	128	FS 02b	Is the individual who conducted the assessment identified?
21	118	FS 02c	Are the specific growing blocks associated with the assessment clearly identified?
22	128	FS 02d	Is the Harvester name and contact information documented?
91-92	Table 6	FS 02e	Did the assessment indicate that the production area was free from evidence of animal intrusion or potential risk of intrusion?
If FS 02e is answered "NO" then FS 02e (1) - FS 02e (6) will drop down.			
91-92	Table 6	FS 02e (1)	Was the animal hazard or potential risk of intrusion assessed by food safety professional or food safety personnel?
91-92	Table 6	FS 02e (2)	Was the animal hazard or potential risk of intrusion assessed as a "Low Hazard"?
91-92	Table 6	FS 02e (3)	Is there a written SOP for corrective actions for "Low Hazard" animal intrusion?
91-92	Table 6	FS 02e (4)	If "YES" were corrective actions carried out according to company SOP?
91-92	Table 6	FS 02e (5)	Was the animal hazard or potential risk of intrusion assessed as a "Medium/High Hazard"?
91-92	Table 6	FS 02e (6)	If "YES" were corrective actions carried out per the LGMA requirements?
91-92	Table 6	FS 02e (7)	If "YES" is documentation available to show that actions were implemented?
24	225-228	FS 03	Did the assessment address environmental sources of contaminants after a change in weather conditions or weather events since the last assessment?
		FS 03a	If the crop or operations were impacted were corrective actions carried out according to Company SOP?
Field Sanitation Worker Practices			
General Requirements			
81	1025	FS 04	Is there a written policy for all employees and all visitors to the field location which describes the required hygiene rules?
			Does the Policy address the following:
81	1031	FS 04a	Field Worker Practices (GMP's, GHP's, etc.)
82	1059	FS 04b	Worker Health Practices
Field Worker Practices			
81	1025	FS 05	Is there a written worker practices program that establishes employee work rules?
			Does the program address the following:
81	1032 & 1036	FS 05a	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. <u>Use of antiseptic/sanitizer or wipes as a substitute for soap and water is not permitted.</u>
82	1043	FS 05b	Confine smoking, eating and drinking (except water) to designated areas.
82	1058	FS 05c	Storage requirements for personal items in/or adjacent to the field?

Arizona LGMA - 2022/2023 Audit Checklist

Field Worker Practices			
81	1039 & 1041	FS 05d	The appropriate use and sanitation of gloves, this includes prohibiting the use of personal gloves and taking gloves home.
82	1042	FS 05e	Avoid contact with animals
82	1044	FS 05f	Prohibitions on spitting, urinating or defecating in the field.
81	1037	FS 05g	Requirement for workers' clothing to be clean at the start of the day.
82	1048	FS 06	For materials targeted for further processing, is there a written physical hazard prevention program?
			Does the program address the following:
82	1050	FS 06a	The proper wearing of head and facial hair restraints.
82	1051	FS 06b	The proper wearing of apron and other food safety apparel.
82	1054	FS 06c	Removal of visible jewelry (rings, bracelets, necklaces, body piercings, etc.) or covering of hand jewelry prior to the start of work.
82	1057	FS 06d	Removal of all objects from upper pockets.
Worker Health Practices			
72	1059	FS 07	Is there a written worker health practices program that establishes employee work rules?
			Does the program address the following:
72	1061	FS 07a	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?
72	1065	FS 07b	Workers with open cuts or lesions are prohibited from handling fresh produce.
72	1067	FS 07c	Instruct personnel to notify supervisors if they may have a health condition that may result in contamination of covered produce or food contact surfaces (e.g. injury or illness).
72	1071	FS 07d	A policy describing procedures for handling/disposition of produce or food contact surfaces that have come into contact with blood or other body fluids.
Sanitary Facilities			
83	1083	FS 08	Is there a documented field sanitary facility program? (i.e. SOP)
			Does the program address the following:
83	1088	FS 08a	The number, condition, and placement of field sanitation units complies with applicable state and/or federal regulations.
83	1091	FS 08b	Sanitary facilities are readily accessible (proximate) to the work area.
83	1092	FS 08c	Sanitary facilities are regularly maintained, cleaned and serviced according to schedule.
83	1093	FS 08d	Sanitary facilities have sufficient consumable supplies (i.e. hand soap, water that meets the hand wash acceptance criteria in Table 2G, paper towels, toilet paper, etc.).
83	1095	FS 08e	Readily understandable signs are posted (e.g. to instruct employees to wash their hands after using the facility)
83	1096	FS 08f	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. (i.e. gray water, black water, overspray/drift or runoff)
83	1100	FS 08g	Address the placement and transport of the sanitary facility in order to minimize any impact on the crop in the field including:
83	1100	FS 08h	Minimize the impact on the crop from leaks and/or spills
83	1101	FS 08i	Ability to access the unit for maintenance and cleaning service
83	1097	FS 08j	Response plan in the event of a leak and/or spill. (e.g. an SOP and a documented corrective action)

Arizona LGMA - 2022/2023 Audit Checklist

Field Sanitation Contact with Soil and Contaminants			
General Requirements			
Field and Harvest Activities SOP's			
		FS 09	Is there a written field and harvest activity SOP?
			Do SOPs address the following:
80	1000	FS 09a	Prohibit ground or soil contact of cut surfaces.
84	1122	FS 09b	Discard and do not pack lettuce/leafy greens dropped on the ground or soil during harvest.
80	997	FS 09c	Cross contamination by farming equipment and tools that comes into contact with raw manure, untreated compost, waters of unknown quality, animal hazards or other potential sources.
		FS 09d	If "YES" does it appropriately restrict the use or require a documented cleaning and sanitation program of the equipment?
		FS 09e	If cleaning and sanitation is required, are records of the cleaning/sanitation available for review.
87	1237	FS 10	Is there a written SOP for production locations that have environmental source of pathogens (i.e. CAFO, dairy, hobby farm and manure or livestock compost facility) and the potential for contamination during weather conditions and events?
81	1013	FS 11	Is there an SOP that addresses waste, trash, and other debris that protects product and production area from contamination?
Field Sanitation Harvest Equipment, Packing Materials and Buildings			
78 & 79	918 & 949	FS 12	Is there an SOP/SSOP for food-contact surfaces of harvest equipment, tools, and utensils?
			Does the SOP/SSOP address the following:
79	949-958	FS 12a	Equipment specific cleaning instructions
79	949-958	FS 12b	Method and frequency of cleaning and sanitation
78	919	FS 12c	Cleaning and sanitizing are completed before moving to the next commodity and/or field
78	920	FS 12d	Daily inspection of food contact surfaces prior to harvest
78	921	FS 12e	Equipment rinsing and sanitizing prior to beginning daily harvest if inspection indicates to do so?
81	1030	FS 12f	Chemical usage and record keeping (e.g. soap, detergent, sanitizer, etc.)
78	926	FS 12g	Sanitation Procedures Verification
80	970	FS 12h	Proper cleaning and sanitation for changes in conditions (e.g. weather, pest activity, contact with non-covered PSR produce, etc.)
78	921	FS 13	Do records indicate that food contact surfaces on harvest equipment was rinsed and sanitized prior to harvest if needed?
78	901	FS 14	Do records indicate food contact surfaces on harvest equipment, tools and utensils are cleaned and sanitized at the end of each daily harvest
78 & 79	918 & 949	FS 15	Is there an SOP for non-food-contact surfaces of harvest equipment and tools?
			Does the SOP address the following:
79	949-958	FS 15a	Equipment-specific cleaning instructions
79	949-958	FS 15b	Method and frequency of cleaning
81	1030	FS 15c	Chemical usage and record keeping (e.g. soap, detergent, etc.)
79	949	FS 15d	Cleaning verification
78	920	FS 15e	Daily inspection of non-food contact surfaces and equipment
79	939	FS 16	Do records indicate that non- food contact surfaces on harvest equipment are cleaned according to SOP?
79	933	FS 17	Is there an SOP for sanitary operation of harvest equipment?
			Does the SOP address the following:
79	934	FS 17a	Spills and leaks on harvest equipment

Arizona LGMA - 2022/2023 Audit Checklist

Field Sanitation Harvest Equipment, Packing Materials and Buildings			
79	935	FS 17b	Inoperative water sprays
79	936	FS 17c	Exclusion of foreign objects (glass, plastic, metal and other debris)?
84	1142	FS 17d	Equipment, water tanks and tool storage when not in use
		FS 17e	Documentation logs for equipment cleaning and sanitation
79	928	FS 18	Is there an SOP for water tanks and equipment used for hydration?
80	967	FS 19	Is there an SOP/SSOP for handling and storage of harvest containers and packaging materials containers?
			Does the SOP address the following:
80	969	FS 19a	Daily inspection of containers
80	972	FS 19b	Overnight storage
80	973	FS 19c	Prohibit contact with the ground or soil
80	974	FS 19d	Container assembly (RPC, fiber bin, plastic bin, etc.)
80	975	FS 19e	Damaged containers
80	976	FS 19f	Use of containers only as intended
79	949	FS 19g	Method and frequency of routine cleaning and sanitation
81	1030	FS 19h	Chemical usage and record keeping (e.g. soap, detergent, sanitizer etc.)
80	970	FS 19i	Proper cleaning and sanitation for changes in conditions (e.g. weather, pest activity, contact with non-covered PSR produce, etc.)
79	961	FS 20	Are packing materials or containers cleanable or designed for single use?
76	955	FS 21	Are reusable packing materials or containers cleaned and sanitized or fitted with a clean liner?
81	1030	FS 22	Is there an SOP for chemical storage and chemical content labeling
79	944	FS 23	Are instruments or controls used to measure, regulate, or record temperature, hydrogen ion concentration, pH, sanitizer concentration or other conditions:
79	946	FS 23a	Accurate and precise as necessary and appropriate for their intended use?
79	947	FS 23b	Adequately maintained?
79	948	FS 23c	Adequate in number for their intended use?
80	977	FS 24	Are there any buildings used to store packing material?
80	985	FS 24a	Does the building have proper drainage and protection from condensate or drips to keep food-contact surfaces from getting wet?
80	982	FS 24b	Are packaging materials and other food-contact surfaces kept separate from contamination sources by partition, time, location, enclosed system, or other effective means?
Transportation			
93	1341	TR 01	Is there an inspection program for equipment and shipping containers used to transport leafy greens from the farm and on the farm?
93	1341	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?
93	1344	TR 01b	Is the condition of shipping units and equipment checked for cleanliness before being used to ship leafy greens?

Arizona LGMA - 2022/2023 Audit Checklist

Field Observations			
Water Use			
		FO WU 01	Are all active and/or inactive water sources and distribution system recorded in the agricultural water assessment?
		FO WU 02	From visual inspection, there is no evidence that the water sources and distribution systems may pose a contamination risk (damage, inadequately maintained, evidence of animal activity, environmental sources of contamination, connection with effluent systems)?
		FO WU 03	No other observations of improper use of water
Soil Amendments			
		FO SA 01	No evidence of undocumented use of soil amendments and/or crop inputs?
		FO SA 02	No evidence of improperly applied soil amendments and/or crop inputs?
		FO SA 03	No evidence of improperly stored soil amendments and/or crop inputs?
		FO SA 04	No other observations of improper use of soil amendments and/or crop inputs?
Environmental Factors			
		FO EA 01	No evidence of fecal contamination in the production area?
		FO EA 02	No evidence of animal intrusion or potential risk of intrusion in the production area?
		FO EA 03	No evidence of non-compliance with distances as outlined in the Environmental Assessment?
		FO EA 04	No evidence that remedial actions have not been implemented?
		FO EA 05	No other observations of environmental risk factors.
Field Sanitation			
		FO FS 01	Are there visitor policies/procedures in place?
		FO FS 02	No evidence of excessive non-vegetative debris in the field?
		FO FS 03	Are chemical containers labeled as to its contents?
		FO FS 04	Are chemicals stored per SOP?
		FO FS 05	No evidence of leaks and spills on equipment in the field?
		FO FS 06	No evidence of equipment is not maintained and operational?
		FO FS 07	No evidence of the use of farm equipment that may have come in contact with potential contaminants (e.g. uncovered products as outlined in the PSR, raw manure, partially treated compost, waters of unknown quality, wildlife or domestic animals)?
		FO FS 08	No evidence of potential cross-contamination of product? (i.e. cut surface of product and contact with the ground/soil)
		FO FS 09	No evidence of other potential cross-contamination of food contact surfaces on harvest equipment or tools
		FO FS 10	No evidence of potential cross-contamination of containers and packing materials
		FO FS 11	No other evidence of improper field sanitation.
		FO FS 12	No employees eating, drinking (except water), chewing tobacco or smoking in crop production actively harvested areas or outside of designated area outlined in the SOP?
		FO FS 13	No evidence that sanitary facilities are not routinely clean and operational?
		FO FS 14	No evidence that sanitary facilities are not adequately stocked with disposable supplies?
		FO FS 15	All employees observed to have washed their hands after; restroom usage, work breaks or any returning to work occasion?
		FO FS 16	No evidence that worker hygiene rules have been violated?
		FO FS 17	No improperly stored personal items observed in the field?
		FO FS 18	No evidence that workers practices for further processing have been violated?
		FO FS 19	No employees with uncovered wounds, boils or cuts?
		FO FS 20	No employees with symptoms of infection or contagious disease?
		FO FS 21	No other observations of improper work practices.